This article is downloaded from

http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au

It is the paper published as:

Author: A. Phelan, M. and J. Sumsion

Title: Lines of articulation and lines of flight in teacher education

Year: 2008

Editor: A. P. and J. Sumsion

Book Title: Critical readings in teacher education: Provoking absences.

Place: Rotterdam

Publisher: Sense Publishers

Pages: 1-16

Edition: 1

ISBN: 9789087902896

URLs: https://www.sensepublishers.com/
http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=9228&local_base=GEN01-CSU01

Author Address:
jsumsion@csu.edu.au

CRO Identification Number: 9228

ANNE M. PHELAN & JENNIFER SUMSION

INTRODUCTION

Lines of Articulation and Lines of Flight in Teacher Education

This book emerged from our unease with "what is" in teacher education and our hope for what it might become. We have taken as our starting point the premise that teacher education, like other fields of study, defines itself both by what it includes and by what it excludes. In setting limits, this process of self-definition, as Foucault (1972) describes it, repulses a whole teratology of learning, and excludes and removes from view a whole range of possibilities. Once excluded and removed, these absent possibilities are not straightforwardly available for assessment, criticism and analysis (Code, 1991). Teacher educators have spent a great deal of time seeking the flaws in existing structures and practices in teacher education and attempting to eradicate them—we have spent a lot less time, however, learning to perceive what is not there to be perceived. If teacher education is to have a different future, we will need to ask difficult questions: What is it in teacher education that has been repulsed? What is not there to be perceived, and how might we begin to perceive it in its absence? Posing these questions, we believe, can assist in interrupting the perennial discourses of teacher education that, too often, confine us to familiar terrains of policy and practice, and recycled litanies of concerns that engulf us in waves of disillusionment, alienation and anxiety. As Hannah Arendt cautions: "the chances that tomorrow will be like yesterday are always overwhelming" (Arendt, 1993, p. 170). We acknowledge the "truth" of Arendt's caution but, like her, we are optimistic that the "infinitely improbable" (p. 170) can occur, and that teacher education might be more.

THE TEXT OF TEACHER [EDUCATION]

On the first day back at school for many Canadian children, Sarah Dougherty of Montreal's *The Gazette* reported the following story of Melanie Bertrand, a beginning teacher:

> Thrown into a tough secondary school during her teacher training, Melanie Bertrand started questioning her career choice. "There were fights, the cops were constantly there—it was mind-boggling," Bertrand said. "The kids, they didn't want to be there." Bertrand had a starkly different experience at another school, which convinced her to stay the course. "You don't have to discipline these kids, they actually ask for more work," she said of her stint at the tiny, private Lower Canada College in N.D.G [Notre Dame de Grace]. Bertrand is weighing job offers in both the public and private sectors as she gets set to start her teaching career this fall. Since the early 1990s, Quebec universities with teacher-training programs have added courses in classroom management and beefed up in-class training. Despite this, some experienced teachers say their young colleagues need still more training in dealing with the growing number of disruptive and special needs students…Bertrand wishes she had even more training in classroom management. "We were never taught to deal with the students, the unruly and unmanageable ones," she says. (Dougherty, 2006, p. XX)

To teach in "tough" schools where kids don't want to be and where police intervention is an everyday reality affords particular types of sense-making to those with a desire to be professional. Erica McWilliam (p. XX) portrays the now-familiar figure of the *risk-conscious teacher*—"manager of unruly bodies"—who, being "properly professional", must be alert to "potential dangers" and attend to "the systematic work of minimizing the possibility of trouble". She describes how, "awash with data" about children (Hattie, 2005) and "proliferating categories of students" and "the large army of classroom support personnel with claims to specialist knowledge", teachers' disciplinary-specific or craft knowledge is "made over" as professional expertise in diagnosis, classification and treatment decisions. While many believe that the psychologizing of pedagogy is in the best interest of the learner as a social and psychological subject, others are wary of the change in the "attentional economy" of teachers (McWilliam, p. XX). The *forensic teacher* must be "trained" in the scrutiny of her students and, as Dougherty (2006) would have it, "in-class training" must be "beefed up" to produce a teacher with "a positive, flexible, adaptable disposition toward the changing challenges (read: behavioural and

intellectual disorders) of school life" (McWilliam, p. XX). In an era of risk consciousness, policy makers' seemingly preferred subject-positioning for teachers becomes one of coldly rational calculation aimed at averting trouble.

Sarah Dougherty's report in *The Gazette* is endemic of a "process" reality wherein larger questions of "what" and "why" are usurped by "how". The beginning teacher wonders "how" she will cope with the monstrous "other". The journalist challenges teacher educators on "how" the university program "trained" Bertrand to cope. In an instant, and under the influence of modern psychology, pedagogy is posed as "a science of teaching in general" (Arendt, 1993, p. 182). A teacher, so it seems, is someone who can teach anything once she knows "how to"—in this case— manage a classroom.

As the conversation staged by the journalist focuses almost exclusively on a beginning teacher's coping mechanisms, the private sphere encroaches on what might have been an opportunity for public dialogue about education, leaving only individuals with their respective personal and institutional accounts and eclipsing any other possibility introduced by the beginning teacher's story. There is no deliberation about educational ends, no consideration of authority in teaching, no apparent concern for the manner in which schools shape and are shaped by social inequities, no allusion to the larger responsibility of the teacher and teacher educators towards the life and development of children and for the continuance of the world. Instead, there is only an enchantment with "small things", where a logic of means/how persists (Arendt, 1993).

We are mindful, however, of Cochran-Smith's (2000) commentary that media coverage of teacher education is often "broad-brushed and simplistic", and "anti-intellectual and ungrounded", intended to provoke rather than to illuminate. Once the first day back in school has ended, so-called "debates" about inadequately prepared teachers and delinquent hoards of public school children typically subside into insignificance (pp. 21-22), and we recognize there is a danger in reading too much into this news story.

And yet, witness the beginning teacher, Melanie Bertrand, at the entrance of the profession, immediately caught within familiar discursive zones: Does teacher education have a vested interest in the propagation and selective dissemination of particular discourses? Is it possible to "do" teacher education differently while remaining within familiar and comfortable discursive zones? Has the continual recycling of these discourses coalesced assumptions about pre-service teachers, teacher educators, and the practices of teaching and teacher education into unyielding and limiting "regimes of truth"?

We have conceptualised this book as an endeavour to expand the theoretical horizons of teacher education and the concerns that teacher educators, researchers and policy-makers have traditionally taken up. The term *provoking absences* is open to a multiplicity of meanings, and we use it here primarily to trouble what has been deliberately excluded or silenced, to invoke what may have been previously overlooked or unrecognized, and to engage with possibilities not yet found. We anticipated that the authors whom we invited to contribute to this collection—given their histories of provocative theorizing about teacher education and the contexts of teaching—would interpret their brief variously, and we have not been disappointed. The chapters that follow challenge our familiar ways of thinking about teacher education and offer rich possibilities for reading and enacting it otherwise.

READING THE TEXT(S) OF TEACHER EDUCATION RHIZOMATICALLY

Teacher education is a "text" that encodes meaning and requires interpretation. Like all texts, teacher education is already inscribed in culture and discourse; it has multiple authors, predominant metaphors, assumptions and practices (Morris, 1998). The chapters in this collection are multi-layered and their complexity invites multiple and varied readings. The authors offer surveys of contemporary realities in teacher education; they disrupt dominant discourses, interrogate the taken-for-granted, create spaces for alternative discourses and subject-positionings, and use theory to evoke new possibilities and rich imaginaries.

Our purpose as editors is not to read or interpret the authors' work in a conventional way, but to ask "what it does, how it connects with other things" (Groz, 1994, p. 117, cited in Alvermann, 2000, p. 116). In this case, we ask what the chapters that follow mean in relation to each other, and how we can move around in and between these chapters in ways that may enable us to reconsider taken-for-granted understandings of teacher education. We have found Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) concept of *rhizome* helpful in considering these questions.

Typically (but not necessarily) an organic structure, a rhizome is defined by its interconnectedness: "any point of a rhizome can be connected to anything other, and must be" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 7). Literally and figuratively, a rhizome provides a stark contrast to tree-like structures such as the

archetypal "tree of Western thought that supports a binary logic and symbolizes linear and ordered systems of thinking" (Alvermann, 2000, p. 116). Tree-like structures are held in place by a root system that "plots a point, fixes an order" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 4). A rhizome, in contrast, has no firm positioning and no beginning, culmination or ending, but is characterized by intersecting and interconnecting lines. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) distinguish between "lines of articulation or segmentarity" that segment, codify and solidify, and "lines of flight" that deterritorialize and destratify (p. 4). When there is a rupture in the rhizome, lines of articulation shatter into lines of flight that take us into new territories. The lines of flight, however, remain part of the rhizome as they "always tie back to one another" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 10). When a rhizome is "broken, shattered at a given spot", it will inevitably "start up again on one of its own lines, or on new lines". To illustrate, Deleuze and Guattari refer to the rhizomatic nature of a colony of ants, noting that "you can never get rid of ants because they form an animal rhizome that can rebound time and time again after most of it has been destroyed" (p. 10). While we hesitate (even metaphorically!), to link teacher education to colonies of ants, it could nevertheless be argued that both prompt disquietingly similar connotations of industriousness and dogged determination to resume temporarily disrupted patterns and projects.

Deleuze and Guattari (1987, pp.13–14) go on to explain that because rhizomes are "open and connectable" and "susceptible to constant modification", they always have "multiple entry ways". The following chapters, individually and collectively, offer multiple entry-points for challenging traditional thinking and theorizing about teacher education, and destabilize what is too often considered as known, settled and beyond doubt. They rupture and splinter into fragments well-worn lines of articulation and segmentation, disrupting and fracturing familiar trajectories and erupting into lines of flight that can open up new spaces for exploration of what has been previously excluded, removed, or otherwise absent. In doing so, the authors engage in "mapping" (Deleuze, 1995/1990). We use the term *mapping* to mean working from sets of interacting lines that invoke and evoke different configurations of ideas and understandings from those that appear ingrained in conventional thinking and theorizing about teacher education, many of which are often considered uncontestable. We are especially interested in working with fragments of possibilities thrown up by the lines of flight. Our interest lies not in codifying these fragments on conventional "axes of significance and subjectification" in teacher education (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 15), but in exploring their interconnections and potential for creating "very different regimes" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 23) within teacher education. Because lines of flight are so interconnected, we are wary of dichotomizing. We are not arguing that what has gone before in teacher education is necessarily "bad", nor that what the authors in this collection are proposing is "good"; rather, we argue for expanding our repertoires for theorizing and for practicing.

In the remainder of this introductory chapter, we read alongside and "across" the contributing authors to join with them in identifying intersecting lines of flight towards new critical and ethical possibilities. As we do so, we look for opportunities to overlay our mapping onto more conventional and bounded readings, or "tracings" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) of teacher education. As Alvermann (2000) explains, it is "by inspecting the breaks and ruptures that become visible" (p. 117) when a map or tracing is laid on the other that we can come to recognize what has previously been absent.

Like the contributors to this collection, we focus especially on spaces where potentially promising possibilities for destabilizing the discourses and cadences of teacher education appear to be emerging. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) refer to such spaces as "smooth spaces". They contrast smooth spaces to "striated spaces" which, like chess boards, are "coded, defined, bounded, and limited" (St Pierre, 2000, p. 263). Striated spaces are evident in shifts to standardization and audited accountabilities, and in the ubiquitous, predictable and seemingly pre-scripted debates characterizing many educational contexts. Although "smooth spaces are not in themselves liberatory" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 551), the dynamic interaction between smooth and striated places gives cause for optimism. Deleuze and Guattari describe how "smooth space is constantly being translated, transversed into a striated space; striated space is constantly being reversed, returned to a smooth space" (p. 524). It is this constant oscillation that leaves open the possibility of provoking what is currently absent. How to make use of these oscillations to maximize their possibilities for changing current trajectories of teacher education is a question implicitly addressed by authors in this collection.

By reading back and forth between chapters, we do not seek closure; instead, we attempt to link ideas that at first glance might seem tangential. Following Alvermann (2000), we work "at the surface" of what these chapters offer to connect sometimes disparate ideas, to weave together incidents, refrains, echoes and citations. These "disconnections, overlappings, variations" (Barthes, 2000, p. 288) emerge as a network of ideas and possibilities that unsettle many of the cultural claims, knowledges and classifications that have come to characterize teacher education.

Even a partial mapping of the multiple and complex discursive contexts of teacher education surveyed by our contributors highlights their collective portrayal of teacher educators (and educators more broadly) as caught between the past and present, the old and new, suspended, as it were, in an "agitated passage" (Carroll, 1984, p. 75) between attraction and repulsion, between the familiar and the strange. Teachers educators and teachers are cast in the "difficult position of being simultaneously heir […] to a particular history" (Levinson, 2001, p. 14) and hostage to it and, at the same time, courted and denounced by yet other, newer discourses that are also determined to constitute them as particular kinds of teaching subjects. Delueze and Guattari (1987) would argue that the rupturing of discourses that favour "striated", orderly spaces can generate fragments and lines of flight that are rich in potential for positive change. Here, we outline three striated spaces—practice, authority, and quality—that constitute lines of articulation that segment, codify and solidify the field of teacher education and, as such, preoccupy the authors in this volume. They urge us to locate and use their fault-lines, fractures, and crevices to create smooth spaces for speaking into existence alternative discourses and subject-positionings.

Spaces of Practice

Historically, practice has often been seen as "merely an expression of embarrassment at the deplorable but soon overcome condition of incomplete theory" (Bubner, 1981, p. 204). As such, there has been a strong tendency to dis-embed knowledge from the immediacy and idiosyncrasy of particular teaching situations and from the experience and character of teachers (Dunne & Pendlebury, 2002):

> Through this disembedding it is supposed that what is essential in the knowledge and skill can be encapsulated in explicit, generalizable formulae, procedures, or rules. The latter then are to be applied to the various situations and circumstances that arise in the practice so as to meet the problems that they present. These problems are supposed to have nothing in them that has not been anticipated in the analysis that yielded the general formulae, and hence to be soluble by a straightforward application of the latter, without need for insight or discernment in the actual situation itself. (Dunne & Pendlebury, 2002, p. 197)

In this "practitioner-proof" view (Dunne & Pendlebury, 2002, p. 197), useful knowledge is defined in terms of that which researchers have unearthed and which practitioners can subsequently apply to practice. Teacher education is therefore premised on the understanding that the sources of teacher excellence are in certain knowledge systems that have been sedimented from the research literature (Phelan, 2005).

In the last decade, there have been several efforts to overturn the emphasis on abstract generalization and to return to the realm of the practical in teacher education (Phelan, 2005). Many sought to prepare teachers who could dwell within the rough ground of experience, appreciate its complexity and deep interpretability, and respond ethically (see Hoban, 2005). However, such efforts may also lead to an undue privileging of narrative as practices of "identity" and "experience" in teacher education. The conflation of narrative and authorial intention, the belief that experience makes meaning (or rather, "meaning setting off the alarm of experience" as noted in this volume by Britzman and Gilbert, p. XX), combined with little consciousness of how "interested" language is, characterize the prevalent use of narrative in teacher education. "The more we utilize narratives, the less we know about how this meta-narrative, as a feature of modernity, forecloses the work of thinking about our thinking" (Britzman & Gilbert, 2007, p. XX). Other writers in this volume, however, highlight the potential of narrative to sharpen insights into the powerful effects of the interplay of dominant discourses, normative structures, and conventional positionings in the production and perpetuation of conformist subjectivities. Dennis Sumara, Brent Davis and Tammy Iftody challenge us to read the "small stories" of individual experience against "grander cultural narratives" (p. XX) and to look for opportunities to use the former to disrupt the latter. Bronwyn Davies highlights the "revolutionary potential" (p. XX) of narratives of rebellion to achieve a similar end.

Practice has also been conflated with reductionist forms of "school practice". Consider the opening line of a recently released study of university-based education schools in the United States:

> The nation's teacher education programs are inadequately preparing their graduates to meet the realities of today's standard-based, accountability-driven classrooms, in which the primary measure of success is student achievement. (Levine, 2006, p. 1)

The report provides “an examination of the successes and failures of university-based teacher education programs” and offers “criteria for excellence” on which to judge “the quality of programs and changing teacher-education policy”. Levine (2006), a former president of Teachers’ College, Columbia University, concludes with five recommendations, which include transforming schools of education “from ivory towers into professional schools focused on school practice”, a focus on “student achievement as the primary measure of the success of teacher education programs”, and the establishment of “effective mechanisms for teacher education quality control” (pp. 9–10).

Instrumentalist views of teaching of the kind espoused by Levine are the provocation for Jennifer Gore and Robert Parkes’ chapter about the “privileged place” of classroom management discourses in teacher education (p. X). These discussions continue to be constrained by modernist and binary views of “power as possession” held either by the teacher or put in the hands of the students (Gore & Parkes, p. X). The lack of critical engagement with or interrogation of classroom management discourses in the teacher education literature, they argue, enables these discourses to operate as a “regime of truth” that constructs “the good teacher” as a “classroom manager”. The effect is to produce a situation in which teachers and student teachers “are likely to desire classroom order over the construction of an intellectually engaging learning environment” (Gore & Parkes, p. X).

An emphasis on performance and classroom management, in conjunction with the absence of critical interrogation of the discourses underpinning them, “has strengthened the mythic, but experientially real, gap between ‘theory’ and ‘practice’ in the preparation of teachers—a phantasmatic gap that has still to be bridged”, according to Green and Reid (p. XX).

> What is it about pedagogy, as both a concept and a practice, that can explain its marginal status in relation to educational studies and educational research, as well as teacher education? Further: How might pedagogy be re-defined and re-assigned a significant value within that practice? (p. XX)

Understood as a hybrid concept, Green and Reid argue pedagogy brings together elements of “art” and “science”, “theory” and “practice”, as such it refers specifically to the situated social practice of teaching and learning wherein “teaching” is viewed not so much “the *cause* of ‘learning’ but rather as its *context*” (p. XX). They gesture toward a poststructuralist epistemology of practice—one that emphasizes the interplay of power and meaning, discourse and subjectivity, and language and the body.

In a similar vein, Stone imagines how educational studies, and particularly philosophy of education, might cultivate in teachers “a welcoming openness”. Such “openness”, she writes, “brings forth questions to which there are no easy answers” (p. XX). She critiques the current approach of philosophical “isms” which tends to promote the pursuit of a certain system or credo as the basis of beliefs about practice, arguing that neither philosophy nor philosophy of education can provide essential and perennial authority as a basis for practice.

Spaces of Authority

Tied closely to the project of mass schooling, teacher education developed as part of the production of the nation-state. In their chapter, Brennan and Zippin remind us that the nationalism at stake in that project refers to a culture of belonging and as a synonym for belief, ethnicity, and religion (e.g., Ireland/Catholicism/Whiteness), rather than nationalism as a civilization of culture. The latter relies on democratic and humanist ideas of civilization, society and community, which are all dependent on our ability to imagine the other—the one who is not close—while the former expels the other to the margins.

In Europe, the legitimacy of nation-centered authority in teacher education has been maintained despite the Bologna Process—an attempt to integrate higher education within a pan-European structure across member countries of the European Union. In a recent policy statement, it was maintained that:

> Teacher education is a major element of the graduate labour market, affected by the new Bachelors’ and Masters’ degrees. Teacher education must remain a matter of policy determination at national level, reflecting the diversity of national cultures. (Bergen Policy Statement, 2005)

Addressing the application of a Bologna Process in Australia, Singh and Han question, in this volume, the notion of “categorical purity”, what is meant by “national cultures”, and what it means to be an English or Australian teacher or, for that matter, a “teacher” for British Columbia or Quebec in Canada. They assert that reconsidering teacher education in terms of cultural globalization may make it possible to move the framing of knowledge away from a nation-centered focus to engage the means and methods involved in the local/global circulation of education cultures, practices, and artifacts. They

document how the arrival of World English students in teacher education in Australia underscored just how much teacher education embodies a particular educational culture. Students hailing from South East Asia found that the progressive student-centered pedagogies espoused by faculty were not necessarily evident in the teacher education program and that their own experience of test-driven, text-based pedagogy was largely ignored. Moreover, any deep engagement with equity issues was absent, with faculty resorting to either individualistic views of equity or suggesting that the foreign students should have stayed in their own countries. The opportunity to move towards a broader framework within which to educate teachers about alternative approaches to teaching, learning, schooling, and education, was lost.

Challenging "categorical purity" is easier said than done. Teacher education is caught indicate in a "devil's bargain", as Brennan and Zipin argue in their chapter, in which it must sustain its public legitimacy as a field and retain government funding. The difficulty was evident of late when the press for "practical-vocational" competencies (as against school and society courses) emerged in Australia:

> A recent federal Minister for Education publicly accused education faculties of degenerating into 'quasi sociology department' (Maiden & McKenna, Aug. 11, 2005) while lamenting teacher education's failures to produce teachers able to redress the 'literacy and numeracy crisis' that holds Australia back 'in global economic terms'. Such subjection of social justice claims (signified by 'quasi sociology') to a politics of derision (Ball, 2006) finds a rousing chorus among tabloid and radio media commentators. Teacher educators' commitments to work on behalf of social justice claims are thus clouded by senses of risk to career (Brennan & Zipin, p. XX).

Teacher educators, largely Caucasian former teachers in national systems, are often caught in the middle. Many hold an understanding of teaching as a state profession associated with service and social justice values. In the current atmosphere however, such commitments transform into mildly progressive investments in multiple intelligences and individual learning styles and, to a far lesser degree, radical social justice faith in schooling. Moreover, meritocratic assumptions about "schooling" and deficit views of the "illiteracies" of less advantaged students prevail. In turn, concerns about student teachers who cannot write or communicate adequately in English pervade introductory courses in teacher education. The situation is particularly problematic for indigenous people, where "widespread co-option of 'cultural' claims into 'economic standards of self-justification" (Brennan & Zipin, p. XX) makes support for cultural claims such as the struggle for recognition of historical languages and identities both more impossible and more necessary—put short, it amounts to a new kind of assimilationism.

Spaces of Quality

The resounding discourse of quality in contemporary teacher education may be another attempt at a type of "categorical purity" (Singhe & Han, p. XX), and yet another reflection of the "historical technologies of nation, nationality and nationalism" (Mayer, Luke & Luke, p. X):

> Teacher education programs are bound by local employing authorities' and state bureaucracies' bids to control and monitor field placements as well as the content of curriculum courses and to ensure that all courses—subject matter preparation included—are aligned with their licensing and accreditation standards…. In many North American, Asian and European sites, teacher education is increasingly becoming a training in how to deploy a particular local educational jurisdiction's curriculum and how to comply with its particular assessment grids and accountability systems. (p. X)

"Standards" imply a romantic nostalgia for a time when teachers were competent and children received quality education. Yet as travelers who return to a previously visited place can attest, memories can be like phantoms, and false memories of excellence, rigor, and high standards can be so convincing that they replace reality (Phelan, 1997). Meanwhile, policy-makers quickly conclude that teachers are key because they are directly responsible for students' learning: "Quality teaching means quality education for all students" (Alberta Education, 1995, p. 2). This kind of logic leads directly to a push for standardization of teaching in the form of skills, knowledge, and attributes—an escape from teacher judgement, if you will, and the beginning of a "narrow" professionalism (Phelan, 1997).

And so, the pilgrimage begins towards the shrine of teacher competencies and emphasis on accountability via testing and outcomes-based curricula. Standards, linked to employability, are used in determining accreditation and assessment of university programs, further emphasizing to faculty and students that the School of Education's "core business" is "work preparation".

In their chapter, Mayer, Luke, and Luke link the standardization of teaching with the emergence of "the generic teacher, branded as a corporate entity and defined in terms of generic competences, skills, interchangeable parts in a global education system with uniform practices including testing, mandated textbooks, scripted teaching, school-based management, marketisation and economic management issues" (p. XX). Identifying two contradictory push/pull factors, they argue that teacher education is being reshaped in the context of economic and cultural globalization. On one hand, teacher education must operate at a local level, wherein the teacher's expertise is not taken as transportable across space and bordered educational jurisdictions, and standards are thus articulated and justified locally. On the other hand, standards operate to produce a generic teacher, " a more objective, standardized and quantifiable commodity which can be understood, judged and even transported/exported across national boundaries, bypassing the local knowledge of states, schools and universities" (p. XX). Ironically perhaps, the generic teacher is the construction of a global, transnational teacher by default, "without a strong normative view of what teaching can and should entail in relation to globalization" (p.XX). As such, standard-based reforms tend to sidestep questions about the construction and regulation of teachers' work and teacher education in the context of cultural and economic globalization. In a critical response to this default position, the authors draw on a philosophy of cosmopolitanism to articulate "the making of a 'world teacher' who can teach in and about the complex dynamic socio-demographic and industrial conditions, knowledge and technological relations" (p. XX).

There is a glimpse of a "world teacher" as Mitchell, Weber and Yoshido invite us to consider student teachers as youth workers. Their case-studies from Rwanda, South Africa and Canada reframe teaching and teacher education as a broadly conceived ethical and social endeavour. Refusing to cast "quality" as "standard" or to embrace impoverished mainstream views of teacher education, they confront teacher education with a different mandate: activism in a socially unjust world. Drawing on discourses of youth participation, community mobilisation, human rights activism, new alliances, participatory research and social change, they illuminate fragments of possibilities and potential lines of flight that challenge us to consider how teacher education might situate itself and to rethink what it might become.

Practice, Authority, Quality: Striated spaces marked out by "poses, postures, silhouettes, steps and voices" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 353). Each space designed to delineate and reinforce the territorial boundaries of teacher education, creating a critical distance between what it is and what it is not. Striated spaces can also rupture into lines of flight, connections and linkages that extend beyond what we have traditionally thought of as constituting concerns of the profession. Every rhizome contains not only lines of segmentarity (according to which it is stratified and territorialized), but also "lines of deterritorialization down which it constantly flees" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 10). What then, of rupture?

RUPTURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

At the heart of these chapters are the ethical positionings available to us in the dominant and emerging discourses of teacher education. Too often it seems teacher education is codified in narrow and impoverished terms of securing predetermined outcomes. The effect, as Brennan and Zipin forcefully argue, is that teacher education operates as a form of "cultural imperialism by baptizing generations of teachers, primarily white, in mainstream curricula and pedagogies" (p. XX). In return (and often grudgingly as part of the "devil's bargain" referred to by Brennan & Zippin previously), teacher education is accorded at least some legitimacy and public funding. Consequently, questions concerning ethical responsibilities must include: What ethical principles are we drawing upon in negotiating that "devil's bargain"? What responsibilities do we have to ensure that teacher education is more than a "culturally normative" project (Brennan & Zipin, p. X), and how can we go about meeting those responsibilities? Has "cultural resistance", or "the problem of not wanting to know" (Britzman & Gilbert, p. XX), led us as teacher educators to sometimes lose sight of our ethical responsibilities? In what circumstances? In our enthusiasm for the seductive language of reflection and narrative, for example, have we forgotten our ethical responsibility to "pay attention to how we word the world" (Davies, p. X) and the impact of the discourses that we have taken up?

One of the effects of discourses, as Gore and Parkes (p. X) argue, is that they can "deflect responsibility". Singh and Han illustrate how deflection can play out in practice. Some teacher educators in their study appeared content with a "superficial reading of "equity", which they used as an excuse to avoid "deep engagement with different education cultures and what this meant for their teaching" (Singh & Han, p. XX).

Conversely, Pitt asks us to consider whether we are being diverted from important social justice considerations by a tendency to worry unduly about relatively minor or displaced paternalist concerns. She refers to teacher educators' anxiety about their "pedagogical authority" (p. X) and their propensity to recoil from their capacity to influence. She contends that, although well-meaning, an "anxiety of influence" can translate into a reluctance to introduce students to the kinds of challenging ideas conducive to creativity and deep intellectual engagement. Pitt leaves us with a discomforting question: Are we *exercising* or *refusing to exercise* our authority and influence in ethically responsible ways?

An overwhelming refrain throughout the chapters in this collection is the importance of not recoiling from asking uncomfortable questions. Britzman and Gilbert, for example, refer to queer theory as legitimization of gayness, thus enabling the "reversal of what counts as a problem" (p. XX). Their chapter throws up many unsettling questions: What other reversals of problems should we be working towards? And how can we draw on other theories to deepen and complicate narratives? What different positionings might different narratives make possible? What new configurations could emerge and will these be more ethically just? What will have been said about teacher education in the early 21th century? Will it have been different from what has gone before, or enslaved to its past?

If we are committed to teacher education escaping the bonds of its past, then "there remains much soul searching and hard work to be done" (Brennan & Zipin p. XX). We will need to acknowledge that we are entangled in an ethical *aporia*, or unresolved perplexity (Derrida, 2001); in other words, that we are inevitably caught between unconditional ethical impulse and an unavoidably conditional adaptation of this impulse. The challenges we face are at once "more 'impossible" and the need to address them "more necessary" (Brennan & Zipin, p.X). If we are to rupture what some might see as an unwarranted complacency about ethical matters pervading teacher education, then "we must work up the courage, intellectual resources and ethical imagination to address what postcolonial teacher education might look like, and to 'possibilize' this 'impossibility' in institutional practice" (Brennan & Zipin, p. X).

If teacher education is to be more than what it currently is, more than social engineering, more than mastery and colonization, more than "the impulse to invent—through its technologies of correction—the needy student, the dangerous individual, the attention deficit, the ignorant parent, the docile body, the dysfunctional gender, and all the other tragic roles that spring forth from the moral panic that stages education" (Britzman, 1998, p. 58), and indeed, more than *The Gazette*'s troubling newspaper story of Melanie Bertrand that began this introduction—then teacher educators will need the imagination and courage to challenge and transgress the present limits of what is considered acceptable.

We will need to find new openings for different conversations and new theoretical frames and resources for making sense of these conversations. We will also need to engage in "continual questioning" (Stone, p. XX) of the logic of the normalizing structures, spaces, hierarchies, discourses, categorizations, power relations, and regimes of truth that characterize, shape and constrain teacher education. And to paraphrase Singh and Han, we will need to go beyond resistance, beyond ignoring silently, beyond pretending to ourselves that we are only marginally affected, beyond convincing ourselves that we can "carry on un-implicated" (p. XX), beyond remaining content with the merest of ethical toeholds. Ultimately, "we are responsible … for our revolts" (Pitt, p. XX).

Neo-liberal structures and discourses leave little space for revolts or for alternative framings of teacher education, and they undoubtedly complicate struggles for recognition of the legitimacy of alternative framings. But they cannot extinguish hope that teacher education can become a "new thing in an old world" (Arendt, 1993, p. 193)—a space for the creation and recreation of "islands of freedom" (Villa, 1993, p. 200) wherein we imagine, think, speak and act alongside one another, wondering aloud: "What if?" Nor can they prevent moments of rebellion that generate fragments of possibilities and potential lines of flight "to new knowledge, new insights, new modes of being" (Davies, p. XX).

IN CLOSING

Could teacher education be more? Could it be "a new thing in an old world?" How might the new come about? Progress and doom are two sides of the same medal, Arendt told us, but what does this mean for teacher education? Is it foolhardy to have the audacity to hope that we can avoid turning the next generation of teachers into "the living dead?" (Euginedes, 2002, p. 345; in Pitt, p. XX).

The contributors to this book have identified many potential starting points for opening up new trajectories and new lines of flight for teacher education. In their exploration of "multiple absences in teacher education at the level of textual, personal, collective, generic and disciplinary knowledge" (Singh & Han, p. X), they have alerted us to fragments of possibilities that offer potential escape-routes from the tired recycling of the same old concerns. As a text of teacher education, the chapters

collectively immerse us in different theoretical standpoints. They require us to approach them with a posture of aliveness and attentiveness to new language, to newly glimpsed openings and fractures, and to new configurations and relations. In recasting theory as evocative object (Bollas, 1992, p. 83) rather than tool to apply, they offer the means by which one can radically alter one's way of imagining reality. Above all, they alert us to the value of reading different theoretical perspectives against each other, rather than settling "for a single all-encompassing account, one 'theoretical' explanation of what is really happening" (McLeod & Yates, 2006, p. 88) in teacher education, and how it might happen otherwise. The "smooth space" to which these authors gesture possesses "a greater power of deterritorialization than the striated" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987/1980, p. 480) and remind us that

> …smooth spaces are not in themselves liberatory. But the struggle is changed or displaced in them, and life reconstitutes its stakes, confronts new obstacles, invents new paces, switches adversaries. Never believe that a smooth space will suffice to save us. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987/1980, p. 500)

REFERENCES

Arendt, H. (1993). The crisis in education. In H. Arendt, *Between past and future: Eight exercises in political thought* (pp. 173–196). New York: Penguin.

Alberta Education. (1995). *Quality teaching: Quality education for Alberta students. A discussion paper for consultations on enhancing the quality of teaching*. Edmonton, AB: Alberta Education.

Alvermann, D. E. (2000). Researching libraries, literacies and lives: A rhizoanalysis. In E. St. Pierre & W.S. Willow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 114–129). New York: Routledge.

Ball, S. (2005). *Education policy and social class: The selected works of Stephen J. Ball*. New York: Routledge.

Barthes, R. (2000). From work to text. In N. Lucy (Ed.), *Postmodern literary theory: An anthology* (pp. 285–292). Oxford: Blackwell.

Bergen Policy Statement. (2005). *Pan-European structure: Policy statement on the Bologna process in the 'Bergen' round*. Constructed at the conference "From Bologna to Bergen: A mid-term review from the academic's point of view". Brussels, 11/12 February. Retrieved 12 October 2006 from http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/03-Pos_pap-05/050212_Pan-European_Structure.pdf

Britzman, D. (1998). *Lost subjects, contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Bubner, R. (1981). *Modern German philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carroll, D. (1984). Rephrasing the political with Kant and Lyotard: From aesthetic to political judgements. *Diacritics, 14*(3), 74–88.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2000). The future of teacher education: Framing the questions that matter. *Teaching Education, 11*(1), 13–24.

Code, L. (1991). *What can she know? Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations 1972–1990* (M. Joughin, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published in 1990)

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (M. Massumi, Trans.). London & New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1980)

Derrida, J. (2001). *On cosmopolitanism and forgiveness* (M. Dooley & M. Hughes, Trans.). London & New York: Routledge. (Original work published in 1997)

Dougherty, S. (2006, 12 August). Teachers need training. *The Gazette*, p. L8.

Dunne, J., & Pendlebury, S. (2002). Practical reason. In U. Blake, P. Swayer, R. Smith, & P. Standish (Eds.) *The Blackwell guide to the philosophy of education* (pp. 194–211). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York: Routledge.

Hattie, J. (2005). *What is the nature of evidence that makes a difference to learning?* Proceedings of the Australian Council for Educational Research Conference Using Data to Support Learning Research, August 7-9, 2005, Melbourne, Australia (pp. 11-22). Retrieved 8 May 2006 from http://www.aceredu.au/workshops/documents/Proceedings_000.pdf.

Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers*. Washington, DC: The Education Schools Project.

Levinson, N. (2001). The paradox of natality. In M. Gordon (Ed.), *Hannah Arendt and Education: Renewing our common world* (pp. 11–36). Boulder: Westview Press.

Maiden, S., & McKenna, M. (2005, 11 August). Seven years' primary 'worse' for maths. *The Australian*, p.1.

McLeod, J., & Yates, L. (2006). *Making modern lives: Subjectivity, schooling and social change*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Morris, M. (1998). The tao of Derrida. *Teaching Education, 10*(1), 23–33.

Phelan, A. (2005). On discernment: The practice of wisdom and the wisdom of practice. In G. Hoban (Ed.), *The missing links in teacher education: Innovative approaches in designing teacher education programs* (pp. 57–73). Netherlands: Kluwer Press.

Phelan, A. (1996). Strange pilgrims: Nostalgia and disillusionment in teacher education reform. *Interchange, 27*(3&4), 331–348.

St Pierre, E. (2000). Nomadic inquiry in the smooth spaces of the fold: A preface. In E. St Pierre & W.S. Willow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 258–283). Routledge: New York.

Villa, D. (1997). Hannah Arendt: Modernity, alienation and aritique. In C. Calhoun & J. McGowen (Eds.), *Hannah Arendt and the meaning of politics*. (pp. 179–206). Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.

AFFILIATIONS

Anne M. Phelan
Faculty of Education,
University of British Columbia

Jennifer Sumsion
Faculty of Education,
Charles Sturt University