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Abstract
This paper deals with the dichotomy between subject teaching and education (pedagogics) sciences, in the context of the teachers’ knowledge and teaching practice. According to that dichotomy, the fragmentation between the subject matter and the teaching matter is highlighted. The purpose of this paper is to show the influence of habitus and practical education and training on the teachers’ pedagogical teaching praxis. The paper focuses specifically on the issue of habitus, which is considered to be more important than formal guidelines and recommendations, which are either a result of policy documents or of a teacher’s formal education and training. The right place to examine the influence of habitus is in practical education and training because it is only in practice that habitus emerges in all its dimensions. The key findings point to the problem of a mismatch between school habitus and family habitus of a particular child. Due to the influence of habitus, teachers need to balance three types of knowledge. These are instructional knowledge and practice, knowledge of the children’s background and knowledge of self-beliefs and attitude. The connection and interaction among all these types of knowledge would help to surpass the fragmentation exposed. This interaction leads to new possibilities for research and improvement of the teachers’ praxis, already in the process of practical education and training, and with the possibility of going beyond the simple transformation of a teacher’s own experience into praxis.

Key words: dichotomy in teacher’s knowledge; habitus; pedagogical praxis; practical education; teacher.

Introduction
In direct research of the teachers’ pedagogical praxis a modern phenomenon of teachers defining their own lack of knowledge considering the pedagogical work
(this is pedagogical content knowledge or knowledge not connected with the subject and content), has been noticed. This is the important dichotomy between education (pedagogics) sciences and subject teaching. Furthermore, it demonstrates the fragmentation between the teaching matter and the subject matter.

This fact points to the evident problem of discrepancy between the knowledge of the subject field that a teacher has gained and a lack of knowledge of the field of pedagogy, that is, of responses of the child in his behavioral, social and emotional context. A large number of problems for teachers emerge from that discrepancy and also from confrontation with their own lack of knowledge. These two fields (knowledge of the subject and knowledge of pedagogy) should not be separated. Accordingly, the knowledge a teacher needs can be divided into two fields: instructional knowledge and practice in the subject and knowledge of children’s background (pedagogical knowledge), both of which are crucial for working with children. Therefore, a teacher’s practical education and training are very important first steps in the real world development of a teacher’s praxis. We can see the consequences of this separation of subject knowledge and pedagogics both in our past experience and in contemporary teaching, despite the fact that many changes in society and teacher education have taken place. That is why we think that the correct explanation of this dichotomy lies in the exposed root of the problem.

The focus of this paper is finding the solution to the problem, and this is Bourdieu’s habitus, which has an important influence on the pedagogical teaching praxis, regardless of other circumstances, except those that are relevant for its confirmation. From the viewpoint of habitus (Bourdieu, 2002; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2006), this paper provides answers to the problem of difficulties in changing the pedagogical praxis, which, despite numerous changes to policy guidelines for teaching practice (Buchberger, F., Campos, B. P., Kallos, D., & Stephenson, J., 2000; OECD, 2005; European, 2013b), remains unchanged.

The aim of this paper is to demonstrate the important influence of habitus and practical training on the teacher’s praxis, through the theoretical concept of habitus (Bourdieu, 2002; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2006), a comparative descriptive method of analyzing the documents regarding teacher education (Buchberger et al., 2000; OECD, 2005; European, 2005, ETUCE, 2008; European, 2011a, 2011b, 2013b), and with interpretation of those documents through Bourdieu’s concept of habitus (Bourdieu, 2002; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2006).

The main question of the research combines two fields of study: (1) what is the significance of the individual’s habitus, and (2) what is the meaning of practical education for good teaching practice? The first thesis states that in practical work, an important conflict between the teacher’s personal habitus and the children takes place. Teachers’ personal experiences and points of view play an important role in forming their own professional pedagogical practice and contribute to the discrepancy between the theory and the practice. The second thesis states that with practical education
based on the questions mentioned above, we can help reduce the discrepancy between the subject and the pedagogical knowledge. In other words practical education should be derived from findings, conformations and deficiencies connected with the determined teachers’ lack of knowledge.

In this paper we will address, applying the habitus theory (Bourdieu, 2002; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2006), the problem of the unchanged teacher’s praxis, which tends to remain the same, despite many different educational policies in teaching (Buchberger et al., 2000; OECD, 2005; European, 2013b).

The exposed issues are fundamental and could be discussed on philosophical grounds as well. That is why we need to go back to our roots and that is why it is necessary to establish the context.

**Establishing the Context: Teacher Education between the Past Experience and Future Praxis with Mindset of What to Do?**

Contemporary trends in teacher education and preparation for the teaching profession already take into account the problems which occur most frequently, and these are work with difficult children, various relationships that teachers need to fit into and a very important field to be discussed - that of practical education and training of future teachers (Buchberger et al., 2000; European, 2005, 2011a, 2011b).

The main and the most complex task of any teacher, regardless of subject matter, is to know children, their background and their difficulties. That is why the dichotomy exposed alongside this evident fragmentation poses a very important question: how can you do a good job as a teacher if you do not know how to work with children? The problem we see is that the child comes second after the subject matter, which is the main occupation of the teacher. The most important requirement for each child is that they have a teacher who cares. In this relationship a teacher is guided towards a child. The relationships are integral to everything that a teacher is doing, and that is why a teacher is a pedagogue. The relationships also guide us towards questions about ourselves, our involvement, responsibilities and contribution in class and our work with each child, whether they are more or less challenging. Closely related to this is an inability to understand where you, as a teacher, stand in regard to these questions: What can I do? What is the message for me in each relationship?

The dichotomy between the pedagogical work and work with the subject of teaching leads to the third component in the teacher’s knowledge of self-beliefs and attitudes. We need a mindset that questions ourselves as teachers - What to do?

Teacher education is always based on teaching the content today which can be relevant tomorrow, but it seems that in teaching we sometimes still remain focused on the past. According to that statement, the underlying question is: what kind of teacher education do we need for the future and what do we need to learn from our past, without being constrained by it? Could experience be our guide, helping us not to repeat the mistakes nor forget what we have learned from it? Can we fit in the idea...
that habitus is important? We all have our own experience from the classroom, with our teachers, and that is why it should not be so difficult to make good changes, except if the precise experience is the obstacle.

A teacher’s pedagogical praxis is subject to many influences and among these we can discuss the influence of time, social circumstances, educational policies, a teacher’s education and the influence of habitus, which is the special focus of this paper.

**Influence of Time and Educational Policies on Teacher Education**

Improving the quality of teacher education with the purpose of improving the teaching process or pedagogical praxis is a never-ending story. This area has not been neglected, but heatedly discussed instead. During the last few decades, the initiatives and actions which would help the contemporary needs in knowledge and improve the image of a teacher have been introduced.

In this paper we analyze the selected policy documents from the field of teacher education within the context of the exposed problem and the required teachers’ knowledge. When considering policy documents on the subject we looked at the relevant contemporary literature that highlighted the importance and value of the teacher. This is made clear in the guidelines, recommendations and requirements in the documents. For the purpose of this paper the most important are general policy documents, which are required for a broader point of view and our fundamental questions (Buchberger et al., 2000; European, 2005, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c). The selected policy documents clearly address these issues. For the purpose of the analysis the main focus was placed on the guidelines, recommendations and demands in the documents, regarding the teachers’ knowledge, encompassing learning, education, competences, skills and quality. Further text analysis is made through Bourdieu’s (2002) concept of habitus.

The OECD report *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers*, which is about school teachers’ preparation, recruitment, work and careers (OECD, 2005), as an official document states the importance and value of teachers. Its specific concern are the policies which contribute to attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers in schools. The reason for a really large interest in collaboration is the fact that “teacher issues are a priority for public policy, and likely to become even more so in future years” (OECD, 2005, p. 2). There is no country that would not try to improve its schools, and in that sense “teachers are central to school improvement efforts” (OECD, 2005, p. 2). For that reason teacher policy matters so much. According to that policy, “actions to do with teachers and teaching are the most important influences on student learning. In particular, the broad consensus is that ‘teacher quality’ is the single most important school variable influencing student achievement” (OECD, 2005, p. 3). Furthermore, “a point of agreement among the various studies, is that there are many important aspects of teacher quality that are not captured by the commonly used indicators, such as qualifications, experience and tests of academic ability” (OECD, 2005, p. 3), *these are characteristics that are harder*
to measure. This report lists some of these characteristics and from the point of this paper, “to foster productive teacher-student relationships” (OECD, 2005, p. 3) needs to be emphasized. The demands on teachers are becoming more complex and teachers and their roles are now expected to change. “As teachers are in daily contact with the students who potentially form the next generation of teachers, the enthusiasm and morale of the current teacher workforce are important influences on future teacher supply” (OECD, 2005, p. 3). We agree that changes are needed and we also know (from observation and participation) that teaching does not change in fundamental ways, which has been precisely stated in our fundamental questions. The truth is that there are some main concerns that probably create obstacles to changes, such as a problem of interest and attractiveness of teaching.

Policy initiatives and objectives are necessary to cover all complexity in teachers’ development and improvement (OECD, 2005), because it has to play the key role in helping teachers to develop and meet the demands. And that is why teacher policy also needs to be developed in the way that is connected with our fundamental questions, if that is possible. With such a broad view as this report (OECD, 2005) presents, we acquire new information, ideas and emphases according to demands. In a time of comprehensive change in the field of education, which is the priority of the development strategy, the teacher’s role is closely observed and is very unstable. Teachers, in their modified subject role, lose the absolute power in the sense of permanent, unchanged source of knowledge, due to the technological progress and the changed pedagogical standards. The subject matter becomes less significant than the teaching matter.

The Green Paper on Teacher Education in Europe (2000) emphasizes two very important categories for our field of research. These are ‘traditions in teacher education’ (Buchberger et al., 2000, p. 13) and static ‘rucksack-philosophy’ (Buchberger et al., 2000, p. 16). Contemporary teacher education in the European Union seems to be strongly influenced by some long-standing traditions, which “are made up of a blend of not always consistent and sometimes hidden assumptions, beliefs and opinions on the professional role of teachers and on the acquisition of professional expertise” (Buchberger et al., 2000, p. 13). We can follow two traditions: one is the ordinary school tradition and the other is academic tradition. Both can still be seen and may be identified as “celebrating experience” (Buchberger et al., 2000, p. 15) and “celebrating the academic discipline” (Buchberger et al., 2000, p. 15). Any of them standing on its own is not sufficient. The hidden assumption behind the concept of static rucksack-philosophy “is that initial teacher education has the ability to equip prospective teachers with all those competences that seem to be necessary to competently fulfill the tasks of the teaching profession over a life-long career, and at the same time to develop the problem-solving capacity necessary to meet rapidly changing tasks of teaching and the teaching profession” (Buchberger et al., 2000, p. 21). These assumptions are inappropriate and against teachers as professionals.
In 2005, *Common European Principles for Teacher Competences and Qualifications* (European, 2005) were agreed upon and after that there have been a number of documents that address this topic in terms of answering *what competences teachers need and what they need to improve them* (European, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2013b). What is also important today is that the concept of competences is one of the main concepts in education and training programs and in teacher education. Competences such as knowledge, skills and attitudes are replaced by an emphasis on content and declarative knowledge. A competence is best described as a complex combination of knowledge, skills, values and attitudes, which lead to effective action in a particular domain (Deakin Crick, 2008).

In the ETUCE policy paper – *Teacher Education in Europe*, from 2008, teacher’s competences are built on “a concept of teaching as praxis in which theory, practice and the ability to reflect critically on one's own and others' practice illuminate each other, rather than on a concept of teaching as the acquisition of technical skills” (ETUCE, 2008). The concept of competence in teaching and concept of teacher competences are broad and encompass many features, all of which are important (European, 2013b).

Feiman-Nemser (2008, European, 2013b) implies that there are four fundamental aspects in teacher’s learning: *learning to think, know, feel and act as teachers*, which is also very closely connected to the essence of habitus. The first one, “learning to think as teachers implies a critical examination of one’s beliefs and the development of pedagogical thinking” (European, 2013b, p. 12). The second one, “learning to know as teachers concerns the several aspects of knowledge required - including knowledge generated by one's own practices” (European, 2013b, p. 12). The third one, “learning to feel as teachers is linked with professional identity: intellectual and emotional aspects” (European, 2013b, p. 12), and includes attitudes and expectations (European, 2013b, p. 12). And the fourth one, “learning to act as teachers entails integrating thoughts, knowledge and dispositions in practices that are informed by consistent principles” (European, 2013b, p. 12).

Within the key elements of the *European Programme* of the last two decades, *Education and training 2010* and *Education and training 2020*, improving the quality of education is the *quality of teachers and teaching*. The *Final report of the Study on Policy Measures to improve the attractiveness of the teaching profession in Europe* (European, 2013a) found out that students, teachers and school heads “all say they chose their profession out of a desire to transmit values, to work with children and young people” (European, 2013a, p. 11). What is interesting is the fact that this contradicts the exposed fundamental problem. But there is also the following finding, which is that “a majority of future teachers feel they are *insufficiently prepared* for their professional activity, especially as regards to the practical issues of class management and pupil assessment” (European, 2013a, p. 11). A good recommendation is the *idea of early career support* (European, 2010, 2013a) but the question remains: is it enough to defeat the exposed problem? Without the appropriate reflection we can strengthen this problem and achieve the opposite effect.
According to the meaning of the competences, we found out there is a complex demand for teacher education. That should be investment in knowledge and skills, and also in understanding, reflecting on what I am doing. We think it is time for new emphasis and actions in teacher education. We can stress the demand with the question: does the teacher understand what he is doing and not just what he is teaching? Undoubtedly, this question is related to the third component of a teacher’s knowledge, which is self-beliefs and an attitude that has a mindset of What to do?

*Influence of Habitus on the Pedagogical Praxis of a Teacher*

With regard to the already stated dichotomy problem, and insisting on the existing practice, we will try to find the answer with the help of the theoretical concept of habitus by Bourdieu (2002). Since teaching is such a complex phenomenon in terms of demand, an individual will sooner or later have to focus on it. This relation must be exposed and shown in its importance for the entire construct of teaching.

In this article we will present habitus as a very important dimension, which has influence on the teaching praxis that occurs only and directly by a human. It does not emerge in theoretical teaching and it is not shown in its essence. The key for the influence of the habitus phenomenon is the actual encounter between the teacher’s and the child’s story, experience, idea of a teacher.

Bourdieu presented the theoretical background of the concept of habitus (2002; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2006). However, the concept has its roots in Aristotle’s notion, hexis, “which was made in his doctrine of virtue and it means acquire an even hardy position of moral character, which directs our feelings and wishes in the conditions and with that our behavior” (Wacquant, 2006, pp. 125-126). Habitus is obtained with education, and habitus gained in a family is strengthened with school experience. For the individual, habitus is a system of gained dispositions, which functions as categories of awareness, evaluation and as an organized way of acting. Habitus is a gained system of schemes, which are objectives adjusted to the constituted conditions. The main function of habitus is to bridge the tension between the conscious and the unconscious. Social reality exists in thinking, field and habitus, in and outside the agent. According to Bourdieu (1989, in Grenfell & James, 1998), there is a mutual relationship between habitus and field. They have a “relation of conditioning: the field structures the habitus” (Bourdieu, 1989, in Grenfell & James, 1998, p. 16) and “a relation of knowledge or cognitive construction: habitus contributes to constituting the field as a meaningful world” (Bourdieu, 1989, in Grenfell & James, 1998, p. 16). When habitus comes to the real world (social environment), where it originated from, it feels natural. Habitus is social inheritance (Roobins, in Grenfell & James, 1998). Social action has two properties, time and space, and will be actualized only with individuals with individual cases (Grenfell & James, 1998). The focuses of the habitus concept are social experiences (habits, praxis) that come from interaction between the individual, habitus and the field. We can understand habitus as a person’s history (Hodkinson,
1998) which develops in interaction with important others and the culture in which the individual has lived and is living. The social world is produced and reproduced with habitus. Habitus is deeply anchored in the system that was designed by former generations and represents the foundations of culture, values, and norms. Habitus provides an active presence of former experiences that are loaded in an individual’s body in the form of perceptive schemes, thinking and actions that an individual gives to higher means than formal rules and norms.

Early experiences are the most important features for habitus, since they produce structures that are the basis for “detection and evaluation of each latter experience” (Bourdieu, 2002, p. 93). According to Bourdieu, habitus is “practical competency gained in and for activity” (Wacquant, 2006, p. 127). Habitus is gained in childhood and that is why it is produced on a history-by-history basis (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2006), where the early experiences form the main point and on them structures are formed, which are the base “of detection and evaluation of each later experience” (Bourdieu, 2002, p. 93). It means that the teachers of teachers are all those individuals that have been included in the teaching process, formal and informal, and not only during the time of studying, but also from a much earlier period, from their first personal experiences in school or class, when they were students. Habitus is a memory that works in the long term, memory that is written in body, language and gestures, the memory that tells us what is right and how to do our job, without questioning or checking. According to Durkheim (1938, in Bourdieu, 2002), in each and every one of us there is yesterday’s man who dominates, “since the present is necessarily insignificant when compared with the long period of the past because of which we have emerged in the form we have today” (Durkheim, 1938, in Bourdieu, 2002, p. 96).

The question for the topic of this paper is What does habitus mean to the practical part of education and how can we use it as a part of education? We know that learning to teach in the process of teacher education is not the same as learning about teaching, in the process of doing it. Practical education and training has, in the developing pedagogical praxis, an extreme meaning for the individual on the journey from the mentored learning to independent experience, when also the gap between the theory and the praxis has to be bridged. This happens in the process of education or to the new teacher, and the problem arises if it is not bridged or sustained (Buchberger et al., 2000). According to Bourdieu (1972, 1977 in Wacquant, 2006) “habitus provides our praxis with connections of all past experiences and it works as a matrix of perception, values and acts”. The past experiences are trying to provide “praxis regularity and their irreversibility in time more reliably than all formal rules and written norms” (Bourdieu, 2002, p. 93), which answers the questions about irreversibility in pedagogical praxis, despite many orientation changes through commitments as policy documents. It is important to understand the double loads against changes, namely that habitus “produces the individual and the collective” (Bourdieu, 2002, p. 93) historical praxis. Collective praxis includes everybody who has the same past experience from the same
source, which is easy to acquire in education, where all generations are included. In this context we could talk about school (class) habitus. A teacher’s habitus emerges in the case of self-teaching praxis.

Transfer and conservation of the ‘right’ praxis is happening very subtly, through speech, gestures, body language (Bourdieu, 2002). Teacher’s habitus is powered and confirmed by common, school habitus, and that is why it insists twice and has ascertainable and certifiable adequacy.

**Findings – Critical Interpretation of Educational Policies with Bourdieu’s Concept of Habitus**

The answer to the research question: *What is the significance of the individual’s habitus and what is the meaning of practical education for good teaching practice?* can be seen in the following explanation.

A teacher’s confrontation with a child triggers the teacher’s habitus. That is why during this event it is very important to reflect from the very beginning of the encounter on what is already best in practical training. For the same reason the value of practical training is confirmed, as a trigger to contribute to the waking up of a teacher’s habitus in the process of his education for a future teacher, before he or she starts to create the real teaching praxis. The new teacher, as a beginner, is usually overloaded with work and often does not pay attention to reflection on what she or he is doing, thinking or feeling. According to habitus, it is very important to reflect from the very beginning. Habitus is embodied in individuals, in their social reality, experience, performance of teaching praxis and has the ability to preserve and restore by interpretation of the meaning of experience and learning in it. Who decides on the teacher’s profession, what kind of habitus the person possesses, what kind of experience this person has, are all very important questions for teacher’s habitus or teacher’s biography, according to Grenfell (2007). This would be a very important source of knowledge on what was exposed.

The key finding is the answer of teachers defining their own lack of knowledge considering the pedagogical work, which is also their biggest problem. The answer is in *the problem of mismatch of school habitus and family habitus of a child* (Bourdieu, 2002). A teacher is in a conflict with it through the child’s behavioral, social and emotional manifestations, which are the opposite of what is expected to be right and that is why they are valued as negative, causing difficulties in class management. Not possessing reflective praxis blocks the pedagogical approach to teaching, while, according to educational policies, a teacher should be seen “as a reflective agent” (European, 2013b, p. 13).

Furthermore, we can understand why pedagogical content knowledge or knowledge is not connected with the subject and content, which is confirmed by the past orientation to subject knowledge. Habitus is stronger than the demands of policies or formal teacher education, which is why changes are difficult to achieve. Habitus
is woken up in an encounter with a child and is confirmed with class habitus – from the teacher’s colleagues where the right praxis is valued. The teaching praxis starts before actions, which are seen in thinking, believing and performance. It is embodied in gestures, look, language and the words we use. Since habitus is very simple to retain, doubt in the possibilities of excellence without reflective praxis is reasonable.

For the reflection on one’s self and self-performance, contact and awareness of self-habitus, the precondition is asking about one’s self, looking into one’s self and into the child’s needs in its messages. This is how we connect pedagogical content knowledge or knowledge with the subject and content. This is another key, because due to the influence of habitus, besides the instructional knowledge (subject knowledge) and knowledge of children’s background, the teacher needs the third component or type of knowledge about self-beliefs and attitudes. This would help to surpass the limitation of the exposed fragmentation.

Document on *Supporting teacher competence development*, with the same address (European, 2013b), opens with the need of teachers to “have critical, evidence-based attitudes to their own practices, grounded in input from different sources” (European, 2013b, p. 11). Teaching requires complex and dynamic combinations of knowledge, skills, understanding, values and attitudes. Their acquisition and development is a career-long endeavor that requires a reflexive, purposeful practice and high quality feedback. There are as many different kinds of teaching as there are teachers; each of these has the potential to be of high quality (European, 2013b, p. 43), but on the other hand, they can create praxis on common habitus, which does not ask a lot of questions.

We found out, from the theory of habitus and analyses of the educational policies, that educational policies (maybe unknowingly) have been trying to change the school’s and teacher’s habitus, where the persistent nature of the preserved habitus is seen in the contextual situation. The documents analyzed in this paper described the contemporary efforts and policies for changing the teaching practices. The review of the selected policy documents, without assessment theory of habitus, at the very least gives an indication that the teaching practice can be a fast changing process. As such, this review confirms that any potential changes to pedagogical teaching practices thought to be simple would in reflection be a misconception.

In the presented traditions in teacher education, and a static rucksack-philosophy (Buchberger et al., 2000), we found the importance of the correlation between habitus and educational policies. In support to habitus, all indicators are harder to measure. According to everything that educational policies have been exposing, for habitus to continue to exist without disturbance it is very important to learn what is, for example, a European teacher. Learning how to think, what to know, feel and how to act as a teacher (Freiman-Nauser, 2008, in European, 2013b) would probably help to make changes, but the question still remains - Is that not the same old, fundamental story about habitus? We cannot avoid asking who a modern teacher is, what her or his task is, what type of knowledge the teacher needs and possesses. What is it that makes the contemporary European teacher? Every teacher, European and other, is required to
meet the challenges of contemporary society, which are numerous. In considering the fundamental question, who is a teacher, I think we cannot answer with European or any other dimension of the teacher. I think the answer should be much easier. The teacher is determined by the kind of knowledge he or she possesses and that is why the appropriate question would be: what kind of knowledge does a teacher need? The teacher profiles need to encompass strong subject matter knowledge and pedagogical skills at the same time. That makes the bridge in front of the exposed problem, where the child is behind the subject and that should not be the case. It seems that the exposed problem is eternal and will remain as such, despite the changes and new goals in teacher education and educational policies. The discrepancy between the two connected areas are still there and it seems it would deepen more and more.

Conclusions

The features of the discussed topic pose more new questions than solutions. According to the facts about habitus, at the end of the paper, the question still remains if the educational policies are the right place for professional standards in teaching? How and where can we address this issue?

The following question is how to manage this potential gap between education and training for competences and the teacher’s practice? What competences are appropriate when theoretical standards and practical demands meet? The competences are not the same as licenses; they need to contribute to changes in understanding, thinking, attitudes, and to break the blockage because of habitus, allowing a professional to become up-to-date. Competences are important for surpassing weaknesses.

Our conclusion is –go back to the state of lack of knowledge, when the situation in the classroom and with the individual is difficult. Regarding habitus for gaining knowledge, the answer is found in awareness, self-work, plus collective memories and experiences.

Through the concept of habitus (Bourdieu, 2002; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2006) we are trying to show its meaning for pedagogical praxis of a teacher. The possibilities to bridge the gap between pedagogical knowledge and subject knowledge in the teacher’s knowledge, skills and competence, lies in the very important field of teacher education - practical training. We agree that teachers cannot teach behind the book and also that praxis without reflection is not enough. So we need to possess the academic content and practical experience. The main point that molds a future teacher, is reflection on them. To get to this stage it seems to be necessary “to develop a coherent knowledge base for teacher education and the teaching profession” (Buchberger et al., 2000, p. 51).

In descriptive policy analyses of teacher education documents (European, 2013b), in the category of personal competences, we found the beginning for improving teachers’ qualifications. These are, first of all, sensitivity, interest, understanding, empathy and then class management with skills and knowledge for pedagogical work with a child. What can we do despite this in teacher education?
Another open question is: is there enough interaction in teacher education between subject teaching, pedagogics and self-beliefs? This is where we see new possibilities for research and improvement of teacher’s practice in the process of practical education. At this point we need to return to the fundamental question - what is a teacher’s mission, what is a teacher’s occupation and what kind of professional esteem do we consider to be necessary for a teacher?

Greater attention should also be paid to the personal competences, among which is also an awareness of the presence of habitus, which would mean that in the practical training during a teacher’s education important steps in surpassing the recognized pedagogical deficits should be taken.

We found out that the concept of habitus and practical training of a teacher are in a confirmed correlation and are the key factors influencing the pedagogical praxis. We have unpleasant feelings about the question if and how the habitus can be bridged. We believe that with practical education and training in teacher education according to a habitus framework, the bridge from personal teaching experience to personal teaching praxis, which needs to be changed, can be done.

The questions such as what is behind, what is in me, what shapes my opinion, my beliefs, my feelings, my responses, my attitudes - are all habitus-related questions. It is very easy to see practical, pedagogical praxis from the habitus perspective (Wacquant, 2006), because inside of it there is a mix of the past, present and future, which are always present in pedagogical praxis. The most difficult task in relation to children and oneself as a teacher is the influence of habitus, and that is why the topic of this paper is very challenging for any teacher.
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Utjecaj habitusa i praktičnog obrazovanja na pedagošku praksu učitelja

Sažetak

Ovaj rad bavi se dihotomijom između poučavanja nastavnih predmeta i obrazovnih znanosti (pedagogije) u kontekstu učiteljskog znanja i njihove nastavne prakse. Prema toj dihotomiji naglasak se stavlja na fragmentaciju sadržaja povezanih s nastavnim predmetom i onih povezanih s nastavnim procesom. Svrha je ovog rada pokazati odnos habitusa i praktičnog obrazovanja na pedagošku nastavnu praksu nastavnika. Rad se posebno usredotočuje na pitanja habitusa, koji se smatra važnijim od formalnih smjernica i preporuka, koje su ili rezultat službenih dokumenata ili učiteljeva formalnog obrazovanja. Pravo mjesto za ispitivanje utjecaja habitusa jest upravo praktična nastava, jer se samo u praksi habitus pokazuje u svim svojim dimenzijama. Ključni rezultati upućuju na problem raskoraka između školskog habitusa i obiteljskog habitusa određenog djeteta. Zbog utjecaja habitusa učitelji moraju usklađivati tri vrste znanja. To su: znanje o nastavi i praksi, znanje o sredini iz koje učenik dolazi i znanje o vlastitim uvjerenjima i stavovima. Veza i interakcija između svih tih vrsta znanja trebala bi pomoći u prevladavanju navedene podjele. Takva interakcija vodi prema novim mogućnostima istraživanja i unapređivanja nastavičke prakse, već i u fazi praktičnog obrazovanja, a također pruža mogućnost izlaska iz okvira jednostavne transformacije učiteljevog vlastitog iskustva u praksu.

Ključne riječi: dihotomija u znanju učitelja; habitus, pedagoška praksa; praktično obrazovanje; učitelj.