Alberta Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 64.4, Winter 2018, 393-410

Educating Preservice Teachers in a Neoliberal Era: Specialized Technicians or Public Intellectuals?

Bob Rigas, Renée Kuchapski

Brock University

Neoliberalism's influence on teacher education has intensified a view of teachers as skilled technicians trained to implement centrally developed curriculum rather than as public intellectuals who engage in self-reflection and critique. In this paper, reforms in the United States and England provide a context for discussing teacher education programs in Canada. Young and Boyd's (2010) "modes of governance" and "images of teachers work" provide a way to conceptualize teachers as public intellectuals that may be useful to counter neoliberal conceptions. Since neoliberal reforms continue to influence both universities and K-12 education, teacher educators are uniquely challenged to maintain a critical perspective on the role of teacher education and teacher work.

L'influence du néolibéralisme sur la formation des enseignants a intensifié une perspective selon laquelle les enseignants sont des techniciens spécialisés et formés pour mettre en œuvre un programme d'études élaboré par des autorités centrales plutôt que des intellectuels publics qui pratiquent l'autoréflexion et l'autocritique. Cet article emploie des réformes aux États-Unis et en Angleterre comme cadre pour une discussion sur les programmes de formation des enseignants au Canada. Les « modes de gouvernance » et les « perceptions du travail des enseignants » de Young et Boyd (2010) offrent une façon de conceptualiser les enseignants comme des intellectuels publics. Ce moyen pourrait s'avérer utile pour contrer les perceptions néolibérales. Puisque l'influence des réformes néolibérales continue à se faire sentir dans le milieu universitaire et dans celui de l'éducation K-12, les formateurs d'enseignants sont confrontés au défi particulier de maintenir une perspective critique sur le rôle de la formation et du travail des enseignants.

> … it is imperative to examine the ideological and material forces that have contributed to what I call the proletarianization of "teacher work"; that is, the tendency to reduce teachers to the status of specialized technicians within the school bureaucracy, whose function then becomes one of managing and implementing curricula programs rather than developing or critically appropriating curricula to fit specific pedagogical concerns. Second, there is a need to defend schools as institutions essential to maintaining and developing critical democracy and also to defending teachers as transformative intellectuals who combine scholarly reflection and practice in the service of educating students to be thoughtful, active citizens. (Giroux, 2010, p. 36)

© 2018 The Governors of the University of Alberta

With education regarded as vital for ensuring national economic competitiveness in an increasingly globalized world, teachers have become viewed as the key resource for ensuring the quality of a nation's education. This has led to increasing government interest in the recruitment, preparation, and professional development of teachers (Cochran-Smith, 2008; Furlong, 2013; Young & Boyd, 2010). Notwithstanding the government's "benign control" of public education in the 1960s and 1970s (Grimmet, 2009), prior to the 1980s teacher education policy in most countries was considered a policy backwater with decisions relating to teacher education garnering little interest from governments, and thus largely left to university teacher education programs (Furlong, 2013; Walker & von Bergmann, 2013; Young & Boyd, 2010). Current interest in teacher education policy is situated in the belief that teachers must play a role in ensuring nations "rise to the top" with respect to their ability to compete economically (Barber & Mourshed, 2007; Furlong, 2013).

In recognizing the teacher's role in enacting educational change, most provinces have viewed the reform of initial teacher education programs as an integral feature of their larger reform agenda. Although the changes to teacher education policy in Canada have been less obvious than in the United States and England, particularly with respect to the expansion of non-university providers of teacher education and "competitive certification" [1] (Walker & von Bergmann, 2013), trends in those jurisdictions may foreshadow educational change in Canada (Grimmet, 2009).

This conceptual paper is based on a review of primary and secondary literature. Its main focus is the influence of neoliberalism on initial teacher education programs and its subsequent effects on how teachers perceive their role. It is intended to provoke thought on how teacher educators can negotiate the conflicting demands of the current neoliberal policy climate to help ensure teacher education programs move beyond a view of teacher training as technique to help maintain a focus on the need for dialectical struggle, on teaching in socially just and thoughtful ways, and on conceptualizing the teacher as a public intellectual. The literature reviewed draws on empirical research and research commentary and reflects key research in the field of teacher education. The paper begins with a discussion of neoliberalism and the neoliberal character of changes to teacher education in the United States and England since both countries have been preeminent in the rise of the Global Education Reform Movement (GERM) that from the 1990s onward has promoted specific structural reforms and educational priorities (Sahlberg, 2011). [2] Young and Boyd's (2010) correlation between "modes of governance" and "images of teachers work" is used as the basis for arguing for a conception of teacher as public intellectual to counter neoliberal conceptions. A discussion of neoliberal's influence on higher education and the particular challenges this presents for teacher education concludes the paper.

Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism is an expansive and general concept that denotes an economic model or paradigm that grew to predominance in the 1980s and through political imposition now represents the hegemonic economic philosophy and discourse in most of the western world (Rigas & Kuchapski, 2016; Steger & Roy, 2010). Holborow (2012) argues that neoliberalism "has become the stamp of our age" (p. 14) and that in less than a generation its principles "have spread across every continent and become so integral to public and private life that thinking outside their parameters is almost unthinkable" (p. 14). Yet, neoliberalism's influence has varied across countries and time periods (Steger & Roy, 2010). Derived from classical liberalism's focus on a self-regulating market and emerging in response to the perceived failure of the Keynesian Left,

its initial application in the 1980s under Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan included a number of key themes:

> the rule of the market; the need to cut state expenditure on services such as education, except where it could be justified in economic terms; consumer choice in public services; and deregulation and privatisation; with the role of the state reduced to managing the awarding of relevant contracts and that no single monopoly provider gains too much power in the market. (Furlong, 2013, p. 31)

Over time, neoliberalism replaced the economic orthodoxy of Keynesianism that advanced state regulations and controls to intervene in market control (Eagleton-Pearce; 2016; Holborow, 2012).

By the mid-1990s, a second-wave of neoliberalism emerged in what came to be known as the pro-market Third Way. As evidenced by Tony Blair's New Labour Third Way policies in the United Kingdom and Bill Clinton's administration in the United States, original neoliberal principles were modified to include "a continuing and ever-growing role for the central-state in supporting markets, particularly in key social policy areas such as education and health" (Furlong, 2013, p. 31). This "middle-of-the-road approach ... embraced major portions of neoliberalism while also seeking to incorporate parts of a socially progressive agenda traditionally associated with parties of the democratic left" (Steger & Roy, 2010, p. 50). Its espousal of the market was supported across the political spectrum from neo-conservativism to social democracy (Holborow, 2012).

In Canada, in the mid-1980s under Brian Mulroney, the federal government adopted policies to further economic growth and efficiency by means of "competition, tax reductions, deregulation, trade liberalisation, incentives to the private sector, and reductions in the role of government and in public expenditures" (Carpenter, Weber, & Schugurensky, 2012, p. 147). At the provincial level, neoliberal policies were implemented in Alberta, British Columbia, and Ontario during the 1980s and 1990s as evidenced through the privatization of public goods; budget cuts to education, health care, and welfare that were required to make up for lost tax revenue; and the downloading of fiscal constraints to municipalities (Carpenter et al., 2012).

In recognizing the extent to which neoliberalism "has adapted to specific environments, problems, and opportunities" (Steger & Roy, 2010, p. xi), Steger and Roy suggest it be conceptualized in the plural as liberalisms with "three intertwined manifestations: (1) an ideology, (2) a mode of governance, and (3) a policy package" (p. 11). Ideologically, it provides "systems of widely shared ideas and patterned ideas that are accepted as truth by significant groups in society ... [and] serve as conceptual maps ... [that] guide people through the complexity of their political world" (p. 11). This offers a view of the world not only as it is, but also as it should be, and advances an agenda of power elites who promote a single global market as requisite for a better world (Holborow, 2012; Steger & Roy, 2010). Such elites are able to "saturate the public discourse with idealized images of a consumerist, free-market world... as an indispensable tool for a better world" (Steger & Roy, 2010, p. 11).

As a mode of governance, neoliberalism is guided by "entrepreneurial values such as competitiveness, self-interest, and decentralization" rather than by the traditional pursuit of the public good through civil society and social justice (Steger & Roy, 2010, p. 12). The technologies of business and the discourses of managerialism, which Green (2011) refers to as *managerialese*, are advanced using terms often aligned with factory production such as quality assurance, strategic plans, cost benefit analysis, value for money, performance-based work

plans, standards of performance, quantitative targets or outcomes, and audit control (Green 2011; Steger & Roy, 2010). Known as New Public Management (NPM) in public administration, the neoliberal mode of governance has been widely adopted by western states to reform public-sector organizations including education, hospitals, schools, and prisons (Green, 2011).

As a set of policies, neoliberalism can be conceptualized as advancing the D-L-P Formula, a set of public policies that consist of: "(1) deregulation (of the economy); (2) liberalization (of trade and industry); and (3) privatization (of state-owned enterprises)" (Steger & Roy, 2010, p. 14). Such policies have resulted in the downsizing of government, anti-unionization drives, the creation of political think tanks and institutions that advance neoliberal principles, the reduction of social services, and massive tax cuts—especially to high income earners and businesses.

Interwoven into the discourse of neoliberalism is the discourse of globalization, which is not presented as an opportunity to advance human interconnectedness and cooperation, but rather as a problem of competitiveness to which neoliberal policies advance a solution (Carpenter et al., 2013; Furlong, 2013). Rivzi and Langard (as cited in Furlong, 2013) refer to this as the "social imaginary of globalisation" (p. 31). In this discourse it is common-sense for educational systems to be subjected to international comparisons of student performance on standardized tests that, when aggregated, serve as a measure of the quality of a nation's education and a proxy for its ability to compete economically (Furlong, 2013; Lingard, 2009).

Neoliberalism and Teacher Education in the United States

In the United States, the neoliberal discourse has defined educational problems and reforms in both K–12 education and in teacher education programs (Furlong, 2013; Zeichner, 2010). Under the successive governments of Clinton, Bush Jr., and Obama, reform efforts have focused on dismantling both public education and teacher education programs through privatization and the de-professionalization of teachers' work. Reflecting a neoliberal corporate capitalist agenda, these reforms have resulted in: (a) the commodification of teacher preparation and its subjection to market forces, (b) overly prescriptive accountability requirements by government bodies and accreditation agencies that work to control the substance of teacher education curriculum, (c) "consistent and painful cuts" to budgets of public universities including those with teacher education programs, and (d) "attacks on efforts to teach students in socially just ways such as preparing them to engage in multicultural and anti-racist education" (Zeichner, 2010, p. 1544).

Alternatives to traditional university-based teacher education programs have emerged in what Weiner (2007) describes as a "systemic market attack" on teacher education. Weiner notes the rise of "fast-track programs, which allow teacher candidates to bypass traditional preparation" (p. 275) and he emphasizes the critical implications for university-based teacher education programs of the "reconfiguration of public education as a market and the privatization of services previously provided … under a school district" (p. 275). This, Weiner argues, has enabled corporations to compete with universities in offering, for example, professional development services marketed to raise students' scores on standardized tests.

Weiner (2007) and Zeichner (2010) note the entry of for-profit companies and for-profit universities into the "market" of teacher preparation. Examples include Kaplan, I-teach Texas, the University of Phoenix, and Laureate. Both Kaplan and the University of Phoenix offer online graduate degrees in education, illustrating a growing privatization of higher education that has

been facilitated by changes to federal legislation (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Government support for disrupting traditional teacher education is evident in its backing of "residency programs" that promote an enhanced role for schools and even communities in teacher preparation. New York State, for example, has empowered non-university providers such as Teach for America to award master's degrees to teachers in the first few years of their careers—allowing them to circumvent university-based teacher education programs altogether (Zeichner, 2010).

The U.S. government has also supported the disruption of university-based teacher education by offering substantial non-competitive grants through the U.S. Department of Education, leading to the creation of the American Board for the Certification of Teaching Excellence (ABCTE). Zeichner (2010) observes that the ABCTE neither requires students to enrol in a teacher education program, nor to demonstrate teaching competence in a classroom to obtain teaching certification, and that it has "certified teachers in 9 states based on two online examinations in content knowledge and professional knowledge" (p. 1545).

Although Zeichner (2010) does not oppose alternative approaches to teacher education outright, noting that universities' monopoly on teacher education in the United States has been relatively brief, extending roughly from 1960 to 1990, and that alternative models have sometimes had progressive elements, he cautions against alternative approaches that are "closely linked with a technicist view of the role of teachers and with efforts to erode teachers' autonomy and collegial authority" (p. 1545). Zeichner cites multiple scholars who document a transformation to a "new professionalism" that "accepts that decisions about *what* and *how to teach* and *assess* [emphasis added] are largely to be made beyond the classroom rather than by teachers themselves" (p. 1545). This new professionalism has infiltrated teacher education, limiting teacher preparation to the training of "educational clerks who are not to exercise their judgement in the classroom" (p. 1545).

Deregulating teacher education through market forces has been accompanied by a simultaneous increase in regulation, as evidenced by extreme accountability demands imposed by state governments and national accrediting bodies (Zeichner, 2010). This is reflected in the extensive use of test scores to measure student learning in K¬12 schools and increasing expectations that teacher education programs will also utilize tests to measure student learning outcomes (Weiner, 2007). Additionally, teacher educators are now required to submit their programs of study to state bureaucrats and often to a national accrediting body for approval (Zeichner, 2010). Consequently, teachers now "spend inordinate amounts of time preparing detailed assessment plans showing how each course in their programs is aligned with state standards and performance indicators showing exactly what competencies student teachers are required to meet" (Zeichner, 2010, p. 1547). Prospective teachers are required to pass standardized tests in order to gain entry into and graduate from teacher education programs, and thus standardized tests are used to measure both the quality of teacher candidates and the quality of teacher education programs (Weiner, 2007; Zeichner, 2010). In this way, neoliberal reforms have attempted "to make schooling no more than vocational training … [and] teaching no more than test preparation" (Weiner, 2007, p. 281).

Neoliberalism and Teacher Education in England

As in the United States, teacher education in England has been characterized by contradictory policies designed to both enhance the market through diversification and alternative

approaches, and to increase government control and regulation (Childs & Mender, 2013; Furlong, 2013). Beginning in the early 1980s, and under three successive governments—Conservative (1979-1997), Labour (1997-2010), and Coalition (2010-2013)—neoliberal reforms promoted a marketized system of governance and a technicist state (Childs & Mender, 2013; Furlong, 2013; Hill, 2007).

Until the late 1970s, responsibility for teacher education rested primarily with colleges of education, polytechnics, and universities that offered either one-year teacher preparation courses for graduates, or 4-year programs for undergraduates—mostly for the primary sector (Childs & Mender, 2013). This homogeneity began to change when the Conservative government began restructuring teacher education by establishing a market to simultaneously open alternative paths of entry into teaching, and by implementing government oversight through a National Curriculum for teacher training developed through the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) (Childs & Mender, 2013; Hill, 2007). Established as a regulatory body in 1984, CATE approved teacher education courses for accreditation, marking the first political intervention into initial teacher preparation. The CATE criteria circumscribed, for example, the minimum time student teachers could spend in school, and for those intending to be primary teachers, the proportions of time to be spent on professional development and both study and teaching in their specialist subject (Childs & Mender, 2013). In later years, 1989 and 1992-93, CATE criteria also stipulated the content and objectives of the Bachelor of Education degree and the Postgraduate Certificate in Education (Hill, 2007). CATE regulated teacher education by setting the requirements providers needed to follow in order to award Qualified Teaching Status (QTS) (Childs & Mender, 2013). It also closely linked teacher education to the National Curriculum (Hill, 2007). The National Curriculum provided a way to micromanage classroom teaching by dictating both curricular content and methods of delivery. The focus on delivery was interpreted by teacher educators as an effort to "deprofessionalise teaching by challenging teacher autonomy [and] encouraging restricted, rather than extended, notions of professionalism" (MacBeath, 2011, p. 378).

Conservative governments established two regulatory agencies, the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) in 1992 and the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) in 1994, that replaced CATE under the 1994 Education Act (Childs & Mender, 2013; Furlong, 2013). The TTA advanced the government's agenda of quality assessment and assurance and worked with Ofsted to raise and review standards and to conduct a national program of school inspection (Childs & Mender, 2013; MacBeath, 2011). A division of Ofsted was established to undertake inspections of Initial Teacher Training programs (Childs & Mender, 2013). The combined efforts of the TTA and Ofsted, together with routine inspections and competitive league tables tied to differential funding opportunities, created a system of initial teacher education that was "highly centralized and responsive to policy change" (Furlong, 2013, p. 34). For the most part, the "market sensitive, financially dependent universities showed themselves to be only too keen to respond to the changing demands of these national agencies" (Furlong, 2013, p. 34).

In 1993, the Conservatives introduced the School-Centred Initial Training scheme which permitted a group of schools in a specific region or who shared a common mission to form a consortium to provide teacher training within their schools. The consortium was not required to utilize the expertise of departments of education for training teachers unless it was intended to lead to an academic qualification (Childs & Mender, 2013, p. 98).

The move to alternative teacher preparation was embraced by the successive New Labour governments that assumed power in 1997 and remained in place for the next 12 years. New

Labour continued to support a competitive market in teacher education and endorsed competition among universities, the key providers. As in the United States, the government approved alternative schemes for teacher education run by schools such as School Centred Initial Training (SCITT), and it supported the creation of employment-based pathways to teaching for older entrants such as the Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP), and Teach First for new university graduates, who, like their counterparts in Teach for America, became classroom teachers before receiving teacher certification (Furlong, 2013).

During its time in office, New Labour continued to control and regulate teacher education and the teaching body (Childs & Mender, 2013; Furlong, 2013; Hill, 2007). Although it discarded the National Curriculum in 2002, it focussed on literacy and numeracy using highly prescriptive strategies such as *Literacy Hour* and *Numeracy Hour* in primary schools, strategies intended to define effective pedagogy (Furlong, 2013; Hill, 2007). In addition, New Labour renamed the TTA to the Teacher Development Agency (TDA) in 2005, which despite a friendlier face, bolstered control and inspection of initial teacher education and training providers. For example, the TDA required providers "to teach a particular approach in literacy, known as systemic synthetic phonics" (Childs & Mender, 2013, p. 101). Hill (2007) states that teacher education under New Labour was "rigorously regulated, inspected, and policed" (p. 214) and "non-compliant" courses could be "closed or 'lose permitted' numbers of students from the next intake" (p. 214). This direct intervention was "the beginning of a move away of seeing initial teacher education on its own as the main strategy for challenging teacher autonomy" (Furlong, 2013, p. 35). Such direct control of teachers' pedagogy had "major implications for universities and their approaches to teaching professional education courses" (Furlong, 2013, p. 35).

Under the Coalition-Conservative government elected in 2010, government policy continued to reflect the neoliberal themes of diversification and freedom, and focussed on strengthening accountability (Childs & Mender, 2013). In 2012, the School Direct Model was introduced which sought to locate teacher education and training primarily in schools (Childs & Mender, 2013; Furlong, 2013). A move to tighter accountability or regulation of teacher education and training providers was evident as changes to Ofsted inspections included a shortened notification period for inspections and a judgment of "requires improvement" that replaced a previous satisfactory judgment (Childs & Mender, 2013).

It should be noted that the other three countries within the United Kingdom have markedly different approaches to teacher education (Childs & Mender, 2013; Furlong; 2013; MacBeath, 2011). Although in England, the government employs providers to identify locales authorized to prepare teachers and teacher preparation is known as initial teacher training (ITT), in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland, teacher education is situated in a small number of universities, and in those countries the academic qualifications required to teach are being increased (Childs & Mender, 2013). For example, in Scotland, teacher education reform has moved toward "a strengthening and deepening of teachers' personal education rather than a narrowing" (Furlong, 2013, p. 46).

Neoliberalism and Teacher Education in Canada

In Canada, teacher education has largely remained situated in universities, with students also spending considerable blocks of time in schools with teacher associates. Young and Boyd (2010) observe that "Canada has not to date followed other jurisdictions such as the UK and many states down the road of 'competitive certification' although Canadian faculties of education have

begun to offer off-campus, community-based, and distant modes to their programs" (p. 5). While privatization has had no significant impact on education in Canada, leaving elected decision makers ultimately accountable for education, performance-based reporting has taken hold (Wallner, 2014). The neoliberal discourse of globalization, with its focus on economic competitiveness, has created an environment where it is now common-sense to measure and improve school outcomes to achieve a quality education. Reflecting this, beginning in 2000, at the K–12 level and orchestrated through the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC), the provinces have been active participants in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), an international assessment of reading, mathematic, and science, administered to 15-year-old students every three years. All provinces now participate in PISA, and since 2007, all provinces have also participated in the Pan-Canadian Assessment Program (PCAP), a Canadian assessment of reading, mathematics, and science administered every three years to students in grade eight. Other international assessments are also regularly coordinated by the CMEC, including the Teacher Education and Development Study of Mathematics (TEDS-M). The focus on standards, standardization, performance reporting, and accountability for results reflects the neoliberal (NPM) influence on education across all provinces (Wallner, 2014).

Until the 1980s, teacher certification, which specifies the knowledge and skills required of beginning teachers, was largely arranged in parallel to university-determined credentials such as a Bachelor of Education degree or post-graduate certificate. More recently, there have been efforts from both inside and outside the teaching profession to "define this professional knowledge base and to structure it into a set of competencies and standards of practice that can serve both to direct the content of initial teacher education programs and to evaluate their graduates" (Young & Boyd, 2010, p. 4). Throughout Canada, competency-based models of teacher education have emerged. Although the Manitoba government has been largely "hands off" in its approach to teacher education, in 1994 it placed a focus on skills and competencies for beginning career teachers (DeLuca & Pitblado, 2018; Walker & von Bergmann, 2013). In Alberta, the provincial government's main reforms have been on teacher standards, or the Knowledge, Skills, or Attributes (KSAs) devised in 1997 (Walker & von Bergmann, 2013). In 2001, the Quebec Ministry of Education published a 235-page long treatise *Teacher Training: Orientations, Professional Competencies*, delineating a new framework for Teacher Education that emphasized professional competencies and situational teaching skills required in the classroom. The establishment of a new Quebec Teacher Education program that same year marked a shift away from a content-focus toward a competency-based focus in Quebec teacher education (Di Mascio, 2018). In jurisdictions where authority for determining standards is located outside of universities, and comprises the requirements for certification, this change partitions the requirements of professional certification from university credentials, and thus transfers governance away from the universities (Young & Boyd, 2010).

Past accountability mechanisms operated in a university tradition of academic freedom and institutional autonomy. Increasingly, this has been replaced by external accountability demands to demonstrate the quality of teacher graduates and teacher education programs (Young, Hall & Clarke, 2007). Canadian teacher education programs thus far have not replicated the accountability measures employed in the United States even though Canadian public schooling has been increasingly shaped by the accountability movement as reflected in the focus on standards, out-come based core curriculum, and scores on externally administered tests of achievement. Teacher education programs continue to vary by province with regards to how

they receive accreditation and how they publicly show their effectiveness. Within the Canadian context, either provincial bodies or professional associations present certification criteria and carry out periodic reviews for each teacher education program. Although there has been a variation and lack of coalescence in how the criteria and approaches have developed across contexts (DeLuca & Pitblado, 2018).

Governance and Images of Teachers' Work

The extent to which the state, the university, and the profession direct the governance of teacher education affects perspectives of teachers' work and the nature of the profession. Young and Boyd (2010) note that initial teacher education programs may be (a) governed directly by governments, (b) governed through a college of teachers with the authority to certify teachers and accredit initial teacher education programs, or (c) governed by individual universities. They develop Gideonse's (1993) three modes of teacher education governance (political, institutional, and professional) to identify governance changes in Quebec, British Columbia, and Manitoba. Young et al. (2007) utilize the model to discuss challenges to teacher education autonomy in Manitoba, British Columbia, and England; and Walker and von Bergmann (2013) use it to discuss different approaches to governance in British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, and Ontario. Young et al.'s (2007) discussion linking modes of governance and perspectives of teacher's work differentiates teacher preparation as:

> (i) a *generative practise*[emphasis added] in which enquiry (and therefore knowledge production) is a defining feature of the teaching profession—a stance that would dovetail most easily with the mandate of the university; (ii) *a replicative practise* of socialisation and induction—necessarily drawing on the practical expertise of teachers; (iii) or a *prescriptive practise* designed to properly prepare new teachers to effectively implement a provincial or national agenda for schooling—where government control and supervision would logically prevail. (p. 92)

Young et al. note that these practices are not mutually distinctive and all three are found to a differing extent in teacher education programs and that the degree "to which one dominates the other within teacher preparation has the potential to lead to significantly different notions of teacher education" (p. 92). We discuss each mode of governance briefly with reference to the image of teachers' work that it tends to promote.

Professional Mode

Professional modes of governance enable professional bodies to develop preparation and licensure standards and "allow for the fullest expression for professional expertise and professional values," something considered largely lacking relative to other professions (Gideonse, 1993, p. 403). Young and Boyd (2010) observe that professional governance encompasses a "delegation by government administrative authority to an organization whose governing body is elected by the profession" (p. 11). They identify two such bodies as the Ontario College of Teachers (OCT) and the now defunct British Columbia College of Teachers (BCCT). Professional bodies are granted authority to determine who enters the profession through teacher certification and they act as an accreditation body for initial teacher education programs. Young and Boyd (2010) suggest that "central to this professional perspective is the

view of teaching as a skilled practice and the purposes of teacher training as a replicative practice of socialization and induction drawing on the embedded expertise of teachers” (p. 13). Young and Boyd note that the professional mode of governance views teachers as skilled and caring practitioners.

Political Mode

The political mode of governance dominates the United States where political representation is provided through elected state boards of education that are supported by qualified public employees. Gideonse (1993) observes that the political mode of governance can “seriously filter or block out altogether the expertise of professionals … in defining and maintaining preparation and performance standards” (p. 402) and it tends to undermine collegiality within the teaching profession since it may focus efforts on lobbying governments rather than engaging in “dialectical struggle within the profession” (p. 402). He also notes that it assumes regulatory processes from the centre can achieve desired outcomes at the periphery, encouraging the myth of rationality, and that it ignores the problem of multiple jurisdictions.

In Canada, the political mode of governance predominates in Quebec (Young et al., 2007) and Alberta (Walker & von Bergmann, 2013; Young et al., 2007), where ministries of education have the legal authority, the requisite structures, and a political willingness to direct teacher education policy (Young, et al., 2007). In Quebec, provincial control over teacher training is justified on the basis that the wide-ranging program of school reform in the province requires “bring[ing] teacher training programs in line with the [provincial] changes affecting the system as a whole, in order to adapt them to the new realities” of changes to curriculum (Young & Boyd, 2010, p. 7). The Quebec Ministry of Education has the mandate to define “general orientations, professional competencies, and exit profiles for initial teacher training programs” (Young & Boyd, 2010, p. 7) and it issues teaching licences to graduates. Teacher education programs are accredited through a Ministry appointed committee.

In Alberta, teacher education is highly regulated and controlled. Upon graduation, Alberta teachers receive an interim certificate and are granted full certification only after completing two years of full time teaching and having demonstrated the requisite number KSAs (Walker & von Bergmann, 2013). Although Ontario may be described as having a professional mode of governance through the Ontario College of Teachers (Young & Boyd, 2010), it is also the only province with a quality assurance board for higher education, the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQC) (Walker & von Bergmann, 2013) that acts as an arm’s-length agency of the government. HECQC was established to evaluate and enhance the access, quality, and accountability of higher education institutions. Through the *Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario Act* teacher education programs are scrutinized and acquire funding for evidence-based research (Walker & von Bergmann, 2013).

Young and Boyd (2010) identify the core interest of political modes of governance as the development of an educated citizenry to ensure national, social, and economic development. Governments interested in ensuring a sufficient supply of teachers to implement government policy require teachers who comprehend and are able to implement government led reforms. The image of a teacher’s work in the political mode is that of servant of the state, regardless of whether government language is grounded in a discourse of professionalism or professionalization. As agents of the state, teachers are “paid by governments to carry out the government agenda in education” (Young & Boyd, 2010, p. 9). This aligns with Piddocke,

Magasino, and Manley-Casimir's (1997) assertion that teachers, as state agents or civil servants, are "expected to represent the authority of the state" (p. 40) and "maintain the values the state wishes to inculcate" (p. 40).

Institutional Mode

Institutional governance refers to governance by units, such as universities, that implement teacher education programs. Manitoba predominantly uses an institutional mode of governance as illustrated by Young and Boyd's (2010) description of a 2010 review of the University of Manitoba's Faculty of Education, which "was considered to be university business, and the appropriate decision-making bodies were the Faculty Council and the University Senate" (p. 10). It was driven internally by the university, and neither the Deputy Minister of Education nor the President of the Manitoba Teachers' Society were given special status in their report to the reviewers. The Faculty itself had the power to make substantial changes "without government or professional endorsement because provincial certification requirements were largely confined to the requirement that candidates held a Bachelor of Education degree from a recognized Manitoba university" (Young & Boyd, 2010, p. 10).

Young and Boyd suggest the core interest of institutional governance is critical inquiry, which encompasses "the theoretical bases of teaching and learning" (p. 13) and "a critical understanding of the role of schools and the debates in public education" (p. 13). They refer to Bridges (1996) to identify three essential components of teacher education in universities, as centres: (a) of expertise or relevant knowledge underpinned by a theoretical perspective, (b) of research and scholarship where systematic enquiry provides the basis for improved professional practise, and (c) for the maintenance of a critical tradition (p. 9). Placing teacher education programs in universities furthers an "academic image of teachers as *public intellectuals* [emaphasis added], where critical knowledge production is a defining feature of the profession" (p. 10). Young and Boyd (2010) quote Cochrane-Smith and Fries (2005) to argue this mode of governance promotes "knowledgeable professional teachers who … [are] learners, leaders, and school reformers" (p. 11). It should be noted that although Young and Boyd distinguish between public servant and public intellectual, the notions are not mutually exclusive as both are dedicated to fostering the public good or public interest (Saltman, 2015; Kesson & Henderson, 2004). As servants of the state, teachers perform a function of public interest but also need to be loyal to the state in performing their duties. The question to consider may be who gets to decide what the public good is and whose public good is advanced. If, as Kesson and Henderson suggest, teachers as public servants are "called upon to exercise leadership and work with the pubic around issues of general moral concern" (p. 11), their role as public servants may limit their intellectual autonomy as public intellectuals.

All forms of governance exist in teacher education programs in Canada; however, because they are housed in universities, this suggests a conceptualization of the teacher as public intellectual may be valuable to retain. Young and Boyd (2010) note the ambivalence of faculties of education within universities when they dispense with their "critical and theoretical responsibilities in favor of a more immediate pragmatic and technical curriculum" (p. 15) and when they "staff their programs almost exclusively with seconded and sessional instructors, while full-time faculty focus their time on graduate teaching and research" (p. 15).

The Teacher as Public Intellectual

The integration of teacher education programs into Ontario universities in the 1960s and 1970s was intended to increase "diversity, innovation, and improved quality of teacher education" (Meyers & Saul, 1974, p. 48). Integration was expected to "elevate teachers' subject knowledge … boost the overall status of the profession … . [and allow] prospective teachers to develop critical thinking skills which might help attract stronger candidates to the profession" (Wallner, 2014, p. 71). Academic university courses were and are intended to expand teachers' knowledge and skills beyond teacher training and pedagogical technique. They are expected to provide prospective teachers with a comprehensive understanding of the larger issues and debates that surround education and schooling.

In the last thirty years in Canada, the preeminent role of the university in the governance of teacher education has been challenged by the expansion of government regulation and the perspective that the profession should play an enhanced role in the creation of teachers (Young et al., 2007). It has also been challenged by the strands of liberalisms that have altered the organization and culture of the university. Giroux (2010) identifies "the increasing development of instrumental ideologies that emphasize a technocratic approach to both teacher preparation and classroom pedagogy" (p. 36) as one of the main threats that current and future teachers will face. He notes this is evident in,

> a call for the separation of the conception from execution; the standardization of school knowledge in the interest of managing and controlling it; and the devaluation of critical, intellectual work on the part of teachers and students for the primacy of practical considerations. (p. 36)

When prospective teachers are taught in ways that negate the importance of critical thinking and that mitigate exploring the key issues that affect schooling and society, their capacity to be public intellectuals is diminished. Giroux (2010) recommends teacher education programs replace the "language of management and efficiency with a critical analysis of the less obvious conditions that structure the ideological and material practices of schooling" (p. 37). He argues this requires a shift away from "learning the 'how to,' with 'what works,' or with mastering the best way to teach a *given* body of knowledge" to one that also raises questions with regard to the de-skilling of teachers and the loss of teacher autonomy" (p. 37).

For Giroux the category of intellectual proves valuable for several reasons. First, it offers a theoretical grounding for viewing teacher work as a form of intellectual labour, rather than framing it in strictly instrumental or technical terms. Second, it specifies the types of practical and ideological conditions that are requisite for teachers to function as intellectuals. Third, it clarifies the role teachers serve in "producing and legitimating various political, economic, and social interests through pedagogies they endorse and utilize" (p. 38). Within the context of neoliberal reforms, Giroux argues that teachers must take responsibility for raising questions about "what they teach, how they teach, and what the larger goals are that they are striving for" (p. 38). For this to occur, teacher education programs must provide teacher candidates with requisite analytical skills.

For Foucault (as cited in Anderson & Grinberg, 1998), the scholar or public intellectual is more problem posing than prescriptive. Foucault argues,

> The work of an intellectual is not to shape others' political will; it is, through the analyses that he [*sic*]

> carries out in his own field, to question over and over again what is postulated as self-evident, to disturb people's mental habits, the way they do and think things, to dissipate what is familiar and accepted, to re-examine rules and institutions and on the basis of this reproblematization (in which he carries out his specific task as an intellectual) to participate in the formation of political will (in which he has the role of the citizen to play). (p. 346)

This suggests that teacher educators need to question the extent to which training is emphasized in teacher education programs at the expense of education and critical enquiry. When training predominates, new teachers may come to accept neoliberal ideology without second thought, through course work aligned with government policy. Their socialization into professional expectations will come through their field placement experiences. Since it is a time of change, paradox, and instability, teacher education programs have some obligation to develop teachers with the tools to engage in systematic and critical enquiry of their education practices (Reid & O'Donaghue, 2004).

Contemporary approaches to teacher education often reinforce organizational structures and approaches that advance a perspective of teachers as technicians, and they "initiate teachers into dominant managerial discourses that valorize efficiency and effectiveness, and socialize students into accepting traditional organizational and pedagogical practices" (Reid & O'Donaghue, 2004, p. 565). Giroux (2010) argues that reforms in the United States present an unprecedented threat to public school teachers because they "display limited confidence in the ability of public school teachers to provide intellectual and moral leadership" (p. 35) and they ignore the role of teachers for developing active and critical citizens. He asserts that teachers are often the object of educational reforms that effectively reduces them to "the status of high-level technicians carrying out dictates and objectives decided by 'experts' far removed from the everyday realities of classroom life" (p. 35). Reforms of this nature, founded in a neoliberal ideology, largely ignore the intelligence, judgment, and experience of teachers.

Neoliberal reforms in the United States and England advanced by government bureaucracies construct educators "as teaching technicians whose task is to inculcate a narrow core of knowledge, the attainment of which it is assumed, will result in quality education" (Reid & O'Donaghue, 2004, p. 562). The current political and ideological climate presents teachers with both the challenge and opportunity of engaging in "a much-needed critique regarding the nature and purpose of teacher preparation, in-service teacher programs, and the dominant forms of classroom teaching" (Giroux, 2010, pp. 34-35).

Challenges for Teacher Education in Canada

It may be contended that Giroux's (2010) arguments regarding neoliberal changes to teacher education are more applicable to the United States or even England than to Canada. Raptis (2018) notes that Canada has a relatively high standard for who can be a teacher, and that one's initiation into the profession has served as a safeguard or push back against neoliberalism. Raptis also argues that as opposed to experiencing a de-skilling or de-intellectualization, Canadian teachers today are more educated than ever, requiring at least four or more years of university study to receive credentials. And, she notes, increasingly Canadian teachers continue their studies at the master's and PhD levels, suggesting they view their work as one of an intellectual and critical nature.

With reference to Ontario, Darling-Hammond (2017) notes the province raised its teacher

education requirements to be commensurate to that of a two-year graduate programme within the 13 universities that are accredited by the Ontario College of Teachers (OCT). She observes as well that these new teacher education programs “are expected to reflect current research in teacher practice and to integrate theory and practice” (p. 299). It should be noted however, that teacher education courses are still considered professional courses in the province of Ontario, and the substance of these courses must reflect the Ontario curriculum. Additionally, the OCT serves as the accreditation body, not the universities themselves, and in the university of the authors’, the requirement for admission into the teacher education program is not commensurate to that of a two-year graduate program. Darling-Hammond (2017) notes that the University of Toronto was recently approved to create a two-year master's degree program that “significantly extends the clinical experience for candidates and deepens their coursework to teach diverse learners, with the result that studies have found its teachers feel much better prepared for challenges they face in the classroom" (p. 299). However, this was the only university in the province to gain this approval, and the focus of the degree appears to remain focused on the teacher as technician and professional rather than the teacher as public intellectual.

In her comprehensive review of internal accountability in Canadian mandatory education, Wallner (2013) revealed that every province has a strong Ministry of Education that exerts command and control over school boards and education professionals, in part because most provinces receive full financial funding, having reclaimed school board taxation dollars through general taxation. School boards are thus unable to deviate from provincial mandates since they lack the resources to do so and are also unable to run deficits under the threat of provincial takeover. With reference to professional autonomy, Wallner found that teachers in all provinces were required to “adhere to a provincial curriculum, use provincially approved texts, and maintain certification under provincially developed standards” (p. 243). Furthermore, ministries have focussed efforts on mandatory assessment programs and standardized reporting practices “to measure the efficacy of the curriculum while providing the opportunity for officials to gauge the quality of teachers, administrators and local boards in developing and implementing successful education plans” (p. 243). Accountability instruments in Canada are oriented to learning the curriculum and evaluation through testing, and schooling promoted for its role in national economic competitiveness.

Schools are part of a society that is increasingly influenced by neoliberal values. Canada has not been excluded from the GERM, with at least five of the features identified by Sahlberg (2011) being evident: (a) a focus on standardization, (b) an increased emphasis on literacy and numeracy, (c) teaching for predetermined results, (d) the transfer of innovation from the corporate world to the educational world, and (e) test-based accountability policies for schools. At least at the K-12 level, increased control over schools through such measures as inspections, audits, and evaluations have not occurred, however, the trend toward standardization, which enables management from the margins, moves education closer in that direction.

To add to this, the universities in which teacher education programs are situated are increasingly subjected to neoliberal reforms. As in the United States and England, higher education in is becoming commodified, vocationalized, and subjected to market forces. Already in the 1990s, Tudiver (1999) observed, with reference to higher education in Manitoba, that reforms have given universities a “distinctly commercial feel” and reduced the “debate and critical enquiry” that was commonly observed in the 1970s when “faculties were still in charge of their own destinies … [and] broadening the curriculum and making higher education more

accessible … seemed eminently possible” (p. xi). A growing body of literature in higher education suggests that neoliberalism’s influence in Canada has contributed to eroding government funding that has left universities vulnerable to commercialization, and paradoxically, to standardization and increased government control (Brownlee, 2015; Chan & Fisher, 2008; Kirby, 2012; Rigas & Kuchapski, 2016). An “entrepreneurial university” (Falkenberg & Young, 2018) may jeopardize teacher education programs’ ability to further critical enquiry and to fashion teachers as public intellectuals. Falkenberg and Young suggest that reduced public funding and entrepreneurial budget models may require faculties of education to seek third-party financial support, with the potential that research disciplines may be shaped by commercial interests rather than the public good. Furthermore, they noted that inadequate funding may impact the ability of teacher education programs to foster critical enquiry, or at least find it a priority to do so. The movement of professorial faculty from undergraduate to graduate teaching and research and their replacement with sessional instructors, along with recent calls for teaching-focused universities moves faculty of educations away from integrating research and theory—a facet of critical enquiry (Falkenberg & Young, 2018).

When K-12 education, universities, and teacher education programs are shaped by a neoliberal agenda, teachers can easily be viewed primarily as technicians or skilled workers. This occurs when teaching is “standardized: rule-bound and replete with procedures and guidelines to follow in the classroom” (Evans, 2010, p. 187). A “teacher technician” may be conceptualized as a teacher “who gains the competencies within the scope of effective teaching, needs to be guided, controllable, and accountable, sticks to standards, and focuses on implementing more than thinking” (Sari & Yolcu, 2017, p. 14). This restricts teacher autonomy and authority and mitigates a view of teacher as public intellectual.

Burke (2005) refers to Berdahl who notes that “colleges and universities must stay sufficiently safe from external pressures to safeguard their societal critique yet sufficiently responsive to external needs to sustain societal support. They must simultaneously serve and scrutinize their society that supports them" (as cited in Burke, 2005, p. 5). This may be especially important for teacher education programs to ensure the relevance of their location within the university. It may also be increasingly challenging at a time when universities themselves are becoming financially dependent, market sensitive, and subject to cyclical outcome-based quality assurance reviews.

References

Anderson, G.L., & Grinberg, J. (1998). Educational administration as a disciplinary practice: Appropriating Foucault’s view of power, discourse, and method. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 34*(3), 329-353. doi:10.1177/0013161x98034003004

Barber, M., & Mourshed, M. (2007). How the world’s best-performing school systems come out on top. New York, NY: McKinsey & Company. Retrieved from http:// mckinseyonsociety.com.

Brownlee, J. (2015). *Academia, Inc.: How corporatization is transforming Canadian universities*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Burke, J. (2005). The many faces of accountability. In Joseph C. Burke & Associates(Eds.), *Achieving accountability in higher education: Balancing public, academic, and market demands* (pp. 1-24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Carpenter, S., Weber, N., & Schugurensky, D. (2012). Views from the blackboard: Neoliberal education reforms and the practice of teaching in Ontario, Canada. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 10*(2), 145-161. doi:10.1080/1467724.2012.647401

Chan, A.S., & Fisher, D. (2008). Introduction: The exchange university. In A.S. Chan & D. Fisher (Eds.), *The exchange university: Corporatization of academic culture* (pp. 1–18).Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Childs, A., & Mender, I. (2013). Teacher education in 21<sup>st<sup> century England. A case study in neoliberal public policy/La formación del profesorado del siglo XXI en Inglaterra. Un estudio de caso desde la política neoliberal. *Revista Española de Educación Comparada, 22*, 93-116. Retrieved from http://revistas.uned.es/index.php/REEC

Cochran-Smith, M. (2008). The new teacher education in the United States: Directions forward. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 14*(4), 271-282. doi:10.1080/13540600802037678

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005). Researching teacher education in changing times: Politics and paradigms. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the American Education Research Association panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 66-110). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Reforming teacher preparation and licensing: Debating the evidence. *Teachers College Record, 102*(1), 28-56. doi:10.1111/0161-4681.00047

Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? *European Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(3), 291-309. doi:10.1080/026196768.2017.1315399

DeLuca, C., & Pitblado, M. (2018). Progress and looking into the future. In T.M. Christou (Ed.), *The curriculum history of Canadian teacher education* (pp. 259-27). New York, NY: Routledge.

Di Mascio, A. (2018). The struggle for a profession: Teacher education in Quebec. In T.M. Christou (Ed.), *The curriculum history of Canadian teacher education* (pp. 111-124). New York: Routledge.

Eagleton-Pierce, M. (2016). *Neoliberalism: The key concepts*. New York, NY: Routledge

Evans, L. (2010). Professionals or technicians? Teacher preparation programs and occupational understandings. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 16*(2), 183-205. doi: 10.1080.13540600903478458

Falkenberg, T., Young, J. (2018). Understanding curriculum: The history of initial teacher education in Manitoba. In T.M. Christou (Ed.), *The curriculum history of Canadian teacher education* (pp. 145-159). New York, NY: Routledge.

Furlong, J. (2013). Globalisation, neoliberalism and reform of teacher education in England. *The Educational Forum, 77*, 28-50. doi: 0.1080/00131725.2013.739017

Gideonese, H.D. (1993). The governance of teacher education and systematic reform. *Educational Policy, 7*(4), 395-426. doi:10.1177/0895904893007004001

Giroux, H. (2010). Teachers as transformative intellectuals. In K. Ryan & J.M. Cooper (Eds.), *Kaleidoscope: Contemporary and classical readings in education* (12 ed., pp. 35- 39). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Green, J. (2011). *Education, professionalism and the quest for accountability: Hitting the target but missing the point*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Grimmett, P. P. (2009). The governance of Canadian teacher education: A macro-political perspective. In F.J. Benson & C. Riches (Eds.), *Engaging in conversation about ideas in teacher education* (pp. 22-32). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Hargreaves, A. & Shirley, D. (2012). *The global fourth way: The quest for excellence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Hill, D. (2007). Critical teacher education, New Labour, and the global project of neoliberal capital. *Policy Futures in Education, 5*(2), 204-225. doi:10.2304/pfie.2007.5.2.204.

Holborow, M. (2012). What is neoliberalism? Discourse, ideology and the real world. In D. Block, J. Gray, & M, Holborow (Eds.), *Neoliberalism and applied linguistics* (pp. 14-32). New York, NY: Routledge.

Img, D., & Img, S. (2008). From traditional certification to competitive certification. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education:*

Enduring questions in changing contexts (3rd ed., pp. 886-907). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kesson, K.R., & Henderson, J.G. (2004). Cultivating democratic curriculum judgments: Toward a mature profession. In K.R. Kesson & E.W. Ross (Eds.), *Defending public schools: Teaching for a democratic society* (Vol. II, pp. 3-16). Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Kirby, D. (2012). Marketizing Canadian higher education: An examination of recent access policy reforms. In H. G. Schuetze, G. A. Mendiola & D. Conrad (Eds.), *State and market in higher education: Trends, policies and experiences in comparative perspective* (pp. 43– 55). Boston, MA: Sense.

Lingard, B. (2009, November). Testing times: The need for new intelligent accountabilities for schooling. *QTU Professional Magazine, 24*, 13-19.

MacBeath, J. (2011). Education of teachers: the English experience. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 37*(4), 377-386. doi:10.1080/02607476.2011.610988

Myers, D., & Saul, D. (1974). How not to reform a teacher education system: Ontario 1966-71. In D. Myers & F. Reid (Series Eds.), *Symposium Series: Vol. 4. Educating teachers: Critiques and proposals* (pp. 33–51). Toronto, ON: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Piddocke, S., Magsino, R. F., & Manley-Casimir, M. E. (1997). *Teachers in trouble: An exploration of the normative character of teaching*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Raptis, H. (2018). The Canadian landscape: Provinces, territories, nations, and identities. In T.M. Christou (Ed.), *The curriculum history of Canadian teacher education* (pp. 20-42). New York, NY: Routledge.

Reid, A. & O'Donaghue, M. (2004). Revisiting enquiry-based teacher education in neo-liberal times. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*, 559-570. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2004.06.002

Rigas, B., & Kuchapski, R. (2016). "Strengthening" Ontario universities: A neoliberal reconstruction of higher education. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 180*, 47-70. Retrieved from https://journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/cjeap/

Saltman, K.J (2015). Democratic education against corporate school reform: The new market bureaucracy in U.S. public schooling. In J.M. Paraskeva & T. LaVallee (Eds.), *Transformative researchers and educators for democracy* (pp. 7-22). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense.

Sari, M., & Yolcu, E. (2017). Views of Pre-Service Teachers on Profession: Technician or Professional? *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 9*(1), 13-26. doi: 10.15345/iojes.2017. 01.002

Sahlberg, P. (2011). The fourth way of Finland. *Journal of Educational Change, 12*(2), 173-185. doi:10.007/s10833-011-9157-y

Saunders, D. B. (2010). Neoliberal ideology and public education in the United States. *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies, 8*(1), 41-77. Retrieved from http://www.jceps.com/

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Steger, M. B., & Roy, R. K. (2010). *Neoliberalism: A very short introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Tudiver, N. (1999). *Universities for sale: Resisting corporate control over Canadian higher education*. A CAUT Series Title. Toronto, ON: James Lorimer and Company Ltd.

Walker, J.M., & von Bergmann, H. (2013). Teacher education policy in Canada: Beyond professionalization and deregulation. *Canadian Journal of Education, 36*(4), 65-92. Retrieved from http://cje-rce.ca/

Wallner, J. (2014). *Learning to school: Federalism and public schooling in Canada*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Wallner, J. (2013). Internal accountability and intergovernmental policy learning: Accountability in Canadian mandatory education. In P. Graefe, J. Simmons, & L.A., White (Eds.), *Overpromising and underperforming? Understanding and evaluating new intergovernmental accountability regimes* (pp. 238-257). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Weiner, L. (2007). A lethal threat to U.S. teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(4), 274-

286. doi:10.1177/0022487107305603

Young, J., & Boyd, K. (2010). More than servants of the state? The governance of initial teacher preparation in Canada in an era of school reform. *The Alberta Journal of Education Research, 56*(1), 1-18. Retrieved from http://ajer.ca/

Young, J., Hall, C., & Clarke, T. (2007). Challenges to university autonomy in initial teacher education programmes: The cases of England, Manitoba, and British Columbia. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 81-93. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.008

Zhao, Y. (2013). Directions of change: Why the United States and China are moving in opposite directions. In H.J. Malone (Ed.), *Leading educational change: Global issues, challenges, and lessons in whole-system reform* (pp. 16-19). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance, and attacks on diversity: Neoliberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the U.S. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 1544-1552. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.004

Notes

1 Competitive certification is advanced to apply market pressure on teacher preparation programs by offering alternative ways for teachers to demonstrate teaching competency, including passing tests of competency (e.g., Hess, 2002)

2 GERM is grounded in the education reform thinking of the 1980s, and its educational paradigm has become adopted within the educational reform movements of not only the United States, England, and Canada, but also in the transition countries and the developing world (Sahlberg, 2011). According to Sahlberg, since the 1990s, GERM has been characterized by six features: (1) standardization, (2) an increased emphasis on literacy and numeracy, (3) teaching for predetermined results, (4) the transfer of innovation from the corporate world to the educational world, (5) test-based accountability policies for schools, and (6) increased control over schools through such measures as inspections, audits, and evaluations.

Bob Rigas is a Doctoral Candidate in Educational Studies with a focus on Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Brock University in St. Catharines, Ontario. He has received a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in History and English literature, a Bachelor of Education, and a Master of Arts in History from Queen's University at Kingston, and a Master of Education from Brock University. Rigas's research interests include accountability, K-12 educational reform, higher education and teacher education policy, and the historical contexts of education policy. Rigas is also a certified Ontario teacher and has taught secondary school English and History in the Ontario public school system for over thirteen years. He also has post-secondary teaching experience as an instructor at Brock University's Faculty of Education.

Renée Kuchapski is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education at Brock University, Ontario, Canada. She teaches graduate courses in the Administration and Leadership field of specialization. Her research interests include educational policy, neoliberalism and its influence on education, accountability, and life history research. Her professional career included time as a high school teacher, school principal, program coordinator, and a school board consultant.