SUPERVISING REFLECTIVE TEACHER DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

Flávia Vieira and Isabel Marques

Introduction

The quality of teacher development practices has become a major concern in recent educational discourse, with a growing emphasis on a reflective approach suggesting that quality should be assessed with reference to teacher empowerment through reflection. Whether and to what extent practices meet this goal is, however, often unclear and left unassessed. This paper argues for the need to take an inquiry-oriented approach to teacher education, by supervising (planning, monitoring and evaluating) the quality of teacher development practices in a principled way. We propose an exploratory set of criteria for this purpose, developed in collaboration with a group of students within a post-graduate course on Pedagogical Supervision in EFL Teaching, where one of us (Flávia Vieira) was the teacher and the other (Isabel Marques) was one of the students, although we have also been working together as colleagues in the same department. Seven of the students were secondary school EFL teachers and three were teaching at our university; only five of us (including the present authors) had experience as supervisors of pre-service teachers in training. Some of the students had already been working with us in previous teacher development programmes, where a reflective approach was promoted in tandem with a pedagogy for autonomy in schools.

The criteria were conceptualised within a reflective perspective of teacher education and are grouped into six broad areas: *assumptions, goals, tasks, content, roles and discourse* (see grid in the Appendix). We start by clarifying some basic assumptions which underpin our conceptual framework, then we focus on the design and use of the criteria, and we finish by summarising what we consider to be their potential value and limitations.

Although the quality of teacher development practices cannot be defined in absolute terms, provisional definitions are worth pursuing as long as both teachers and teacher educators acknowledge their usefulness in the regulation of professional empowerment processes. They should serve both to provide a *direction* to practices and to establish a framework for the *assessment* of those practices.

<u>Reflection, teacher empowerment and school pedagogy: basic assumptions within reflective teacher education</u>

The increasing emphasis on a reflective approach in teacher education in many parts of the world implies that the quality of teacher development practices should be evaluated with reference to the criterial attributes that make it reflective. According to much of the literature in the field, teacher empowerment should be the main goal of professional reflection, but there is neither a consensus about its attributes, nor, at least in our country, a tradition of evaluation of teacher development programmes with reference to this goal.

Zeichner (1993: 19) remarks that reflection, like motherhood, is a concept no one is likely to oppose, but he argues that it can be elusive as a teacher development tool when it does not serve the interests of the school community and is used for the application of externally imposed innovations in the school context. Educational reforms often involve top-down approaches to educational change within which teachers are disempowered and treated as consumers of 'new' pedagogical approaches.

Kemmis (1999) presents five propositions about the critical, political nature of reflection that not only clarify what it entails but also indicate that reflective teacher education can be a far-reaching, complex approach, not easy to put into practice and probably even less easy to evaluate:

1. Reflection is not biologically or psychologically determined; nor is it 'pure thought'; reflection expresses an orientation towards action and is about the relation between thought and action in real historical situations.
2. Reflection is not the individualistic working of the mind as a kind of mechanism or speculation; it presupposes and shapes social relations.
3. Reflection is not value-free or neutral as regards values; it expresses and serves concrete human, social, cultural and political interests.
4. Reflection is not indifferent or passive towards social order, nor does it extend socially accepted values; it either reproduces actively or transforms the practical ideologies that support social order.
5. Reflection is not a mechanical process or a purely creative exercise to construct new ideas; it is a practice that expresses our power to reconstitute social life through participation in communication, decision making, and social action.

(Kemmis 1999: 105, our translation)

These propositions highlight the transformatory potential and empowering role of reflection, both at individual and social levels. Its practical, ethical and political

dimensions determine some basic assumptions of our view of reflective teacher education that could be summarised as follows:

1. Promoting critically reflective teachers is a value-laden goal, with direct implications for how one defines the direction of reflection, its aims and scope;

2. Critical reflection involves critical reason, critical self-reflection and critical action at different levels of criticality, from critical skills to transformatory critique (see Table 1, from Barnett 1997);

	Domains		
Levels of criticality	Knowledge	Self	World
4. Transformatory critique	Knowledge critique	Reconstruction of self	Critique-in-action (collective reconstruction of world)
3. Refashioning of traditions	Critical thought (malleable traditions of thought)	Development of self within traditions	Mutual understanding and development of traditions
2. Reflexivity	Critical thinking (reflection on one's understanding)	Self-reflection (reflection on one's own projects)	Reflective practice ('metacompetence', 'adaptability', 'flexibility')
1. Critical skills	Discipline-specific critical thinking skills	Self-monitoring to given standards and norms	Problem-solving (means-end instrumentalism)
Forms of criticality	Critical reason	Critical self-reflection	Critical action

Table 1: Levels, domains and forms of critical being (Barnett 1997: 103)

3. Critical reflection should facilitate teacher autonomy, especially through the mediation between pedagogical goals and situational constraints (Benson 2000), within a research-like approach to teaching, whereby educational contexts are questioned and scrutinised in order to be understood and changed;

4. Critical reflection must entail an understanding of the nature and goals of school education and of its role in social transformation.

If we accept assumptions 1–4 above, then we have to consider what implications they bear for teacher education practices and be able to evaluate those practices in order to understand the extent to which they promote reflection that has emancipatory power.

The emancipatory goal of reflective teacher education implies that the quality of teacher development must rely on the notion of *transformation*, here conceived as the goal and the process of education, involving enhancing and empowering the individual (Harvey and Knight 1996). The direction of this transformation will, however, have to be defined in relation to the intended direction of school pedagogy, and we think this is what teacher education often fails to make clear, by not assuming a compromise with a political view of teaching. What is the use of having teachers reflect upon pedagogy if the scope of reflection is only technical and does not touch upon moral and ethical issues? We strongly agree with Zeichner and Liston (1996) when they say that there are limits to educational action, including non-repression and non-discrimination, for example, and that we need to 'consider the degree to which the actions taken in relation to the reflection can be defended in terms of some notion of education in a democracy' (p. 49). What this means is that reflective practice is value-laden and ideological, and that reflection should not legitimate *any* kind of educational action. Smyth (1997) goes further in suggesting that 'teachers should be encouraged to become self-conscious social activists' who 'work in ways that challenge the taken-for-granted in their teaching and operate from the position that there may be other more just, inclusive and democratic ways of working that help to overcome various forms of classroom disadvantage' (p. 109).

In our approach to the supervision of teacher development practices, we assume that a reflective orientation has to go hand in hand with the defense of a view of school education as a space for individual and social transformation, and that talking about teacher autonomy will not make much sense without a conception of teaching that accomodates the development of *learner* autonomy. Together with other colleagues, this is an idea we have been pursuing in teacher development programmes (both pre-service and in-service) for a long time. The results from projects undertaken with foreign language teachers have shown that a reflective approach to teacher education/ teaching can be promoted in tandem with a pedagogy for autonomy with benefits for teachers and students alike (see, for example, Moreira, Vieira and Marques 1999; Vieira 1999a, 1999b, 2000a, 2000b; Marques 2000).

As our previous work has shown, when learner autonomy becomes the object and goal of reflective teaching, professional reflection is empowering in some important ways: it entails a continuous mediation between pedagogical goals and

situational constraints, thus promoting not only teachers' awareness of how their action is historically determined, but also their sense of agency in transforming the conditions of teaching and learning; furthermore, it requires teachers to inquire into the implications of their theories and action upon learners, thus validating pedagogy on the basis of negotiation, something that fosters powerful, context-sensitive justifications for pedagogical options, and a strong sense of direction.

If transformation is regarded as the goal and the process of teacher education *and* of school education, then teacher autonomy and learner autonomy can be seen as two sides of the same coin, the development of the former leading to the development of the latter, and vice versa. Only then, in our view, can education become a space for personal and social reconstruction.

Supervising teacher development practices

Devising the criteria: the process

As indicated above, the criteria for supervision of teacher development practices (see Appendix) were devised collaboratively within a class of ten students in a post-graduate course on Pedagogical Supervision in EFL Teaching. The course is part of a two-year master's degree programme and took up 60 hours during the second semester of 1999/2000. The programme aims at developing teachers' expertise in the field of supervision/teacher education, so it is basically a trainer development programme.

The class had already taken two other courses in the first semester of the programme – Pedagogical Supervision and ELT Methodology –, where the themes of 'reflective teaching', 'reflective teacher education' and 'pedagogy for autonomy' had been extensively discussed. So, when we started thinking about criteria for the supervision of reflective teacher development practices, everyone was familiar with assumptions and principles of a reflective approach and its possible articulation with learner-centred pedagogy.

The main justification for our task was that it was consistent with the aims and content of the course. Accepting that teacher development practices should promote teacher and learner autonomy, we agreed to develop a set of criteria which could help teacher educators (and also teachers and student-teachers) to regulate the emancipatory potential of those practices. However, when this task was first proposed

to the class, there was no pre-defined plan for all the steps to be taken, and nobody (including the teacher) had a clear idea of where it would carry us. Now we can say that it carried us much further than we expected initially.

During a long, collaborative step-by-step process, where each stage seemed to lead more or less 'naturally' to the next, the criteria were experimented with, revised and elaborated. Most of the work involved was carried out in class, alongside other activities that had to do with other topics of our syllabus. Some work was carried out by the students in individual or group assignments, under the supervision of the teacher. The process can be retrospectively summarised as follows:

1. Recalling a 'bad' teacher development experience and pointing out its negative attributes;
2. Identifying criterial attributes of 'good' teacher development practices as opposed to the negative attributes found in 1. above;
3. Designing the first version of the grid, including some areas and quality criteria on the basis of 2 above:
    (1) *Tasks*: Transparency, Theory-Practice integration, Consistency;
    (2) *Content*: Relevance, Information, Progression;
    (3) *Roles*: Reflectivity, (Inter-)subjectivity, Negotiation;
    (4) *Discourse*: Communication;
    (5) *Context*: Atmosphere, Organisation;
4. Using the first version of the grid to analyse two units from a teacher development resource book (Spratt 1994), focussing on 'teacher development' and 'learner development';
5. Activating prior knowledge of reflective teaching and autonomous learning by re-examining the units on the basis of questions about the presence/absence of assumptions and aims of reflective teacher education and a pedagogy for autonomy;
6. Revising the grid: including sets of Assumptions and Goals to 'frame' the analysis of the other criteria; discussing the first version of explanatory notes to accompany the grid;
7. Refining the grid by using it in planning and/or monitoring and/or evaluating a variety of teacher development practices:

- Comparing two units from two resource books (Lubelska and Matthews 1997, Wajnryb 1992), focussing on 'control and power relationships' in the foreign language classroom;

- Planning a teacher development proposal about lesson observation for student teachers;

- Planning and evaluating two sessions for teachers in local schools;

- Planning, monitoring and evaluating an action research project carried out with a group of student-teachers;

- Monitoring our own sessions on a regular basis by using at least two of the criteria to evaluate each session as a post-session written activity;

- Evaluating our course and all the other courses within the post-graduate programme at the end of the year.

8. Discussing the final version of the grid (as presented in the Appendix) and the explanatory notes.

This process involved a lot of discussion, reading, practical experimentation and theorising. The teacher's role was to suggest and co-ordinate the tasks, participate in most of them, provide counselling and feedback when necessary, summarise class work, promote conceptual consistency and terminological precision, and do most of the computer inputting involved. It was too rich a process to be described in words, although we used a lot of words to carry it through and to talk to one another about its role in our professional development. A growing sense of individual and collective commitment, direction and accomplishment was perhaps one of its most important outcomes.

The criteria

The criteria presented in the Appendix are grouped into six broad areas – *Assumptions, Goals, Tasks, Content, Roles* and *Discourse* – which were considered essential for critical regulation of teacher development practices within a variety of contexts: pre-/in-service or post-graduate; supervised by others, collaborative or self-directed; occasional (eg. a session) or extended (eg. a course). The criteria can also be used to analyse published materials for teacher development and to plan teacher development programmes.

Quoting from the explanatory notes that were part of the final document produced during the course (see italicized quotations below), we will now briefly clarify the criteria. It is important to note that Assumptions and Goals act as a *frame* for the analysis of the other four areas and corresponding criteria. For example, tasks can be highly transparent or consistent, yet highly controlled and therefore not emancipatory, so when transparency or consistency are analysed this should be done bearing in mind the assumptions and goals of reflective teacher education. In a sense, the application of the proposed criteria makes greater sense if the stated assumptions and goals are accepted as valid within the analysed practices, so the main purpose of their supervision would be to assess the extent to which those assumptions and goals are accomplished by looking at the other areas: tasks, content, roles and discourse (a scale could be used to identify degrees of presence of the criteria). If the suggested assumptions and goals are completely absent from a given practice, then we can conclude that the approach is not reflective or emancipatory in nature. All the criteria are, to some extent, interdependent so that the presence or absence of one usually affects others.

Assumptions: All teacher development practices are explicitly or implicitly based upon assumptions about the nature of teacher education and school pedagogy. Analysing practices requires inquiry into those assumptions:

> *To what extent do teacher development practices build on the assumptions of a reflective approach (as developed by authors such as Donald Schön, Kenneth Zeichner and John Smyth, among others)? These assumptions can be summarised as follows: teacher education is a process of personal and social transformation; practice generates theory; a good teacher is a reflective practitioner; an autonomous teacher develops autonomous learners.*

Goals: An understanding of teacher development practices implies the analysis of its direction. Reflective teacher education aims primarily at the empowerment of (student) teachers towards the promotion of a pedagogy for autonomy:

> *To what extent do teacher development practices promote an empowering transformation of (student) teachers in tandem with a pedagogy for autonomy? Basic knowledge, abilities and attitudes involved in this goal are: content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, 'artistry' (cf. Schön 1987), ability to act, ability to self-regulate, ability to communicate and*

negotiate, and a critical stance towards institutional and sociocultural contexts.

Tasks: The nature of teacher development tasks greatly determines the quality of teacher education. Transparency, integration of theory and practice, consistency and organization are seen as essential characteristics of tasks, to be analysed in relation to assumptions and goals:

Transparency:

To what extent are teacher development tasks (made) explicit as regards their assumptions and aims, steps and demands, potential value and limitations, and evaluation? Task transparency improves awareness and enhances a critical attitude towards practices; it can be promoted directly by the teacher educator/the task instructions (external explicitness), or achieved by (student) teachers' reflection on tasks (participatory explicitness).

Theory–practice integration:

To what extent do the teacher development tasks focus on the integration of private and public theories and practices? Integration implies the activation of (student) teachers' experiential knowledge and/or practical experimentation. Although both kinds of integration promote processes of awareness and theorisation, only the second can involve the development of proactive reflective/research cycles. Experimentation may be indirect or direct. Indirect experimentation involves tasks other than teaching, aiming at preparing for teaching (e.g., communication development tasks, analysis of literary texts, analysis and production of teaching materials, observation of video-taped lessons, etc.); direct experimentation is school-based and refers to all the tasks involved in real teaching (planning, developing, monitoring and evaluating pedagogical action). Both indirect and direct experimentation should foster a pedagogy for autonomy.

Consistency:

To what extent do teacher development tasks reveal congruence between aims and processes, as well as between their different steps? Internal consistency increases task meaningfulness, intentionality and impact. Lack of consistency affects course credibility and (student) teacher commitment.

Organization:

To what extent is the management of resources, space and time adequate to the assumptions, goals, content and roles of teacher development practices? Organizational matters depend on the teacher development

approach, and their analysis only makes sense with reference to that approach.

Content: The analysis of the content of teacher development practices highlights the arena of professional reflection and action; knowledge, abilities and attitudes listed under 'Goals' above constitute main content areas, but it is important to assess their relevance and progression:

Relevance:

To what extent is the content of teacher development programme(s) relevant considering: (student) teachers' previous knowledge, expectations, interests and needs (meaningfulness); past/recent developments within the area of study (information); contribution to challenging established assumptions and practices towards the development of a pedagogy for autonomy (innovation)? The articulation of these aspects will potentially increase the impact of teacher development upon school pedagogy.

Progression:

To what extent does the content of teacher development practices promote the elaboration of (student) teachers' theories and practices? Does it facilitate uncovering, analysing and restructuring their 'practical theory' (as Handal and Lauvas 1987 define it – a set of practical, conceptual and ethical assumptions that support and determine their action), as well as changing their practice?

Roles: The roles (student) teachers assume vary according to the assumptions and goals that orient development practices. The asymmetry between teacher educators and (student) teachers ought not to reduce the latter to passive consumers of educational knowledge; the authoritative power of teacher educators should confer on them the responsibility to help teachers become critical consumers and creative producers of pedagogical knowledge and action. Reflectivity, (inter)subjectivity, negotiation and regulation are important qualities of roles in a reflection-oriented approach:

Reflectivity:

What kind of reflection do teacher development practices promote? What view of school pedagogy do they encourage? Reflection should be the basis for the definition of the teachers' role, and the emancipatory potential of reflection varies according to forms and levels of criticality (see Table 1

above). At a technical level, reflection aims mainly at the achievement of short-term objectives, in order to improve performance (What do I do? How can I improve my action?); at a practical level, reflection is centred on the analysis of assumptions, predispositions, values and results of teachers' practice (How do I explain my action? What are the implications of my action upon others?); at a critical or emancipatory level, reflection includes the ethical, social and political dimensions of teachers' practices (how does my action relate to the context in which it is developed? what constraints are there on my freedom and the efficacy of what I do and how can I deal with/change them?). This level includes reflection on teacher education processes (metacognition), from an inquiry-oriented perspective. All three levels of reflection are important in promoting the development of a pedagogy for autonomy.

(Inter)subjectivity:

To what extent do teacher development practices integrate the (student) teacher's self in interaction with others? The construction of professional knowledge is both a personal and social process which involves description, interpretation, confrontation and reconstruction of educational practice (Smyth 1989). This means that roles are (re)defined through meaningful interaction that fosters both individual and collective commitment.

Negotiation:

To what extent do teacher development practices create opportunities for negotiation? The emancipatory goal of teacher education implies the involvement of (student) teachers in the collaborative construction of meanings (and discourses) as well as decisions, which means that they determine their own learning, at least to some extent. Negotiation can involve various degrees of (student) teacher autonomy, but it always requires that teacher education curricula are conceived as praxis, not as pre-defined products to be consumed.

Regulation:

To what extent do teacher development practices enable the individual and collaborative regulation of development processes? The promotion of (student) teachers' autonomy requires their critical participation in the supervision of their own learning and of the learning contexts.

Discourse: Reflective teacher education assumptions and goals have implications for the discourse of (student) teachers and teacher educators, especially for the quality of communication, which has a strong influence on the quality of development processes, particularly in terms of relevance and degree of democracy:

> Communication:
>
> *To what extent do teacher development practices integrate focussed, contingent and expressive communication (verbal and non-verbal, oral or written, interactive or not)? Focus is related to the articulation between teacher education content and discourse content, involving questions of direction, clarity and rigour of ideas and concepts, terminology, explanation and illustration procedures, argumentation, etc. Contingency in interactive discourse relates to the degree of interdependence between utterances, that is, to the role each interlocutor plays in the construction of the interaction, which depends on power relationships between interlocutors and the degree of discursive (a)symmetry (van Lier 1996); highly contingent discourse is conversational and implies the presence of other criteria such as theory-practice integration, relevance, reflectivity, (inter)subjectivity and negotiation. Finally, expressiveness results from the creative use of verbal and non-verbal language, including gesture, prosody, image, metaphor, etc.*

Some problematic criteria

One of the main conclusions of our work was that the use of the criteria highlights the complexity of teacher development practices and helps clarify both their benefits and limitations. We will now focus on some of the criteria which we believe to be particularly problematic and largely absent from current practices. In doing so, we will see how the criteria relate to one another so that the absence or presence of one usually implies the absence or presence of others.

Let us start from assumption 1.4 – *An autonomous teacher develops autonomous learners* – which reflects our view that the defence of reflective teaching should imply the defence of a pedagogy for autonomy in schools. There has been, in the literature on FL learning, a growing awareness of the fact that learner autonomy and teacher autonomy are interdependent (see, for example, Sinclair, McGrath and Lamb 2000), and that teacher autonomy varies according to the degree of willingness and ability to mediate between constraints and pedagogical goals. In turn this puts a high value on goals 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7: developing *abilities to self-regulate, communicate and negotiate*, and also *a critical stance towards institutional and*

sociocultural contexts. These goals point to the importance of self-determination and social responsibility, but also of inquiry and resistance as basic components of teaching towards the autonomisation of learners. As Lamb puts it (2000: 127), 'as with learners, teachers need to understand the constraints on their practice but, rather than feeling disempowered, they need to empower themselves by finding the spaces and opportunities for manoeuvre'. This often implies scrutinising contexts and challenging established values, rules and power relationships, something that teacher education very seldom takes as a priority. Making it a priority implies a strong presence of criterion 3.2 – *integration of theory and practice* – especially through the creation of opportunities for pedagogical *experimentation through action research* whereby teachers uncover and elaborate their practical theories in trying to improve teaching that promotes learner autonomy. This will obviously enhance criterion 3.3 – *consistency* – as well as criteria 5.1 and 5.4 – *reflectivity* and *regulation* – at the level of roles. If teacher development practices lack a component of pedagogical experimentation, which is often the case, the relationship between teacher education and school pedagogy is weakened. Criteria 4.1 and 4.2 within the area of content – *relevance*, especially in relation to *innovation* (4.1.3), and *progression*, here defined as the elaboration of personal theories and practices – are also impoverished by the same lack of pedagogical experimentation. Although indirect forms of experimentation can play an important role, reflection in/on action is the most crucial element of reflective teacher development, so when it is absent many other quality criteria will be affected.

There may be many reasons why some quality criteria are particularly difficult to meet in certain contexts, from local situational constraints to teacher education policies that favour low time-consuming, low-cost, top-down approaches. This is not to say that quality criteria are useless in some contexts or that quality standards have to be lowered. One of the roles of supervision is to highlight the limitations of teacher development practices as regards teacher empowerment, this being a crucial step if teacher educators are to have a grasp of the real implications of their action and possibly challenge the conditions that limit their own autonomy as agents of educational transformation.

Potential value (and limitations?) of the criteria

We will now point out what we believe to be the most positive features of the proposed supervisory tool with reference to the conditions under which it was produced.

It is *theory-based*, for it integrates values, concepts and principles of a reflective approach to teacher education in articulation with school pedagogy that promotes learner autonomy; its development was based on a shared view of the theoretical framework underpinning the assumed direction for teacher education and school practices.

It is *experience-based*, since it resulted from reflective action in a variety of activities that focussed on the regulation and conceptualisation of practices.

Its *scope* is wide enough to accommodate a large variety of contexts and purposes: it can be used for planning, monitoring and evaluating practices within pre-service and in-service contexts, and for the analysis of a whole programme and/or parts of it, with a focus both on process components and on final outcomes. We have ourselves used it extensively and selectively, and it proved to allow for discrimination and comparison of practices on the basis of the criteria involved.

It assumes a *participatory* approach to the definition and use of quality criteria within teacher development contexts; quality criteria were negotiated among participants and used as self-/co-regulation guidelines.

It is *exploratory* in the sense that it has always been open for change; the version here presented is only the best one achieved in the circumstances under which it was produced; other circumstances might lead to different outcomes.

It is *inquiry-oriented*, thus promoting a critical stance towards teacher education processes and outcomes, and an empowerment of its users. The requirement that *Assumptions* and *Goals* should underlie the other four areas made the supervision of practices principled and demanding, preventing a technical approach to the issue of quality. The grid increased our understanding of the complexity of practices and of the factors that affect its quality, thus facilitating the identification of degrees of teacher empowerment.

It is *action-oriented*, aiming at transforming both teacher education and pedagogical practices; in fact, most criteria listed under *Tasks*, *Content*, *Roles* and

Discourse apply equally in pedagogical contexts, since the empowering goal of both educational contexts calls for homology of principles.

Paradoxically, some of the features above can also be viewed as limitations of our proposal, especially because it will be impossible for other people to replicate the conditions under which it was designed. Whatever others do with these criteria from now on will inevitably lack the *process* of defining the criteria as they are. Just to give one example, supposing the same criteria were now used in a programme with other teachers (for example, to analyse teacher development materials), would those teachers understand, accept and use the criteria in the way we do, given the fact that they would be presented to them as a *product*? We ourselves feel this limitation whenever we try to use the criteria with others, since those others did not experience what we did for long hours of discussion and experimentation during the course. As a product, then, the criteria will always have meanings that are different from the original, and we hope that this is taken as a challenge for others to build on and reconstruct our proposal, rather than a constraint on their freedom to conceptualise quality in teacher education.

Concluding remarks

If we accept that teacher education should aim at transformation that is empowering for both teachers and learners, then teacher educators should supervise the quality of their own practices in order to understand and improve them. Although the quality of teacher education cannot be defined in unique or absolute terms, provisional definitions are worth pursuing so long as both teachers and teacher educators acknowledge their potential for professional empowerment. The definition of quality as transformation seems promising, for it values critical reflection and action as conditions for personal and social change. The criteria we suggest are provisional. They were 'produced by their users' as part of a collaborative development process where everyone believed in the work being done and acknowledged its contextual appropriacy. Readers or potential users may find the criteria unsuitable in their own working contexts, irrelevant given their own professional theories and experience, too theory-driven to be accepted by a large number of people, or even too narrow-minded given the complexity of teacher development. As we remarked above, we hope they

see our proposal as a starting point for discussion and further inquiry into the quality

of teacher education.

References

Barnett, R. 1997. *Higher education: a critical business*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Benson, P. 2000. 'Autonomy as a learners' and teachers' right' in B. Sinclair, I. McGrath and T. Lamb (eds.).

Handal, G. and **Lauvas, P.** 1987. *Promoting Reflective Teaching: Supervision in Action*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Harvey, L. and **Knight, P.** 1996. *Transforming Higher Education.* Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Kemmis, S. 1999. 'La investigación-acción y la política de la reflexión' in A. Pérez Gomez, J. Barquín Ruiz and J. F. Angulo Rasco (eds.) *Desarrollo profesional del docente – política, investigación y práctica*. Madrid: Ediciones Akal.

Lamb, T. 2000. 'Finding a voice: learner autonomy and teacher education in an urban context' in B. Sinclair, I. McGrath and T. Lamb (eds.).

Lubelska, D. and **Matthews, M.** 1997. *Looking at Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marques, I. 2000. 'From teacher autonomy to learner autonomy: an action research project' in R. Ribé (ed.).

Moreira, M. A., Vieira, F. and **Marques, I.** 1999. 'Pre-service teacher development through action research'. *The Language Teacher* 23/12: 15–18.

Ribé, R. (ed.). *Developing Learner Autonomy in Foreign Language Learning*. Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona.

Sinclair, B., McGrath, I. and **Lamb, T.** (eds.) 2000. *Learner Autonomy, Teacher Autonomy: Future Directions*. London: Longman.

Schön, D. 1987. *Educating the Reflective Practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smyth, J. 1989. 'Developing and sustaining critical reflection in teacher education'. *Journal of Teacher Education* 40/2: 2–9.

Smyth, J. 1997. 'Teaching and social policy: images of teaching for democratic change' in B. Biddle, T. Good and I. Goodson (eds.) *International Handbook of Teachers and Teaching*, vol. 2. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Spratt, M. 1994. *English for the Teacher. A Language Development Course.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Lier. L. 1996. *Interaction in the Language Curriculum: Awareness, Autonomy and Authenticity.* London: Longman.

Vieira, F. 1999a. 'Pedagogy and autonomy: can they meet?'. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* (Universidade de La Laguna) 38: 13–35.

Vieira, F. 1999b. 'Pedagogy for autonomy: teacher development and pedagogical experimentation' in S. Cotterall and D. Crabbe (eds.). *Learner Autonomy in Language Learning: Defining the Field and Effecting Change*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Vieira, F. 2000a. 'Teacher development towards a pedagogy for autonomy in the foreign language classroom' in R. Ribé (ed.).

Vieira, F. 2000b. 'The role of instructional supervision in the development of language

pedagogy'. *Mélanges Pédagogiques* (CRAPEL, Nancy) 25: 31–40.

Zeichner, K. 1993. *A formação reflexiva de professores – ideias e práticas.* Lisbon: Colecção Educa-Professores.

Zeichner, K. and **Liston, D.** 1996. *Reflective Teaching: An Introduction.* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zeichner, K. and **Tabachnick, R.** 1991. 'Reflections on reflective teaching' in R. Tabachnick and K. Zeichner (eds.). *Issues and Practices in Inquiry-oriented Teacher Education.* London: The Falmer Press.

Wajnryb, R. 1992. *Classroom Observation Tasks. A Resource Book for Language Teachers and Trainers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<u>Appendix</u>

Supervising Teacher Development Practices: Areas and Criteria

MA course in Education – Pedagogical Supervision in ELT – Flávia Vieira – 1999/2000, University of Minho, Portugal. Instrument designed in collaboration with MA students: Madalena Paiva, Isabel Marques, Isabel Sandra Fernandes, Júlia Amaro, Isabel Maia, Carla Soares, Susana Pereira, Leonor Remísio, Manuel Sousa, Helga Oliveira.

1. Assumptions

1.1 Teacher education is a process of personal and social transformation
1.2 Practice generates theory
1.3 A good teacher is a reflective practitioner
1.4 An autonomous teacher develops autonomous learners

2. Goals

*Professional empowerme*nt through the development of:

2.1 Content knowledge
2.2 Pedagogical knowledge
2.3 'Artistry'
2.4 Ability to act
2.5 Ability to self-regulate
2.6 Ability to communicate and negotiate
2.7 Critical stance towards contexts

3. Tasks (with reference to 1. & 2. above)

3.1 Transparency	3.1.1 external explicitness
	3.1.2 participatory explicitness
3.2 Theory-practice integration	3.2.1 activation of experiential knowledge
	3.2.2 experimentation (action / research)
3.3 Consistency	3.3.1 ends–means articulation
3.4 Organization	3.4.1 adequacy of resources
	3.4.2 adequacy of space
	3.4.3 adequacy of time

4. Content (with reference to 1. & 2. above)

4.1 Relevance	4.1.1 meaningfulness (expectations, interests, needs)
	4.1.2 information (novelty)
	4.1.3 innovation (inquiry, challenge to change)
4.2 Progression	4.2.1 elaboration (theories and practices)

5. Roles (with reference to 1. & 2. above)

5.1 Reflectivity	5.1.1 technical reflection
	5.1.2 practical reflection
	5.1.3 emancipatory reflection
5.2 (Inter)subjectivity	5.2.1 personalization (my theories and practices)
	5.2.2 confrontation (me vs. others)
	5.2.3 commitment
5.3 Negotiation	5.3.1 negotiation of meanings
	5.3.2 negotiation of decisions
5.4 Regulation	5.4.1 self-regulation
	5.4.2 co-regulation

6. Discourse (with reference to 1. & 2. above)

6.1 Communication	6.1.1 focus (direction, clarity, rigour)
	6.1.2 contingency (co-construction of meanings)
	6.1.3 expressiveness (verbal and non-verbal)