This edited volume, based on papers presented at the World Congress of Comparative Education (Istanbul, 2010), presents research examining pre-service teacher education, in-service teacher development, and the politics of teachers’ work in a variety of geographical regions, including Asia, Africa, Eurasia, Europe, Latin America, and North America. More specifically, the chapters examine the situations, activities, and education of teachers in the societal contexts of Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, France, Germany, Ghana, Hong Kong, Ireland, Lithuania, The Netherlands, Scotland, Spain, Turkey, and the United States. The authors address a variety of important questions related to a group of employees who are key actors in determining the quality of education: How can pre-service teacher education best be organized for different purposes in various settings? What kinds of activities should be organized and who should be involved in in-service professional development to promote teacher capacity and commitment to perform their roles in classrooms and communities? What kinds of incentives can motivate teachers’ engagement with various aspects of their work? How do certain educational policies and reforms promote the professionalization or the deprofessionalization and proletarianization of teaching? What are the opportunities and constraints for teachers as they seek to operate within the micro-politics of schools and the macro-politics of society? The book thus contributes to refining our understanding of the critical theoretical issues in the field of comparative and international education as well as calling attention to dynamics that should be considered in developing and implementing as well as critiquing and resisting educational policies in varying contexts.
Preparation, Practice, and Politics of Teachers
The WCCES is an international organization of comparative education societies worldwide and is an NGO in consultative partnership with UNESCO. The WCCES was created in 1970 to advance the field of comparative education. Members usually meet every three years for a World Congress in which scholars, researchers, and administrators interact with colleagues and counterparts from around the globe on international issues of education.

The WCCES also promotes research in various countries. Foci include theory and methods in comparative education, gender discourses in education, teacher education, education for peace and justice, education in post-conflict countries, language of instruction issues, Education for All. Such topics are usually represented in thematic groups organized for the World Congresses.

Besides organizing the World Congresses, the WCCES has a section in CERCular, the newsletter of the Comparative Education Research Centre at the University of Hong Kong, to keep individual societies and their members abreast of activities around the world. The WCCES comprehensive web site is http://www.wcces.com.

As a result of these efforts under the auspices of the global organization, WCCES and its member societies have become better organized and identified in terms of research and other scholarly activities. They are also more effective in viewing problems and applying skills from different perspectives, and in disseminating information. A major objective is advancement of education for international understanding in the interests of peace, intercultural cooperation, observance of human rights and mutual respect among peoples.
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MULTILOGUE ON THE PREPARATION, PRACTICE AND POLITICS OF TEACHERS

INTRODUCTION

Teachers are key actors in the field of education. It is not surprising, therefore, that educational reformers identify the teachers’ preparation and practice as major reasons for the poor quality of education and as core elements of initiatives to improve educational quality (e.g., see Craig et al., 1998; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Good et al., 2009; Griffin, 2012; Karras & Wollhuter, 2011; UNESCO, 2006). Interestingly, however, teachers are not always included in discussions about the problems and solutions (see Ginsburg, 2012b; Villegas-Reimers and Reimers, 1996). Indeed, some have sought to limit organized teachers’ involvement in the policy arena, arguing that such involvement has led to “provider capture,” that is, teachers controlling the education system to serve their “narrow” occupational interests (Barrington, 1991). While the latter argument is debatable, it draws appropriate attention to the political dimension of teacher preparation (Ginsburg and Lindsay, 1995) as well as teachers’ work and lives (Ginsburg, 1995).

In this chapter we introduce the other contributions in this book by exploring issues which have been the focus of our multilogue – or conversation – over the past several months. This multilogue was stimulated by theoretical and empirical research literature in three areas: 1) teacher education, 2) teachers as professional employees; and 3) teachers as political actors. Thus, here we discuss the book’s other chapters as they connect with and contribute to these areas.

Prior to engaging in this substantive discussion we describe the origins of this book, the strategies used to solicit and select chapters, and the nature of collaboration in writing this introductory chapter. We hope that this information will help teachers, teacher educators, policy makers, and others in the field of comparative and international education to better understand and appreciate how this edited volume informs theory, research, policy, as well as individual and collective action in relation to the preparation, practice, and politics of teachers.

© 2012 Sense Publishers. All rights reserved.
Origins and Strategies for Developing this Volume

In May 2011 during the Comparative and International Education Society conference in Montreal Allan Pitman, Suzanne Majhanovich, and Mark Ginsburg discussed the possibility of developing an edited volume focused on teachers and teacher education based on papers which had been presented at the most recent World Congress of Comparative Education. Although almost a year had passed since the World Congress had been held in Istanbul (June 2010), Ginsburg agreed to pursue this book project and take the lead as editor.1

Based on a review of the World Congress program, Ginsburg selected 48 manuscripts which appeared to be relevant to the theme. He then contacted the authors to invite them to submit their manuscripts for consideration for inclusion in the edited volume. After carefully reviewing the 25 submitted papers, some of which were revised and resubmitted, to assess their relevance and potential, he selected and sent out for blind review eight manuscripts.2 The authors of these manuscripts were sent track changes and feedback from reviewers and the editor, and undertook two or three rounds of revisions to refine their contributions. Based on the reviewers’ feedback and his own re-readings of the manuscripts, Ginsburg eventually selected seven of them for inclusion as chapters in the book.

The processes for developing Chapters 1 and 4 were somewhat different. This introductory chapter grows out of a series of informal conversations at Teachers College, Columbia University (New York, USA), on the topic of the politics of teachers and teacher education which began in the fall of 2011, just as the final round of feedback on other chapters was being provided. Although our multilogue focused initially on published works, we decided to organize our discussions around how the draft chapters connected to the literature participants – individually and collectively – had been reading. We present key points that emanated from our conversations in the remainder of this chapter. In addition, the authors of this introductory chapter served as reviewers of the draft manuscript of Chapter 4 in this volume. This manuscript is based on a paper which Ginsburg and his co-authors originally planned to present at the World Congress of education in Istanbul, but were unable to do so because of work-related scheduling conflicts.

Chapters 2 through 9 report on research examining pre-service teacher education, in-service teacher development, and teachers’ work in a variety of geographical regions, including Asia, Africa, Eurasia, Europe, Latin America, and North America. More specifically, the chapters examine the situations, activities, and education of teachers in the societal contexts of Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, France, Germany, Ghana, Hong Kong, Ireland, Lithuania, The Netherlands, Scotland, Spain, Turkey, and the United States. Moreover, the authors of the various chapters draw on a range theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches. As noted above, here we discuss the connections we see between the various chapters and key issues addressed in the extant literature focused on teacher education, teachers as professional employees, and teachers as political actors.
Teacher education consists of the life-long processes through which individuals acquire, broaden, and deepen their knowledge, skills, and commitments related to performing their work roles as teachers (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 2001; Schwille and Dembélé, 2007; Villegas-Reimers, 2003). In addition to formal pre-service and in-service programs, teacher education occurs during more informal experiences, such as individuals’ observations of school teachers before they enter a pre-service preparation program (Lortie, 1975) as well as their interactions with colleagues and students after they are employed as teachers (Lacey, 1977). What teachers learn from any given formal or informal experience – whether content knowledge, pedagogical skills, or strategies for being involved with/in communities – can reinforce, complement, or contradict what they learn from other experiences (Feiman-Nemser, 2008; Ginsburg, 1988). Moreover, teachers are constrained and enabled to put into practice their knowledge and skills by policies and material conditions as well as other aspects of the institutional and broader cultural, economic, and political contexts in which they work and live (Anderson-Levitt, 2002; Ginsburg, 2012a; Ginsburg and Lindsay, 1995; Leu and Ginsburg, 2011).

Considerable attention has been given to whether and how teachers develop the commitment and capacity to implement what are labeled student-centered or active-learning pedagogies (du Plessis and Musaffar, 2010; Ginsburg and Megahed, 2008; Vavrus, 2009; Vavrus et al., 2011). Evidence from this line of research conducted in a variety of societies indicates that a) teachers are more likely to change their orientations or commitments than their actual classroom practices; b) changes in attitudes and/or behaviors are more likely to occur when they engage in formal and informal professional development activities – including action research – with colleagues in their own school than if they only attend workshops or other activities that are not directly informed by or focused on their immediate work context; c) teachers are more likely to shift their teaching practices if the school administrators and supervisors are knowledgeable about and encourage such reform pedagogies; and d) teachers are more likely to implement the reform pedagogies when their working conditions – e.g., number of students and availability of instructional materials – are conducive (Anneli, 1998; Barrow et al., 2007; Dahlstrom et al., 1999; Ginsburg, 2010; Kunje, 1999; Megahed et al., 2012; Vavrus and Bartlett, 2012).

Various chapters in this volume contribute further evidence related to these issues. For example, Irene Psifidou in her study of policy and practice in vocational education programs in the field of logistics in France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Spain, and the UK-Scotland notes that “written curricula and other official documents …[promote] changing teaching and learning methods … [toward] more active-learning, learner-centered approaches” (see Chapter 7). However, she reports that such pedagogical approaches were not being fully implemented, at least in two of the countries in which case studies were undertaken. In the two institutions studied in more depth she found that three-fourths of the students in Germany
and more than one-half of the students in the Netherlands stated that they “often” only sit and listen while the teacher talks. Many instructors in these institutions indicated that learner-centered teaching methods are not really feasible in their situations, because of inadequate training, insufficient administrative support, large class sizes, and personal doubts about the effectiveness of using this pedagogical approach.

In their study of teacher education program students at the Jaume I University in Spain, Joan Andrés Traver Martí and her colleagues also focus on attitudes toward innovation in teaching (see Chapter 2). They found that students became somewhat more positive in their attitudes, but such changes occurred only during the first semester of the program and were only significant for two of their nine aspects of innovation: a) leadership and b) teacher profile as an educator and mediator. Thus, despite the fact that “the program implements innovative methodology … mov[ing] from a transmission-oriented, teacher-centered approach to one based on constructive theories with a social orientation focused on the students’ … interaction with peers and research processes,” their findings showed that students in the program did not develop more positive attitudes to pedagogical aspects of innovation, such as: c) methodological change and improvement, d) knowing how to teach, and e) educational ideology. Moreover, while the authors stress that upon entering the program students had relatively positive attitudes toward the various aspects of innovation, they also acknowledge that positive attitudes do not always translate into innovative actions.

A similar conclusion is reached by Mark Ginsburg and his colleagues, based on their study of primary teachers participating in various professional development activities in Equatorial Guinea (see Chapter 4). They report that most participants expressed enthusiasm about active-learning pedagogies, which were being promoted by a project jointly funded by a transnational oil company and the national government and being implemented by a US-based international nongovernmental organization. However, they were less likely to exhibit substantial movement toward implementing these practices in their classrooms. For instance, the chapter coauthors indicate that participation in both the more limited forms (workshops and materials) and the more site-based and intensive forms of professional development activities (including in-school, peer or administrative supervisory guidance and support in addition to attending lectures/workshops and receiving instructional materials) did lead to teachers’ increased use of group work. This suggests that it is possible to implement this form of active-learning pedagogy, despite large numbers of students and even in circumstances with limited peer and administrative guidance and support. Nevertheless, teachers did not increase their use of the more demanding types of active-learning pedagogy (e.g., teacher-student and student-student communication during lessons) regardless of the form of professional development activities in which they participated.

Focusing on pre-service and in-service professional development opportunities, Ashley Snell Goldstein argues that in Cuba the relationships that pre-service teachers
establish with a mentor teacher during their practicum continues to be a source of influence and support throughout their careers (see Chapter 3). She also reports that in-service teachers benefited from their discussions, mutual observations, and joint research with their school-based peers (members of the *collectivos pedagógicos*) as well as from the regular observation and feedback provided by school administrators. Snell calls attention to what might be a contradiction, that in-service professional development is both a right and an obligation, provided free – but also required – by the Cuban state. In her portrayal of teacher professional development in the *United States*, Snell mentions the growing popularity of action research as part of pre-service and in-service programs and the growth of induction/mentoring programs for novice teachers. Nevertheless, she suggests that non-school-based workshops and conferences – for which individual teachers often have to pay and in which participation is voluntary, at least for some teachers – tend to be the dominant forms of *in-service* provision in the U.S.

Further evidence of the perceived value of school-based learning activities with peers is provided by Elena Jursaite-Harbinson (see Chapter 5). She indicates that in two relatively different societal contexts, *Lithuania* and the *United States*, teachers perceived their on-the-job informal learning (i.e., communities of practice) as the greatest source of professional development. They discounted the relevance and utility of their pre-service program experiences as well as the more formal, out-of-workplace in-service program activities. Nevertheless, she identifies a tension in the education systems in both societies, because administrators and officials did not generally view such informal learning activities as contributing much to improving teaching and learning in schools.

*Kelvin Wan Wing Mak’s* study of six teachers participating in a school network in a secondary school in *Hong Kong* further complicates our understanding of how in-service activities are experienced (see Chapter 6). He reports that teachers with more seniority and formal education and experience in teaching subject matter relevant to the new liberal studies curriculum tended to hold less favorable attitudes regarding the deliberations that took place in network meetings. In contrast, their more junior colleagues, whose previously taught subjects were less connected to liberal studies, tended to rate highly the interactions in the network, and particularly expressed favorable views regarding the contributions of the external school development officer. Their different appraisals of the school network’s functioning were also connected to whether they emphasized acquiring content knowledge or developing inquiry skills as being at the core of the liberal studies curriculum. He concludes that as a result “the promise of a school network to contribute to teachers’ professional development is not fully realized.”

The chapters in this volume thus add to our understanding of how pre-service and in-service teacher education may contribute to developing teachers’ capacity and commitment to implement certain pedagogical practices. The degree to which professional development activities are effective depends not only on the approach used (e.g., out-of-school workshops versus school-based initiatives). It also depends
on the material conditions within which teachers work and social relations of the school as a workplace.

**Teachers as Professional Employees**

The international literature addresses the points that teachers are workers and educational institutions are workplaces, while also giving attention to gendered differences among teachers and rural/urban differences in institutional contexts (Acker, 1996; Apple, 1983; Barter, 2009; Bottery, 2009; Connell, 1985; Lawn and Ozga, 1981; Ozga, 1988). There is also an extensive literature examining teachers as “professional” employees (Ginsburg and Megahed, 2010), even while debating the degree to which teaching as an occupation in various societies resembles an ideal type profession (Alba, 1969; Bagunywa, 1975; Hoyle, 1982; Kale, 1970; Lortie, 1975; Mazzwi, 1994; Meyers, 1976; Nagwu, 1981; Pritchard, 1983). And some of the literature focused on teachers as workers or professionals emphasizes that, like those employed in other organizations, teachers, administrators and others who work in educational systems are involved in hierarchical relations and engage in struggles to obtain and maintain material and symbolic resources (Blase, 1991; Ginsburg and Kamat, 2009; Smyth, 1987).

While some scholarship focuses on teaching as a profession or the professionalization of teaching, other work documents how under certain circumstances teaching has been *deprofessionalized* (Esland, 1980; Friedson, 1983; Haug, 1975; Johnson, 1972) – that is, lost status, autonomy, financial rewards (e.g., Carlson, 1987; Darvas, 1991; Dove, 1986; Filson, 1988; Jarausch, 1990; Kelly, 1982; Ozga and Lawn, 1981; Seth, 2002). Still other scholars adopt a marxist perspective in analyzing changes in teachers’ work (Apple, 1995; Busswell, 1988; Ginsburg and Spatig, 1988; Laudner and Yee, 1987; Robertson and Woock, 1991; Street, 1992), focusing on the proletarianization of teachers – that is, the processes of separating control of the conception and execution of work tasks, standardizing and routinizing work tasks (or deskilling); intensifying the demands of work; and reducing the costs (salaries, benefits, training, etc.) of workers (see Braverman, 1974; Derber, 1982; Johnson, 1980; Larson, 1980).

Relevant to the processes of professionalization as well as deprofessionalization and proletarianization of teaching is the *ideology of professionalism* (Ginsburg, 1987; Ginsburg and Megahed, 2010; Ginsburg et al., 1980; Larson, 1977; Metzger, 1987). Teachers have drawn on various versions of this ideology in efforts to achieve “professionalization” or to deflect others’ moves to deprofessionalize or proletarianize their occupation (Densmore, 1987; Fendler, 2009; Filson, 1988; Ginsburg, Wallace, and Miller, 1988; Lawn, 1988). For example, teachers may emphasize length of formal education in making claims to increased remuneration and autonomy. However, there is also evidence that administrators and state officials have also sought to use the ideology to challenge teachers’ professional claims and aspirations or, more generally, to control teachers’ work (Densmore, 1987;
Fendler, 2009; Filson, 1988; Ginsburg, Wallace, and Miller, 1988; Lawn, 1988). For instance, state officials may highlight the service ideal element of professionalism to legitimate providing teachers with limited salaries and benefits.

That teachers need to be understood as workers or professional employees is well illustrated by Chisato Tanaka in her chapter examining the strategies undertaken in Ghana to address the shortage, low commitment, and poor performance of teachers (see Chapter 8). While some individuals who may become and remain as teachers because of an ideal of service, an element of the ideology of professionalism, Ghanaian officials concluded that financial rewards would be an important motivating factor. Nevertheless, the way authorities implemented the “best teacher” award, incentive packages, accommodations, and upgrading programs limited their impact. Because “unqualified” teachers and those working in rural areas perceived that they were excluded from consideration and because many other teachers did not view the award decisions by district administrators to be merit-based, these programs did not work to increase these teachers’ capacity and commitment. As Tanaka states, “teachers tended to perceive themselves as unappreciated and undervalued rather than the key to high quality education.” At the same time this study calls attention to the importance of understanding how administrators and teachers construct and respond to hierarchical relations in the school as a workplace.

Ashley Snell Goldstein’s discussion of the emergentes (rising ones) in Cuba is also relevant here. In an effort to reduce class size in primary schools from 40 to 20 Cuban authorities recruited secondary school graduates, provided them with a short, intensive preparation program, placed them in classrooms as teachers, and then involved them in a variety of school-based and other in-service professional development activities. While they were academically capable to enter higher education, during the initial years of teaching they were “unqualified” in the sense that they did not have the length of formal pre-service teacher preparation that was the norm among primary school teachers. While a number of issues arose in implementing the emergentes program, a key one was that many parents and some educators viewed them to have a lower status and level of expertise (in effect, less “professional”).

In his study of a school network in Hong Kong, Kelvin Kwan Wing Mak also focuses attention on hierarchical relations among employees in the education system (see Chapter 6). He reports that teachers with less seniority and less directly relevant subject matter expertise welcomed the input provided by the school development officer, a non-school-based, education system employee responsible for facilitating school network activities in relation to implementing a new liberal studies curriculum. In contrast, the more senior teachers who taught subjects more directly relevant to the new curriculum tended to devalue the ideas and resources provided by the school development officer, arguing that their own (professional) knowledge and experience were a better source for determining what and how to teach liberal studies. As a consequence, Mak informs us, “it is difficult to build up sufficient consensus on the curriculum interpretation within the school network that is necessary for collaborative creation of new knowledge.”
Sebiha Kablay’s analysis of teachers in Turkey illuminates the situation of teachers as employees in relation to governing officials (Chapter 9). She argues that neoliberal policies not only transform citizens into customers who have to purchase social services, such as education, which had previously been provided by the social welfare state; these policies also affect the nature of work of teachers and employees in other sectors. Focusing on changes in employment status, such as the growth in number of teachers who work on an individual contractual basis, as “substitute teachers,” or for private schools and private tutoring institutions, Kablay suggests that teachers’ work has become “commodified” as education has become “marketized.” This can be seen to contribute to the deeprofessionalization or proletarianization of teachers, in that their status and remuneration are reduced and the occupational group experiences a process of deskilling.

These chapters situate teachers as employees within educational organizations (institutions and systems), focusing on issues of status, expertise, remuneration, working conditions, autonomy, etc. These considerations also raise questions of how processes of professionalization and deprofessionalization or proletarianization are constrained and enabled by ideologies of professionalism and how these dynamics open up and close down spaces for teachers to engage in various kinds of individual and collective political action.

Teachers as Political Actors

While teachers in many historical and societal contexts have sought to define themselves as apolitical, in part in relation to their claims to being professionals, we suggest that teachers should be conceived of as political actors. This is to say that teachers are imbedded in power relations and thus engaged in a variety of activities that either reinforce or challenge the existing distribution of power and resources (Carlson, 1987; Ginsburg and Kamat, 2009; Ginsburg et al., 1992). For example teachers may engage collective action in associations or unions as well as political parties and social movements (Blum, 1969; Dove, 1986; Feeley, 1989; Ginsburg, 1995; Lawn and Grace, 1987; Ozga, 1988; Rosenthal, 1969; Seifert, 1989; Sereny, 1989; Skopp, 1982; Sultana, 1991; Warren, 1989; White, 1981).

However, teachers also can be seen as political actors in the individual activities in which they engage in classrooms and in relation to parents and others in communities. For instance, teachers’ curricular, pedagogical, and evaluation activity can be viewed as forms of political action, activity having consequences for power relations and the distribution of material and symbolic resources (Apple, 1986; Connell, 1985; Dove, 1986; Ginsburg, 1988; Giroux, 1988; Jansen, 1990 Myers, 2007; Popkewitz, 1998; Sumf, 2006; Weiler, 1988). Relevant here is the issues of whose knowledge and whose world views are transmitted and highlighted in curriculum content and student assessments as well as what languages and forms of social relations are privileged in classrooms.
Additionally, because of either the dictates of political and economic elites or their own values and convictions, teachers have come to play an active political role in the community. For instance, in a range of societies teachers have served as community leaders, sometimes challenging the political and cultural hegemony of dominant groups and other times operating as agents of state and economic elites to promote change or conserve the status quo (Dove, 1986; Lauglo, 1982; Meyers, 1976; Skopp, 1982; Watson, 1983). Furthermore, we should note that nonparticipation is also a political act—a point illustrated by the fact that governments have at times sought to restrict certain types of teachers’ community-based political action (Blum, 1969; Dove, 1986; Jarausch, 1990; Zeigler, 1967).

In his chapter on Turkey, Sebiha Kablay concludes that the implementation of the above-referenced models of employment (e.g., contractual teachers, substitute teachers, teachers in private schools and tutoring institutions) “fractured the solidarity of teachers as an occupational group and promoted competitive rather than cooperative relations among teachers” (see Chapter 9). These developments not only lead to deterioration of “educators’ remuneration and conditions of employment … [but] also undermine teachers’ opportunity and ability to organize collectively … [because] teachers avoid joining a union for fear of being dismissed or not rehired.” One may also want to consider whether the deprofessionalization or proletarianization that some teachers experienced in this context will encourage or discourage them from joining with other workers and citizens to challenge teacher employment and other neoliberal policies.

A similar question might be raised about how “qualified” and “unqualified” teachers in Ghana may respond to the situation described by Chisato Tanaka (see Chapter 8). Given their dissatisfaction with the incentive schemes and the way they were being implemented, different groups of teachers could pursue individual strategies to gain more material or symbolic rewards for themselves, they could join together to demand that the incentives be increased as well as distributed more broadly and fairly, and/or they could collaborate with other workers and citizens to lobby for more resources devoted to the education sector and for a better quality of life for children and adults. That they do not seem to be engaging in any collective action should be recognized as a form of politics, one that is likely to contribute to sustaining the existing distribution of power and resources.

In their chapter based on research in Equatorial Guinea, Ginsburg and his colleagues also address the political dimension of teachers’ work and lives, both in classrooms and communities (see Chapter 4). First, they discuss the link between efforts to promote the use of active-learning pedagogies (i.e., classroom dialogue and student group work) in primary school classrooms to the political culture of that country. Drawing on Bernstein’s (1971, 1975a, and 1975b) theoretical and empirical work, they identify a challenge for teachers to move from strongly “framed” or “visible” pedagogies, characterized by strong teacher control over the organization, pacing and timing of knowledge transmission, given that the countries’
political culture features a “positional” compliance ideology (Wilson, 1992). At the same time, they find it is noteworthy that some teachers, particularly those who participated in the Escuela Activa and Alianzas de Calidad initiatives of PRODEGE, began to implement more weakly framed or “invisible” pedagogies, which accord with a political culture dominated by a “contractual” compliance ideology (Wilson, 1992).

Second, Ginsburg and his colleagues develop a similar analysis of their findings in Equatorial Guinea with respect to teachers’ extra-classroom roles – facilitating parents’ and community members’ involvement in school-related activities and participating in community activities (see Chapter 4). They report that a relatively modest impact of professional development activities associated with the Escuela Activa initiative on how teachers relate to parents and the community. That is, they found significant differences for only on two of the nine indicators of parental involvement in school (cleaning facility and contributing resources), and two of the four indicators of teacher involvement in the community (using community spaces for learning activities and communicating about the schools achievements and problems) when comparing teachers who participated in the Escuela Activa initiative compared to teachers who had not participated in any of the PRODEGE initiatives. That Equatorial Guinea’s political culture may have served as a constraint to change in teachers’ extra-classroom roles is also evidenced by the fact that the more intensive forms of action (e.g., promoting parents involvement in conducting school evaluations and taking decisions to improve the school as well as working to strengthen community participation in school and collaborating in community development projects) were not impacted by any of PRODEGE’s professional development initiatives.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have shared some of the ideas that were generated during the authors’ multilogue. In doing so, we have sought to situate the studies presented in this volume within the broader literature on teacher education, teachers as professional employees, and teachers as political actors. The chapters in this book, which focus on Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, France, Germany, Ghana, Hong Kong, Ireland, Lithuania, The Netherlands, Scotland, Spain, Turkey, and the United States, refine our understanding of the theoretical issues in the field of comparative and international education as well as call attention to dynamics that should be considered in developing and implementing educational policies in varying contexts.

We opened this chapter by noting that analysts and policy makers have identified teachers’ preparation and practice as both the major reasons for the poor quality of education and as core elements of initiatives to improve educational quality (Craig et al., 1998; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Good et al., 2009; UNESCO, 2006). The studies presented in subsequent chapters indicate that to take seriously the idea that teachers are a source of and key part of the solution to educational problems around
the world, we need to consider the complex way that teacher education, teachers’ work, and teachers’ political (in)action intersect. The content, processes, and impact of pre-service and in-service teacher education are enabled and constrained by the status, remuneration, and work environments of teachers. The extent to which teaching resembles the ideal type of a profession (versus being deprofessionalized or proletarianized) is likely to influence how seriously teachers and those who plan and deliver teacher education take these activities. At the same time, the experiences of teacher education shape not only the knowledge and skill but also the commitments and perspectives that teachers may develop. Furthermore, the conditions of teachers’ employment encourage or discourage teachers’ engagement in political action or inaction, as individuals, as an occupational group, or as part of broader social groups at the local, national, and international levels. And, of course, teachers’ political action or inaction may influence how the educational system is organized, with implications for teachers work and lives as well as for the quality and quantity of education that students receive. Similarly, teacher political action or inaction may inform the policies and practice of pre-service and in-service teacher education, while the content and processes of such professional development activities can promote various types of teacher political action or inaction.

It is important to remember, though, that teachers are not a homogeneous occupational group. The studies in this volume point to differences across countries, rural and urban contexts, and employment categories (contractual versus regular, subjects taught, and hierarchical position). Although not highlighted in the chapters, one should also call attention to gender, race/ethnicity, and social class differences – in terms of the background and current situation of teachers as well as their students.

In closing we want to emphasize the complexity of teachers’ work and lives should be factored into scholarship as well as the reform of educational policy and practice. And do so properly, one has to incorporate teachers into the conversations and decision making. We hope that this book contributes in a way that encourages teachers, teacher educators, (local, national, and international) policy makers, and others in the field of comparative and international education to move in this direction.

NOTES

1 Mark Ginsburg would like to express his sincere appreciation to Toni Cela Hamm for her assistance in formatting the chapters for this volume.
2 Mark Ginsburg would also like to thank the following colleagues who reviewed and provided constructive feedback on one of the originally submitted manuscripts: El Houcine Haichour, Rudi Klaus, Steve Klees, Elizabeth Leu, Sheryl Lutjens, John Myers, Simona Popa, and Anita Sanyal.
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Attitudes of Teacher Education Students Towards Educational Innovation

INTRODUCTION

Attitudes towards innovation in education are a key factor in efforts to improve the quality of education (Guskey, 1988; Traver, 2005; Traver and García, 2007; Albrini, 2006; Gorozidis & Papaioannou, 2011). As noted in the Preamble to the Declaration of Leuven / Louvain-la-Neuve (2009), “higher education has a key role to play if we are to successfully meet the challenges we face and if we are to promote the cultural and social development of our societies.” According to priorities established for the European Higher Education Area, future school teachers must be open to pedagogical innovations, especially those that make effective use of new information and communication technologies (ICTs). In Spain, for instance, teacher education degree programs are charged with helping students develop four types of learning abilities: learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together, and learning to be (ANECA, 2005).

This research presented here highlights the abilities of analysis, synthesis, organization and information management, teamwork, critical thinking and independent learning. In this chapter we examine how students’ attitudes toward pedagogical innovation change during their experience in a preservice teacher education program at Jaume I University in Castellón, Spain. Specifically, we address the following research questions:

1. To extent do preservice teachers’ overall attitudes toward innovation change during the course of their program?
2. To what extent do such changes occur for different dimensions of attitudes toward innovation?

School, University, and the Information Society

Technological development and globalization have had a tremendous impact, and present significant challenges to education today. Some of the issues facing education systems in developed countries include immigration and increasingly
multicultural societies; globalized flows of information; and greater reliance on new information technologies to manage, analyze and apply information. Because traditional approaches to education can no longer provide adequate answers, we need innovative ways of organizing teaching and learning (Flecha and Tortajada, 1999; Hargreaves, 2003; Peña and Fernández, 2009).

The shift from the industrial to the information society is introducing radical changes in many areas of our lives. In industrial societies, power was linked to control of and access to information. Schools encouraged encyclopedic learning—based on an accumulation- and transmission-oriented idea of knowledge—as the means for attaining academic, social and economic success. In contrast, access to information is less restricted in information societies. For increasing numbers of people the Internet offers an open window to the universe of information; any person with minimum computer technology and skills can access an almost infinite amount of information in a matter of seconds.

To be able to deal with these changes we need to rely more on applying intellectual and technological resources and less on accumulating products and material resources (Majó, 1997; Adell, 1997; Flecha and Tortajada, 1999; Ayuste et al., 2003; Castells, 2003). The rapid development and growing use of ICTs requires changes in the tasks assigned to teaching institutions and the ways they teach future citizens (García Rueda & Sáez Vacas, 2004). As stated in the European Union Commission (2003) report, *The Role of Universities in the Europe of Knowledge,* European universities need to adapt to the changes brought about by the information and communication society by moving away from reproductive views of learning and shifting to transformative ones; from memory-based to relation-based learning; from individual, isolated, and competitive learning to collective, cooperative learning; from promoting a view of knowledge as objective and authoritative to treating knowledge as problematic and open to question. The new globalized context also requires the introduction of ICTs both as resources and as learning objects. According to Aubert et al. (2004. pp. 13–14), it is no longer a question of training individuals with accumulated knowledge; we need people who can work in teams to select and process all the information around them.

Students in preservice teacher education programs are likely to become primary and secondary school teachers, who may have a critical impact on future citizens and workers. It is therefore especially important that these programs incorporate and foster innovative pedagogical practices. Garcia-Lopez (2002) argues that appropriate intervention in shaping the professional practice and ethics of future teachers will lead them to become more responsible and committed to the community. However, following Martínez (1995), good grades are no longer enough. People must also be open to change, able to update their own skills, committed to learning to learn, and concerned with research and professional development, all of which favor social and cultural transformation, and aim to raise levels of justice and social equity.
Atitudes and Teaching Innovation

A large body of literature indicates that attitudes are key to improving the quality of education (e.g., Escámez, Ortega and Saura, 1987; Escámez et al., 1993; Moreno, 1994; Sales, 1996; Martínez Agut, 1999, Perez Samaniego, 1999; Traver and Garcia, 2004; Traver, 2005; Hirsch, 2005; Porta and Ferrández, 2009). For example, Fishbein and Ajzen (1980) conclude that individuals whose attitudes are evaluatively or affectively consistent with new behavioral patterns are more likely to enact those new behaviors. Similarly, Kim (2011) found that students in a preservice program for teachers of English as a second language, working with new ICTs (podcasts and blogging), achieve mastery and confidence in their technological skills to teach new generations. Thus, we can expect preservice teachers with positive attitudes toward certain kinds of pedagogical innovation to be more likely to seek out information on new instructional strategies and techniques, experiment with them during teaching practice, and incorporate them in their actual teaching repertoires.

The accelerated evolution of ICTs and their implementation in the social network affects the schools and learning of future citizens (García Rueda and Sáez Vacas, 2004). European universities are attempting to meet the imperative to adapt to the changes demanded by the information and knowledge society (AA.VV., 2003). These new challenges involve developing students’ personal, social and professional competences. This is a new context for reflective practitioners, and independent and critical citizens, but despite this reality, classroom lectures and individual work still prevail in university education.

The European Higher Education Area and European convergence criteria require a change of paradigm in university teaching. Transmission-oriented models of teaching are currently giving way to constructivist models focused on learning and student activity. The real change in teaching and learning depends on several factors, including improved structural conditions in faculty workplaces, optimized teaching loads, adequate student-teacher ratios, increased appreciation of the teaching function, continuous professional development of faculty pedagogical skills, and the enhancement of student and faculty attitudes to the processes of educational innovation and improvement.

Educational improvement should thus move away from what Botkin, Elmandjra and Malitza (1979) term ‘maintenance learning’ and toward ‘innovative learning.’ Maintenance learning seeks to perpetuate established educational and social systems, whereas innovative learning attempts to define a new educational system that can resolve the conflicts brought about by the maintenance learning system. In order to prepare people to deal with this new reality, we need to encourage positive attitudes toward cooperation, transformation and updating of knowledge and skills.

In relation to these ideas the European Tuning II project on educational structures in Europe identifies a set of generic competences that are common to all professions and degrees, and which consequently should be included in all higher education programs (González and Wagenaar, 2003 and 2006). The National Assessment
Agency (ANECA, 2005) has analyzed these competences in the context of Spanish teacher education students, focusing on four types of learning: learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together, and learning to be. All of them are related to the intellectual abilities needed in the information society and specifically for critical analysis of information (Castells, 2003; Flecha and Tortajada, 1999; Aubert et al., 2004).

METHODOLOGY

For the larger study we used integrative methodology, which combines a positivist approach with a qualitative, interpretive and critical approach (Biddle & Anderson, 1989). This chapter mainly reports our analysis of quantitative data collected from 200 students in the teacher education degree program in the Faculty of Human and Social Sciences at the Jaume I University. The sample comprised students from the four specialties in the program: Child Education, Primary Education, Music Education and Physical Education. The students were in their first and third years, and taking any of the following courses: Theory of Education, History Education, and Physical Education.

We used a questionnaire developed specifically for this research to assess student attitudes: The Attitudes toward Educational Innovation Questionnaire (see Annex). The questionnaire measured 36 items on a five-point Likert scale (1 = least favorable, 5 = most favorable), and was created following the methodological guidelines set by Hennerson et al. (1978). We had previously used the questionnaire successfully in other studies (Traver, 2005; Traver and García, 2007).

In order to identify the factors of educational innovation in higher education, we formed a focus group with 6 students and 6 faculty associated with innovative educational experiences. The focus group discussed four topics: a) educational innovation and teaching at university; b) educational innovation and teachers; c) educational innovation and students; and d) educational innovation and university. The focus group discussions were recorded on video and transcribed by the research team. The main factors that emerged in this study were obtained using content analysis.

A list of items for these factors was reviewed by a panel of professional educators, education students, and experts in educational innovation in higher education. They were asked to evaluate the appropriateness of the characteristics related to the educational innovation construct in higher education, and to choose the categories with the highest valuation. As a result of this process we identified nine dimensions that characterize educational innovation in university education:

1. **Leadership** (L) refers to teachers’ functions and characteristics, such as research into improving teaching methods in the classroom.
2. **Updating and ongoing education** (U) is related to renovations and changes in teacher training.
3. Methodological change and improvement (M) includes issues such as new teaching methods aligned with the educational, professional and social situation (e.g., problem-based learning, cooperative learning, projects, tutorials, seminars, etc.), and new ICTs.

4. Teacher profile as an educator and mediator (T) refers to the teacher as a guide, mentor, companion, interested in the students, accessible and having an affective relationship with students.

5. Training autonomous and critical citizens and professionals (TR) refers to students’ goals: preparation for life, ability to learn to learn, having the right learning attitudes and skills for group work, ability to understand and transform information into knowledge, to select and to find information, and to reason and discern critically.

6. Involvement and motivation towards education (I) refers to commitment to teaching and learning.

7. Knowing how to teach (K) refers to the systematic planning of the teaching-learning process (previous reflection, revision and optimization, continuous monitoring and assessment).

8. University policy and departmental organization (UN) covers the structural elements involved in innovation and improvement: workplace situation, economic incentives and institutional recognition, coordination with other colleges.

9. Educational ideology (ED) is related to the position teachers assume within the educational system and the social, cultural, political or economic factors that legitimize their teaching.

Items are grouped around nine thematic indicators on educational innovation in higher education.

Students responded to the questionnaire three times: at the beginning of the 2008/09 academic year, at the end of the first semester and at the end of the second semester. The questionnaires were administered through a computer application (Moodle), on which the on-line section of the course was hosted. Participation in the research was voluntary and was not a requirement of the program. All responses were made anonymously on line.

Management and quantitative analysis of the data were carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Specifically, we used Student’s t-test to determine statistical significance when comparing the mean values of specific items across the three waves of data collection.

Key Features of the Teacher Education Program

Before discussing the students’ attitudes toward pedagogical innovation, it is important to describe the program in which they were enrolled. The program implements innovative methodology based on the guidelines of the European convergence scheme. It seeks to move from a transmission-oriented, teacher-centered
approach to one based on constructive theories with a social orientation focused on the students’ work. Methodological strategies included interaction with peers and research processes through groups in the classroom. The courses involved were all included on the curriculum of the teacher education degree, and the duration of the program ranged from a minimum of one semester to a maximum of one academic year, depending on the number of classes required.

The program uses ICTs to organize the students’ work and to facilitate communication between teachers and students or among students in the virtual space. It also follows principles of cooperative learning (e.g., Johnson, Johnson and Holubec, 1999; Garcia, Traver and Candela, 2001; Pujolás, 2008; Traver and Rodriguez, 2011), and group work was organized in structure similar to that of a research team (see Sharan and Sharan, 1990; Garcia, Traver and Candela, 2001). Assessment focuses on individual and group learning, and includes evaluation of teachers, students and self-assessment.

Research Outcomes

Table 1 summarizes the main findings from the statistical analysis exploring changes in teacher education students’ attitudes toward educational innovation across three waves of data collection. In interpreting the findings we classified the mean scores as follows: a) very low (below 1.50), b) low (between 1.51 and 2.50), c) medium (between 2.51 and 3.50), high (between 3.51 and 4.50), and very high (above 4.51).

Initially, the global mean (averaging across all items) was 3.57, representing a value toward the bottom of the “high” score on attitudes toward innovation. At the end of their first semester the global mean of students’ attitude score was 3.70, representing a statistically significant (p <.01) increase over the first wave mean score, though this figure was only slightly larger and remained toward the bottom of the “high” range. The same can be said about the difference between the global mean score at the end of the program (3.68) in comparison to the initial global mean score (3.57). However, no significant differences were found between the global mean scores for the second and third assessments, which were virtually the same.

Table 1. Results of Responses to the Individual Items on the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Wave A</th>
<th>Wave B</th>
<th>Wave C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Sx</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 presents the results of our analysis of students’ responses, in which we group the individual items into sets according to the nine dimensions discussed above (see Annex for list of items associated with each dimension). Note that the average scores vary across these nine dimensions, with “updating and ongoing education” (U) receiving the lowest average scores in all three waves (3.14–3.18), in the middle of the “medium” range, while “teacher profile as an educator and mediator” (T) had the highest mean scores in all three waves (4.30–4.48), near the top of the “high” range.

Table 2 shows that between the first and second wave students’ average scores improved significantly for the following dimensions of attitudes toward innovation: a) Leadership (L), with the average score moving from 3.90 to 4.24 (p. < .01), and b) Teacher profile as an educator and mediator (T), with the average score moving from 4.30 to 4.44 (p. < .05). However, we do not observe significant increases in students’ mean scores on the other seven items: a) Updating and ongoing education (U), with averages of 3.16 and 3.14; b) Methodological change and Improvement (M), with averages of 3.33 and 3.46; c) Training autonomous and critical citizens and professionals (TR), with averages of 3.28 and 3.32; d) Involvement and motivation towards education (I), with averages of 3.87 and 3.99; e) Knowing how to teach (K), with averages of 4.04 and 4.22; f) University policy and departmental organization (UN), with averages of 3.45 and 3.55 and g) Educational ideology (ED), with averages of 3.21 and 3.26.

When comparing students attitudes toward innovation at the beginning of the program (wave 1) and at the end of the program (wave 3), we observe significant changes on students’ mean scores for the same two dimensions: a) Leadership (L), with the average score moving from 3.90 to 4.34 (p.<.01), and b) Teacher profile as an educator and mediator (T), with the average score moving from 4.30 to 4.48 (p. < .05). Nevertheless, during this period there were no significant differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between students’ mean scores for the other seven dimensions: a) Updating and ongoing education (U), with averages of 3.16 and 3.18; b) Methodological change and Improvement (M), with averages of 3.33 and 3.48; c) Training autonomous and critical citizens and professionals (TR), with averages of 3.28 and 3.34; d) Involvement and motivation towards education (I), with averages of 3.87 and 3.99; e) Knowing how to teach (K), with averages of 4.04 and 4.03; f) University policy and departmental organization (UN), with averages of 3.45 to 3.54 and g) Educational ideology (ED), with averages of 3.21 and 3.26.

Finally, we observed no significant increases in average student scores on any of the nine dimensions between wave 2 and wave 3 data collections.

CONCLUSION

In response to the first research question (To extent do preservice teachers’ overall attitudes toward innovation change during the course of their program?) results show that overall the attitudes towards innovation of students on the teacher education degree program improved slightly after they had taken part in a program, which was organized around educational innovation strategies. The results indicate that overall initial attitudes of teacher education students to innovation in education were “high” and remained “high,” although increasing to a significant extent, between the beginning of the program and the end of the first semester. However, their overall attitudes toward innovation did not increase further after the second semester of the program.

As Fishbein and Ajzen’s (1980) theory of reasoned action suggests, and as we have seen in previous studies (Escámez, Ortega and Saura, 1987; Escámez et al., 1993; Moreno, 1994; Sales, 1996, Moliner, 2003; Martinez Agut, 1999, Perez Samaniego, 1999; Traver and García, 2004; Traver, 2005; Traver and Garcia, 2007), attitude change and improvement can be approached methodologically from practical changes and techniques that center on the active participation of students and cooperative learning. These are key issues in the approaches that underpin the creation of the EHEA, and will provide the foundations for the training of graduates in the new teacher education degrees.

We also observed stabilization between the second and third questionnaires, with overall attitudes toward innovation remaining at a somewhat more positive level compared to the beginning of the program. This fact indicates that the greatest attitudinal increase occurs at the beginning of the course. This finding is similar to what we observed in a previous study on changes in high school student solidarity (Traver, 2005; Traver and Garcia, 2004).

Regarding the second research question (To what extent do such changes occur for different dimensions of attitudes toward innovation?), we found a medium-high result in the nine dimensions at the beginning of the study (average between 3.16 and 4.30). A significant increase or attitudinal improvement in any of these values would therefore be more difficult to achieve. In cases that start with high values, the stabilization of the mean can be considered a good result. If we analyze the
dimensions in which the main attitudinal changes appeared, we can see a clear improvement on the following dimensions: Leadership (L) and Teacher profile as an educator and mediator (T). These factors must therefore be taken into account in future research about improvement and educational innovation processes at university. At the same time we need to consider why no significant changes were observed in students’ attitudes as measured by the other seven dimensions: a) Updating and ongoing education (U), Methodological change and Improvement (M), Training autonomous and critical citizens and professionals (TR), Involvement and motivation towards education (I), Knowing how to teach (K), University policy and departmental organization (UN), and g) Educational ideology (ED).

The results allow us to explore the disposition among students to the processes of innovation and educational improvement, which will in large part affect the future of teaching for new generations. This leads García López (2002) to call for a review of professional training, particularly in the field of teacher education, in at least two areas: (1) preparation for professional practice and (2) ethics education or training. This research project on improving attitudes toward educational innovation of the university student should be placed within this frame of reference.

NOTES
1 This chapter draws on findings from a larger research project, “Analysis of Attitudes and Satisfaction of University Students and Professors towards Innovation in Education,” which was undertaken between 2007 and 2009 and financed by Bancaixa-UJI (Cod: P1 1B2007-53).
4 We agree with Touriñan (1987:187) that education is “the acquisition of the set of skills, habits, attitudes and knowledge that enable the learner to choose their life plan.” And, we view quality education to be that which fosters the four areas that Delors (1996) identifies as optimizing human behavior: a) information (knowledge), b) abilities and skills (learning by doing), c) values and attitudes (learning to be a person), and d) learning to live with others.
5 The European Higher Education Area (EHEA) is the environment shared by Europe’s university systems, designed to promote mobility, interaction and opportunities for its respective members. Its essential parameters were established in the Bologna Declaration. As the main objective of the Bologna Process, the EHEA was meant to promote convergence, that is, to ensure more comparable, compatible and coherent systems of higher education in Europe.
6 The table presents the total number of subjects (N), the arithmetic average (mean) of responses, and the standard deviation (Sx). The three waves represent the beginning, the middle (end of first semester) and the end of the program. Sample mortality occurred when the students’ workload increased as they progressed in the program and during the exams at the end of semesters, both of which led to a drop in students’ responses. In addition, the third moment occurred after the students had finished the program, and thus they were not easily motivated to respond to the questionnaire.
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ANNEX

Items on Questionnaire Grouped According to Nine Dimensions

Leadership (L):
1. I believe the University is a good context for research on educational innovation.
2. I think that teaching at the University should be pioneer in educational research and teaching improvement.
3. I like to participate in experimental groups where methodological innovations are implemented.

Updating and ongoing education (U)
4. I am convinced that to bring innovative approaches to classroom teachers must be in an on-going process of training and renewal.
5. I think that to teach at the university level does not require continuing education courses on educational matters.
6. In the University, it is a sign of prestige that the faculty and its pedagogical methods are updated.
7. I don’t like to waste time learning study techniques.

Methodological change and Improvement (M)
8. Educational proposals in university education -in order to be successful- should adapt methodology and materials to the new conditions of reality.
9. I believe that improving teaching practice is to carry out new teaching methods in line with professional and social reality (such as problem-based learning, cooperative learning, tutoring, seminars, etc.).
12. I don’t like my teachers introducing changes in the way they teach.

Teacher profile as an educator and mediator (T)
13. I consider university faculty must mediate student learning by implementing guiding functions and orientation.
14. Student achievement will improve if teachers seem to be close and accessible.
15. I like teachers getting involved tutoring my learning process.

Training autonomous and critical citizens and professionals (TR)
16. I believe that university teaching should be limited to train competent professionals not taking into account other issues related to their training as persons or citizens.
17. I positively value that my training enables me not only as professionally competent, but as a critical and autonomous person.
18. Student will not easily accept that other issues that are not strictly related to their training as professionals were introduced in their syllabus.
19. I like that university education enhances both professional, personal and citizenship training aspects.
Involvement and motivation towards education (I)
20. I strongly believe that the higher the motivation of teachers toward teaching, the higher the students toward learning.
21. I believe that to be a good university professor it is really necessary to engage in the act of education and teaching.
22. In university education, the fact that teachers are more involved in their teaching does not lead to greater involvement of their students.
23. My involvement as a student comes from my desire to learn new things.

Knowing how to teach (K)
24. I believe that in order to teach at the university knowing the subject matter is as important as knowing how to teach it.
25. In university, knowing the subject matter is the only valued condition to become a lecturer.
26. I like that teachers take time to prepare their lectures.

University policy and departmental organization (UN)
27. I think that the university policy on education does not have an impact on the processes of educational innovation.
28. I believe that if there is no change in the assessment of teaching, it will be difficult to make educational innovation at the university.
29. I think that the department structure of the university has a positive impact on educational improvement.
30. I believe that if teaching were to be more valued than research, innovation in teaching would be encouraged.
31. I think that the ratio in courses does not affect the capability of introducing educational innovation.
32. Students will highly value rate ratios in our courses.
33. If contents of a subject matter were coordinated with other courses contents, my professional training as a student will be improved.
34. I rather prefer courses where my teachers work in a coordinated manner.

Educational ideology (ED)
35. University professors should not make explicit their position with regard to their teaching. They should remain neutral.
36. I prefer my teachers being neutral, from the ideological point of view, while teaching.