**ACCESS: CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN EDUCATION**
2004, VOL. 23, NO. 1, 1–10

ACCESS

INTRODUCTION

# Politics of Censure and 'Will to Certainty' in Teacher Education

Elizabeth M. Grierson and Janet E. Mansfield

## Teacher education and the politics of censure

Tracing the etymology of censure leads us to the Latin *cesura*, 'judgement, assessment', from *cesere* 'assess'. This issue of *ACCESS* is concerned to assess the construction and governance of knowledge policies and their current implementation in teacher education. The essays in this present collection go some way towards revealing and interrogating the *politics of censure* invested in policy as a pre-condition of practice, in relation to the New Zealand educational terrain.

Teacher education is not isolated from the varied reformative reports and propositions within twentieth century governance of public practices in New Zealand (for a summary discussion of these reforms and reports, see Olssen and Morris Matthews, 1997: 7-46; also Codd, 1990a, 19906). The following essays focus on the relations between political ideologies and policies, and their inscription in the practices of teacher education.

The aim of improving the quality of teaching for all students has been a crucial aspect of the rhetoric of educational governance in New Zealand (Education Review Office, 2004, *Quality of Year Two Beginning Teachers*, June 2004) _: echoing a similar emphasis in Australia, United Kingdom and the United States. While the importance of this aim cannot be under estimated, it must be seen in relation to wider contexts of governance. In this respect, teachers and teacher education are not isolated from the regulatory relations between local and global networks of policy and practice, and the performative logic of global exchange with its implicit demand for measurable, 'quick-to-market' results. Reforms in teacher education "are themselves part of a meta-reform agenda driven by frameworks of economic rationalism in a globalised context" as Bartlett (1992) has suggested (cited in Tinning, 2000: 160).

So it would seem crucial 'to work towards a form of student learning in schools and teacher education chat is responsive to global conditions. *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (Ministry of Education, 1993: 1) has emphasised skills and knowledge that would enable students' participation in "today's and tomorrow's competitive world economy". However, what the essays in this issue of ACCESS reveal is that *critical approaches* that might expose the *non-neutrality* of educational processes have been sidelined, even censured out of existence, in the educational climate of competition and accountability that marks the local/global knowledge terrain within which education now operates.

As teacher education becomes folded into the "production capacity" (Robertson, 1999: 122) of public and institutional practice, the necessity for a robust and critical teacher education is revealed. Peters (2001) and other New Zealand scholars who are engaged in critical analysis of educational policy and governance, such as Snook, (1998), Codd (1995, 1998), Olssen (1997), Grierson (2000, 2003a), Mansfield (2000, 2003a), Lines (2003) argue for "the need for the contextualisation of curriculum in the postmodern condition in order to understand the developments in education" and the need for "critical purchase of curriculum as it reflects both its cultural age and its socio-historical context" (Peters, 2001: 10). Thus, it is the "critical purchase" that is a demand for teacher

education and its engagements with curricula and pedagogy, in order to open spaces for *contextual* understandings.

In a time of increasing economic rationalism in public policies, it follows that there must be an enhancement of student teachers' critical awareness of the 'political purpose' of curriculum, of knowledge categorisations, and of factors that might contribute to the lack of motivation in students and subsequent disillusionment in teachers. Given the uncertainty surrounding any predictions of what our students "will need to know and be able to do" (10), Peters questions the continued use of "discrete units of sequence and content" in curriculum theory and planning. By opening up the regulating conditions of practice to question, student teachers might then be cognisant of the political constructions of their conditions of employment under policies of devolution and other managerialist moves, and recognise the kinds of institutional pressures that derive from them. Such a form of teacher education, it is suggested, would be one that empowers student teachers to question, interrogate, resist and displace the 'value-added' model of educational provision. It would be one that encourages critique and critical debate of policy and its historical positioning in the interests of equity, diversity and other forms of social justice. In the 'value-added' model of education the pattern is to assume that the major tasks of school teaching *are* measurable and that constant calculating, counting and reporting on their own performance and that of their charges is the best way for teachers to demonstrate their dedication to children's progressive achievement, school capability and effectiveness. Such a scenario, where education is strategised as a principle force of 'production' for a growing 'enterprise culture', engineered by local and global politics, calls for questioning at the core of its philosophical assumptions.

## Educational blueprints and conditions of subjectivity

Innovation and enterprise is the 'official' rhetoric that now marks the construction and governance of the knowledge society in New Zealand as it mirrors the global mode of recasting knowledge as the principle force of production. The means-end equation fo knowledge generation and its application to productive enterprise is recognisable in the emphasis on applied technologies, skills add attributes, and the 'quick-to-market' application of knowledge to 'industry'. Such a prescription for 'production' is identifiable in educational blueprints for teaching and learning, and curriculum and assessment, with their legislated levels of learning as the acceptable modes of knowledge acquisition for the learning subject.

Educational blueprints, such as *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (Ministry of Education, 1993) and National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA, New Zealand Qualifications Authority), cannot be detached from the constitution of subjectivity, so the question must be asked: what sort of learning subject is constructed by these legislated means? We have seen how the liberal human subject of freedom and autonomy was reinscribed as the neoliberal free-market subject in the 1980s and 1990s; then to be rescripted as the subject of the 'free-global place', a technologised subject of the global economy with its informational networks and performativities. The concept of 'freedom' continues to be gainfully employed as an underpinning liberal value in well-meaning and well-entrenched humanitarian discourses, from fighting terror in public spaces to promoting skills and applied attributes in education and industry. Yet as the essays in this collection show, the 'free' subject is already in chains, predetermined by the rationalised censure of knowledge in the cross fire of functional, technocratic and managerialist discourses through which, it seems, education is now valued.

The sidelining of questions of subjectivity, and its reconstitution in a technologised age of informational processes and networks, is the neglect of vitally important questions of difference, equity, justice, and citizenship. In examining the politics of identity and subjectivity, we may ask, for example, what are the relations and effects of what Wolmark (1999: 241) terms "hybrid cyber-identities" that are inscribed via the proliferation of new-media and cyber-media? Cyberspace may

be opened to deeply embedded issues relating to questions of identity in a technologised age, questions which would seem to be crucial if a cultural and political understanding is to be available for the learning subject (see Grierson, 2001). However, with time restrictions for that sort of enquiry, teacher education must concentrate on more pressing concerns.

Where, then, lie the motivations for teachers to engage deeply in relations between personhood and community, and in the complex configurations and values of gender, ethics, and justice? Where are the deeply implicated cultural and historical questions to be engaged beyond the politically legislated level of the 'known' and 'correct' that are ensured through educational blueprints? In the condition of postmodernity we could imagine an oppositional politics where received approaches to education are challenged by revolutionary and radical subjectivities. Further, in today's conditions of globalisation we might question what 'radical subjectivities' could mean in local spheres where specific practices are framing local subjects in a 'third way' mode of liberalism that is both neo-liberal and post-liberal at one and same time - a sort of hybridised, globalist, human subject. What might this identity process mean in teacher education and how might it be opened out for discussion and analysis? These are the sorts of questions that are begging to be addressed in order to prepare teachers for new kinds social and cultural dynamics and demographics.

Then there is the corporatisation of public institutions and the inevitable effects of economic rationalism in various domains of education. To what extent do corporate complexities and commercial configurations mould education? How, for example, do transnational economic, commercial trade negotiations, as well as agreements and configurations influence or even construct educational attitudes and practices? Can their influence be passed off as incidental and unproblematic or does the working of power in the economic sphere crucially inflect education as a site of knowledge and identity? We would suggest that it is the ways that educational practice is *impacted, inflected and influenced* by these socioeconomic, political and cultural formations, when they span international boundaries, and the ways in which education *takes account* of them, that are matters of crucial concern.

While 'culture' might be much discussed in a climate of transnational 'culture industries' and 'culturalism' in education (see Mane-Wheoki, 2003), gender and relations of power in the social sphere are aspects of identity formation that have tended to become passé in the productionist mode of education. It is as though gender is somehow no longer relevant as a site of struggle in the globalised age of performative and hybrid subjectivities. Yet teacher-educator Elody Rathgen (2000: 207) asks: How are beginning and practicing teachers to negotiate or grapple with submerged "subtleties of gender regimes"? Furthermore how can the complexities of individual and community relationships be understood without an understanding of *difference* and its political configurations? It is in the political lineage and formations of gendered subjects that our teacher educators must operate to negotiate the individual needs of their students and themselves with all the complexities and subtleties of public and private expectations. Yet their time is captured by ordered prescriptions, constraints and demands of curriculum, and assessment and institutional accountabilities. So the question needs to be asked, through which sites do we locate and engage with these complex and often conflicting processes if it is not through teacher education?

Difference as a way of relating and knowing calls for more than mere tolerance; it demands willing acceptance of the 'stranger' without and within, and the trust that comes from accepting the vulnerabilities of students, as of the self; it comes from working with questions of diversity rather than assuming 'diversity' as an unproblematised given. It calls for a critical attitude to questions of aesthetics, cultural practices, customs, language and politics, for questioning the dominant cultural assumptions, and in particular for putting to test the inherited practices of 'the teacher' which are so often assumed as correct. Rathgen (2000: 204) notes: "In teacher education, if we are to confront complex issues and demands to change attitudes and beliefs as beginning teachers usually are, we must respect individual contexts and then begin the disruptive thinking required to mal<:e the

changes". Calling for "less pragmatism and more theory and critical thinking" in teacher education and research, Rathgen (2000: 202) advocates a central position for feminist and other critical theories and practices, "to help counter the schools' reproduction of hegemonic practices and values" (204). Such critical thinking and enquiry, she argues, is likely to result in "more sophisticated and thoughtful classroom practice".

## Overall concerns

As general education is pulled further into a means-end model of skills acquisition to meet the demands for "informational commodity" (Lyotard, 1984: 5), teacher education and teachers' work must likewise conform to the model. Following the above is an outcomes-driven model of public education with teachers coping with diminishing resources, expectations of industry partnerships for funding, quality control achieved through legislated and nationally monitored box-ticking, and increasing demands of accountability. And we suggest that in the wake of this model managerial skills are privileged over preparedness for sound and critically reflective pedagogical practice, and always the ready surveillance by government agencies against which the teacher's performance will be measured -yet this managerialist model is still called 'liberal education'. Is it too presumptuous to ask, in the face of the onslaught of such compelling doctrine, what might be lost in the process? Elsewhere, Grierson puts it this way: "In the delivery of curriculum, management accountability ensures increasingly that the resources of time and energy will be colonised and called to order, as the endless form-filling and data-processing takes precedence over risk-talking and innovative practice" (Grierson, 2003a: 112).

This scenario raises obvious concerns. In the dominant construction and governance of means-end thinking and practice in education, a violence is perpetrated to critical enquiry as a foundational basis of pedagogical practice - certainly, it seems, a suppression. It could be argued that teachers are largely being 'trained' rather than 'educated' to deliver the legislated practices of curriculum and assessment prescriptions. This may be so, but it is the consequences of the implicit eschewment that raises prime concern. If opportunity is curtailed for critical reflection that comes from excavating the historical and philosophical implications of their professional fields, then a diminished form of teacher education will be confirmed - along with a dearth of attention to the intra-psychic, social and creative needs of our students. In this sense the censuring of knowledge is occurring before it is even made visible.

These concerns show why teacher education must act as an enabling process so teachers will gain knowledge and understanding of the controlling frameworks that regulate their own work (see also Robertson, 1999; Jesson, 1995). A teacher education in which the ideological underpinnings of "the politics of blame" (Thrupp, 1998: 163) are left unexamined by a dominating emphasis upon learning theory, classroom practice, psychology, assessment, evaluation and classroom management will reduce teaching to a technical activity and thereby lead teachers down the age-old path of the 'manual' or 'knowing how' doctrines. Knowledge and understanding that might emerge from a more 'contextualist' education of teachers (see Clark, 1998; Codd, 1998; Snook, 1998; A. M. O'Neill, 1998; J. O'Neill, 1998; Openshaw, 1998; Thrupp, 1998) are placed in binary oppositional relationships to subjects that feed technicist practice. A recent issue of *ACCESS* (Vol 22, 2003) has focused on the *enframing* nature of technology and technicist approaches to knowledge, thinking and being, through consideration of the writings of Martin Heidegger (see in particular Engels-Schwarzpaul, 2003; Grierson, 20036; Peters, 2003; Mansfield, 20036; see also Lines, 2003). The manual, practice-based and applied side of the binary epistemological couplet, once decried in liberal education is now repositioned, even celebrated, in the dominant discourses of teacher education, with its positioning of a technologised subjectivity as previously discussed. As knowledge is identified with technological approaches, so identities become subjectified within and by those means-end frameworks.

This issue of *ACCESS* brings together the knowledge and understanding of critical educators that are actively involved in teacher education in this contemporary political terrain. All share a deep concern for what Bates argues is "the move towards the subordination of the social to the economic, the cultural to the vocational and broad-based education to the narrow confines of competency-based education" (1994, cited in Tinning, 2000: 159). Ivan Snook (1998) and John Codd (1995, 1998) have argued for the ethics of teacher education: Snook for the "preparation of a learned profession" (1998: 135) and the "ethical teacher"; and Codd (1995), for the "professional contextualist teacher" and against the "culture of mistrust" (1998: 149). In a post-liberal, global world of 'knowledge' provision, their visions for the education of creative and "critical educators act as something of a beacon across the educational landscape.

## 'Will to certainty'

At a time of excessive rationalisation of resources, of knowledge transfer and its applied positioning, and of the professional role of 'the teacher' as a constructed agent of this process, this issue of *ACCESS* foregrounds the need for rigorous questioning and re-visioning. Throughout the forms of institutional practice addressed here, *censure* is an underlying motif, in the construction of knowledge as a pre-judged event, an *a priori* condition of thinking, determined by government policies where, by and through language, the blueprint for educational practice and purpose is set, thereby diminishing alternative possibilities.

In her work on the politics of curriculum, Mansfield writes of the disciplinary processes in action here (see Mansfield, 2000, 2003). Mansfield cites Jagodzinski: "Discipline and all the paradigmatic clusters of signifiers it buttons down - territory, form, procedure, formalism, obedience, self-surveillance, clarity, directionality - may be summarized as the modernist 'will to certainty"' (Jagodzinski, 1997: 84, cited in Mansfield, 2003: 64). Through that "will to certainty" the politics of censure are ineluctably in operation.

Overall, a reinscribed form of modernity illustrated by Jagodzinski's (1997) "will to certainty", folds education and the human subject into its relations of power and ideals of progresl. While codes of action, behaviour, practice and agency are pre-censured, selected and embedded in a "will to certainty", political ideals of choice, free will and democracy simmer untested. Olssen (2002) mal<:es some decisive commentary on the "*explicit agenda of states*" in a post 9/11 global-world, relating this "new political settlement" to education (Olssen, 2002: 75-90). Depending upon the mystification of this process, the ideological system, faceless, signifies global knowledge governance through its technicist functionality with pre-determined outcomes in educational spheres of operation. Looking at this scenario, as Michael Peters points out, there is a "tacit acceptance of globalisation and the implicit rules of the global marketplace" (Peters, 2002: 13). Education is then divorced from social democratic politics and the fundamental necessities of human rights. On the basis of this scenario, Peters argues, and we would agree, that there is a need to "re-establish education as a minimum welfare right and global public good" (Peters, 2002: 3-17; and response, Olssen, 2002: 75-90).

## Contributing essays

Critical engagements with education of teachers, educational rights, the "politics of censure", and a "will to certainty" in teacher education mark the ensuing contributions. One of the recurring themes relates to the ideological frameworks and implicit logic of the global knowledge economy and local knowledge societies. Prospective teachers are too easily denied access to important philosophical, historical, contextual and critical epistemological spheres of enquiry in favour of the 'how to' of training. "As in the mode of instructional reports, the 'how to' ... is circumscribed with little apparent attention to questions of 'why', 'where from', and 'when"' (Grierson, 2003a: 96).

Each writer in this collection focuses on a specific aspect of 'censuring' in teacher education. The opening essay, by Roger Openshaw, foregrounds the field of curriculum history. Openshaw draws from his own well-researched and experienced position in teacher education, arguing that curriculum historians have a crucial and critical role in teacher education, yet with the demands of the Curriculum Framework the critical components of educational studies have been effectively eviscerated. This promotes an impoverished situation where "students leave teacher education programmes with knowledge about what is in contemporary curriculum documents, but possessing little inclination to be critical of them, and even less understanding of the historical background to curriculum so necessary to true professionalism".

Openshaw promotes in teacher education a need for understanding the relationship between curriculum change and the wider society, and of the politically motivated practices involved in that relationship. Importantly, he points to the politics of institutional research and present climates where "tensions [mount] between research that simply seeks better ways to implement Ministry and government sponsored goals, and research that serves to critique those goals from wider socio-political perspectives".

Also with concern for the policies of curriculum, Anne-Marie O'Neill shows how outcomes-driven curriculum structures and the political nature and purposes of *Technology in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 1995) have been "a pivotal plank" in the creation of an 'Enterprise Culture'. Yet this neoliberal agenda with its resulting commercialisation of education has been overlooked and underplayed in teacher education. O'Neill periodises the reduction of the state - its "adjustment" - and the accompanying changes made to the nature of teacher education through local governance in a global economic context. Drawing from one case study, A.-M. O'Neill suggests a contextual, critical and theoretically vigorous curriculum and the implementation of educational studies as educational imperatives within teacher education, as she underscores the complexity of the theoretical, epistemological, philosophical, policy issues involved in the last fifteen years of educational change and the need for student teachers to understand such complexities as an outcomes-driven model of curriculum cakes precedence.

A.-M. O'Neill argues for "the importance of a contextual, critical and theoretically rigorous curriculum and education studies" in teacher education, as she interrogates the enterprise agenda with the placement of the *Technology Curriculum* at the heart of National's reconstruction project. She invokes an analysis of the ideological role of the *Technology Curriculum* in constituting "a new kind of person for a society engineered towards certain interests which are presented as neutral and inevitable" (Snook, 1997: 5, cited in O'Neill). The politics of censure are in action via an elevation, through the *Technology Curriculum*, of a 'how to do it' approach (the technological development model) rather than a critical 'ought we to' ... which would examine the contexts and effects of technology. The limits of chinking, as well as being and doing, are thus politically legislated and prescribed. O'Neill leaves the reader with the message of a confirmed necessity and need for solid engagement with social and political theory, educational theory and educational history in teacher education, so that teachers may be empowered as critics of "politically and economically driven change" rather than becoming functionary agents of the system. Ultimately, claims O'Neill, there must be the *political will* among teacher educators to ensure students gain access to the critical knowledge of political change in education - and this is particularly so in the environments of newly merged Colleges of Education and University Education Departments.

Also calling for a critical attitude in teacher education is John Clark. Acknowledging the centrally mandated requirements that graduating teachers must meet if they are to be registered and employed, Clark calls for teacher-educators to go beyond sustaining the ideological status quo, and to adopt and instil a critical attitude as a fundamental way of approaching education. Showing the limitations of training teachers simply "to accept as a given the Ministry approved position" in *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (Ministry of Education, 1993), Clark opens for scrutiny what

is "philosophically problematic about the official curriculum" which, he claims, "reinforce(s) a political conservativism".

The official adoption of a particular view of knowledge with neither philosophical justification nor declaration, which in turn maintains traditional subject boundaries and school organisation, is foregrounded as a fundamental problem chat totally ignores crucial questions of the positioning and categorising of knowledge - how they are grouped, why, and whose interests they serve. Objecting to the Ministry's summation of "essential learning areas" as "recognisable categories of knowledge and understanding [that] provide the context within which the essential skills and values are developed" (Ministry of Education, 1993: 8), Clark opens the question of knowledge categorisation to some well argued, philosophical analysis. He presents a range of ways that knowledge might be partitioned, and shows the limitations and assumptions of the *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (1993) with its maintenance of political conservativism in subject and school organisation. Most importantly Clark points out the protectionist aspect of these institutional boundaries, "against which rational challenge and debate is rarely welcomed". He leaves the reader with a possible alternative curriculum through a New Basics problem-solving approach, offering a challenge to those in teacher education to "shake off the shackles of philosophical naivete and political conservatism, which the Curriculum Framework brings". Finally, he urges educators to consider reconceptualising the curriculum, school organisation and management, and above all, to move beyond the conservative, safe, status quo.

In keeping with the theme of the politics of censure, John O'Neill pulls the readers attention to the policies of professional development for teachers and what is included and excluded. The Ministry of Education (1997) *Know How 2* resource for professional development in technology education is scrutinised for its "narrowly ideological view of the curriculum as enterprise technology". Again it is the "unquestioning implementation of official curriculum policy" that is highlighted and the discouragement of "a critically informed analysis of official curricula in pre-service education". Starting from the fundamental premise that "teaching is inherently political work involving individual and collective judgements about what is worth teaching, why and how", O'Neill offers much to consider about the "site of political struggle" in classroom and curriculum, and the overt appeals that are made to "good sense" as a way of confirming and continuing the official lines of policy and practice. O'Neill presents a convincing argument about the silencing of discussion in contemporary teacher education around "issues of purpose and agency" in favour of "instrumental and functional approaches to the 'making' of teachers and curriculum", as he points to what he calls "the tragedy" of "complicity and actual support ... or simply resigned acceptance of many teacher educators".

It is through his analysis of the *Know How 2* resource for technology education that John O'Neill is able to reveal the ideological underpinnings and links between business enterprise culture and the technology curriculum. He laments in particular the conflation of "the activities of 'problem-solving' and 'design' according to a utilitarian criterion of 'fitness-for-purpose"' and the placing of "enterprise as both the means and ends of curriculum" - and the lack of a sense of moral and social purpose of the *Technology Curriculum*. Technology could be positioned *with* culture to enable exploration of the ways beliefs, values and ethics of individuals and groups influence technology. However, there remains a "bitter irony ... that the beliefs, values and ethics of the proponents of enterprise technology and neoliberal views of the purposes of education are ... placed beyond potential scrutiny by teachers and their students". There is much that calls for serious reflection and attention in this essay.

With her focus on citizenship education, Joce Jesson also positions the need for active attention to ethical and social values that draw from the experience of students' lives and relations to work. Drawing upon Freirean theory and pedagogy Jesson argues for "meaningful citizenship education for all students" in the form of union education so that students are not "unprepared for the transition to workplace or further education/training" (National Administration Guidelines). Jesson

points out that the actual aim of citizenship education that relates to students' lives and experiences is coo often "missed in the creation of relevant social studies classroom curriculum". She calls for educational programmes to help secondary students deal with transition to the world of work, acknowledging chat many school students are already at work while still attending school. She argues chat critically engaged understanding of employment rights and working conditions is vital in the transition from a "Keynesian Welfare state towards a more Schumpeterian Workforce state in a globalised economy", where students need the means to develop a workable critical capacity to understand the impact of this shift in their own lives.

Jesson argues that this capacity is crucial at a time when "learning to labour" is already part of the life experience of many students and it is precisely this process that should be accessed and engaged. Jesson acknowledges that the key for change lies in educating the teachers so they may know how to assist students to engage meaningfully with their own experiences and "gain confidence in their own collective skills".

The concluding essay by Brian Findsen echoes the themes of previous essays in chat it expresses a concern for the way teachers' professional behaviour is being framed. Findsen's motif is the classical image of a wooden horse and its hidden cargo. Portraying the process of pre-determined knowledge and the implementation of teacher behaviour, Findsen cakes the reader into the Homerian myth of the wooden horse in which the soldiers are secreted and thereby successfully smuggled into the city of Troy unseen by the city's inhabitants. This, claims Findsen, is the way "professionally reductive, measurable and competent teacher 'behaviour'" is, by stealth, introduced and positioned in university education today.

It is a fitting conclusion chat leaves us pondering the "will to certainty" where the expectations upon tertiary teachers, and the framing of their professional conditions, have been pre-formed via the political ideologies of economic rationalism as they, themselves, will be professionally marked and measured to conform. A behaviourist model of teacher-learner is thus "smuggled into academia" as the "professional" is cast as agent of accountability who must struggle to overcome loss of time for deep learning and perform to the demands of engineered policy and applied practice. Findsen, who is with the University of Glasgow, and latterly from Auckland, draws on examples from both New Zealand and United Kingdom as he illuminates an "underlying ideology of instrumentalism" in higher education and university sectors. With such facility, the university teacher "moves from being a professional to an activist to an entrepreneur".

## Conclusion

This issue of ACCESS engages a number of importunating concerns in teacher education. lt is hoped chat the reflection that comes from them will lead to action for change. 'Official' narratives have been presented and critiqued while counternarratives have been interposed through the exercise of a 'critical will'. Perhaps it is here chat these essays make a collective mark. *ACCESS* is dedicated to *critical perspectives* and in this respect all our writers have contributed to this approach. As editors of this issue we are pleased to bring the work of these educators to you. Roger Openshaw, Anne-Marie O'Neill, John Clark, John O'Neill, Joce Jesson, and Brian Findsen are all well experienced and critically rigorous in

their approach to their field. We hope that these essays will expose the conditions of policy and practice in this vital arena of our educational landscape, teacher education, while opening the ground for further analysis and response.

## References


Clark, J, (1998). ERO'S 'The Capable Teacher'. *Delta: Policy and Practice in Education, 50* (2), 187-200.

Codd, J. (1995). Educational Reform and the Contradictory Discourses of Evaluation. *Evaluation and Research in Education,* 172, 41-54.

Codd, J. (1998). Professional Accountability and the Education of Teachers. *Delta: Policy and Practice in Education, 50(2),* 149-162.

Codd, J. (1990a). Policy Documents and the Official Discourses of the State. In J. Codd, R. Harker, & R. Nash (Eds.), *Political Issues in New Zealand Education* (pp. 133-149). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Codd, J. (19906). Educational Policy and the Crisis of the New Zealand State. In S. Middleton, J. Codd, & A. Jones (Eds.), *New Zealand Educational Policy Today* (pp. 191-205). Wellington: Allen & Unwin.

Educational Review Office (June 2004). *Quality of Year Two Beginning Teachers.* Wellington: ERO.

Engels-Schwarzpaul, A.-Chr. (2003). Ways of Appropriating: Culture as resource and standing reserve. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural & Policy Studies, 22* (1 & 2), 35-45.

Grierson, E. M. (2000). *The Politics of Knowledge: A Poststructuralist Approach to Visual Arts Education in Tertiary Sites.* Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, the University of Auckland, Auckland.

Grierson, E. M. (2001) From Cemeteries to Cyberspace: Cartographies of identity in a technologised age. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural & Policy Studies, 20* (2), 11-20.

Grierson, E. M. (2003a). Framing the Arts in Education: What is really at stake? In *The Arts in Education: Critical Perspectives from Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 9 3-117). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Grierson, E. M. (2003b). Heeding Heidegger's Way: Questions of the work of art. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural & Policy Studies, 22* (1 & 2), 23-33.

Jackson, M. (2003). Abbau-Unbuilding. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural & Policy Studies, 22* (1 & 2), 47-54.

Jesson, J. (1995). The Post Primary Teachers Association and the State: From Militant Professionals to Bargaining Agent, A Study in Rational Opportunisim. Unpublished Doctor of philosophy Thesis, the University of Auckland, Auckland.

Lines, D. (2003). Difference and the Event. Paper presented at the Philosophy of Education Conference, November 2003, University of Auckland. Unpublished Paper.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A report on knowledge.* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. [French 1979).

Mane-Wheoki, J. (2003). Culturalisms and the Arcs Curriculum. In *The Arts in Education: Critical Perspectives from Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 81-91). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Mansfield, J. (2000). The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum from Policy to Practice. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, The University of Auckland.

Mansfield, J. E. (2003a). Beyond the 'Beauty Full' Classroom: The arts curriculum and teacher education in the postmodern context. In *The Arts in Education: Critical Perspectives from Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 63-79). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Mansfield, J. (2003b). Framing the Musical Subject: Technoculcure and curriculum. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural & Policy Studies, 22* (1 & 2), 55-65.

Ministry of Education (1993). *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework.* Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education (1995). *Technology in the New Zealand Curriculum.* Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education (1997). *Towards Teaching Technology: Know How 2.* Wellington: Learning Media.

New Zealand Qualifications Authority (2004). National Certificate of Educational Achievement, Available at URL: http://www.nzqa.govt.nz

Olssen, M. (2002). Terrorism, Globalisation and Democracy: On reading Michael Peters post-9/11. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural & Policy Studies, 21* (1), 75-90.

Olssen, M. and Morris Matthews, K. (Eds.). (1997). Introduction. In M. Olssen and K. Morris Matthews (Eds.), *Education Policy in New Zealand: The 1990s and beyond* (pp. 7-46). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

O'Neill, A. M. (1998). The Politics of Teacher Education in a Market-driven System: An Editorial Introduction. *Delta Policy and Practice in Education, 50* (2), 113-120.

O'Neill, J. (1998). ERO's 'Capable Teacher': A science of control. *Delta: Policy and Practice in Education, 50* (2), 201-221.

Openshaw, R. (1998). "Not expected to Lead": Some issues for the historical study of students and gender. *Delta: Policy and Practice in, Education, 50* (2), 121-134.

Peters, M. (2001). Curriculum in the Postmodern Condition. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Cultural & Policy Studies in Education, 20* (1), 10-23.

Peters, M. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, Postmodernity and the Reform of Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural & Policy Studies, 21* (1), 3-17.

Peters, M.A. (2003). Towards a Philosophy of Technology in Education: Mapping the field. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural & Policy Studies, 22* (1 & 2), 9-22.

Rathgen, E. (2000) Why Teacher Education Needs a Feminist Core. In A. Scott & J. Freeman-Moir (Eds.), *Tomorrow's Teachers: International and critical perspectives on teacher education* (pp. 200-216). Canterbury University Press in Association with Christchurch College of Education.

Robertson, S. (1999). Strip Away the Bark. Expose the Heartwood. Get to the Heart of the Matter: Re/regulating teachers' labour in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 43* (1), 121-132.

Snook, I. (1998). Teacher Education: Preparation for a learned profession. *Delta: Policy and Practice in Education, 50* (2), 135-148.

Tinning, R. (2000). Rethinking Teacher Education in and for 'NewTimes'. In Alan Scott &John Freeman-Moir (Eds.), *Tomorrow's Teachers: International and critical perspectives on teacher education* (pp. 156-175). Canterbury University Press in Association with Christchurch College of Education.

Thrupp, M. (1999). The Politics of Blame: How can teacher educators best respond? *Delta: Policy and Practice in Education, 50* (2), 163-186.

Wolmark, J. (1999). *Cybersexualities: A reader on feminist theory, cyborgs and cyberspace.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.