

January 1978

Diploma in Education? Rethinking the Curriculum.

A. J. Fielding
University of Wollongong

D. M. Cavanagh
University of Wollongong

R. E. Widdowson
University of Wollongong

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte>



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fielding, A. J., Cavanagh, D. M., & Widdowson, R. E. (1978). Diploma in Education? Rethinking the Curriculum.. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.1978v3n2.1>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol3/iss2/1>

Diploma in Education . . . ? Rethinking the Curriculum*

A.J. Fielding, D.M. Cavanagh and R.E. Widdowson,
University of Wollongong

Introduction

For well over half a century the traditional end-on diploma year has been under fire from university departments, students, and the teaching profession. How is it possible in one year for students to reach adequate levels of knowledge and understanding in a large number of subjects, epistemologically diverse and frequently outside their undergraduate experience? The answer, of course, is that it is not possible — to believe otherwise is to labour under a gross delusion. A university department of education, acting with the best of intentions, cannot give more than cursory attention to even the most essential elements of a preservice programme within an abbreviated academic year.

The logic seems compelling enough. University graduates in physics are not going to become competent educational psychologists or even competent interpreters of educational psychology during the dip. ed. year. No amount of essay writing, seminar discussion and case study analysis will substitute for the knowledge gained over years of teaching experience. A few weeks of practice teaching and the observation of single instances of teaching are no real substitutes for the possession of actual teaching skill. An outline sketch of the history of Western educational philosophy, a glimpse into the secrets of developmental psychology and learning theory and a tentative foray into sociology, educational research and comparative studies are not even remotely adequate to the burgeoning needs of the neophyte for a general and substantive understanding of educational ideas and the nature of the formal experience of education in society.

The foregoing remarks speak of serious shortcomings in one particular approach to preservice teacher preparation. Yet despite the fact that many Australian universities are endeavouring to mitigate them by reconstructing their programmes, the traditional end-on diploma in education still figures as a major approach to the training and education of the teacher within our university system. Ironically, in this period of the nineteen seventies, the one year end-on dip. ed. is being introduced into a number of colleges of advanced education, either as an alternative to concurrent programmes or, in these gloomy economic times, as a patently obvious survival strategy. Perhaps the greatest concern though, is that for reasons of political intransigence (or political insensitivity to the problem), of academic under-prioritizing of the teacher training function within the university, and of restrictive economic

practices of both governments and university administrations, end-on diploma programmes seem certain to be retained by universities far into the foreseeable future. Such programmes are of brief duration and relatively inexpensive. They can be thought of as fourth year level studies by the university (hence having a measure of academic respectability), and the State Department of Education, for its part, can claim that the graduates are effectively 'four-year trained'. This is disturbing enough. Experience has long indicated that one year end-on programmes, including the 'do your own thing' variety, are generally regarded — by students, teachers and self-respecting lecturers — as woefully inadequate means of preparing the novice for teaching and of introducing the student to those bodies of knowledge which bring validity and significance to the practice of education in society. Moreover, the three or four year concurrent university degree combining professional preparation courses with academic study may not be the most suitable alternative approach to the problem of teacher training and education. We will consider the issue of concurrency later in this paper. In all events, it is clear that the one year end-on diploma will continue to serve as a formal credentialling device, and it will continue — at its worst — to achieve little more than this. Within the constraints imposed by these unfortunate realities, it is time for the university to take stock of the situation and to do some imaginative and persuasive curriculum reconstruction.

We have five objectives in writing this paper. Firstly, six questions are put forward which we think capture much of the essence of the problem under inquiry. Our intention in raising them is to provide ourselves with directions for making rational decisions about such concerns as the content, structure and duration of the preservice curriculum. Secondly, we select seven assumptions related to the idea of 'the teacher' and the nature of the activity of teaching in our society. We do this in order to establish valid and educationally defensible grounds on which to base those curricular decisions eventually taken. Thirdly, we consider the strengths and weaknesses of concurrent education studies in order to contrast the merits of concurrent programmes with those distinguishable as consecutive ones. For reasons we try to make clear, we come out in favour of the consecutive mode of curricular design. Fourthly, we outline proposals for a four-phase consecutive programme of teacher training and education, suggesting a curriculum which emphasises the university role in several aspects but which sees the overall scheme as an enterprise sponsored jointly by the university, the practising profession and related agencies and organizations. In the continuing education phase (phase 4) we see an important role for the college of advanced education (and/or the teachers college) and, potentially, for the technical college as well. Although the preservice components of the curriculum (phases 1-3) require five years for completion we have given due attention to the economic problems involved, realising that the cost of the programme must conform with current levels of spending if it is to have any real chance of implementation. Finally, a number of recommendations for corresponding modifications in certain key aspects of professional practice are made. We believe that these modifications will be professionally and organizationally acceptable both to senior administrators and to teachers.

* A somewhat longer version of this paper first appeared in, Fielding, A.J., D.M. Cavanagh and R.E. Widdowson (Eds.), *Teacher Training: Anticlimax to Education*, Wollongong: University of Wollongong, 1977.

1. *Educational Knowledge:*

What kind of programme would provide the student with an opportunity to acquire substantive understanding of educational knowledge *prior* to first appointment?

2. *Theory and Practice:*

Is there a curricular approach which does not emphasize the importance of theory at the cost of reducing the importance and the *experience* of practice (and vice versa)?

3. *Role transition and Professional Initiation:*

Is there a curricular approach which would accommodate itself to the role transition and professional initiation needs of students?

4. *Practitioner Skills:*

What kind of curriculum would enable the beginning teacher to enter his first full-time position with an adequate repertoire of interpersonal skills, teaching techniques, instructional strategies, organizational skills and understandings of syllabus contents, structure, and appropriate learning activities?

5. *Continuing Education and Professional Development:*

What kinds of curricular experiences might draw the student's attention to his needs for continuing education and professional development following completion of the preservice programme?

6. *Educational Ideals and Economic Realities:*

Is it possible to design and implement a preservice curriculum (a) which takes cognizance of the foregoing questions, and (b) which does not require more than marginal variations in cost?

Assumptions about the teacher and the nature of teaching

In its formal, institutionalized sense, teaching is an intervention into the lives of children, profoundly affecting the development of their personalities. Moreover, institutionalized education has become cemented into our way of life to the extent that the general population no longer questions the merits of sending children to school, accepting that attendance at school is part of the natural social order. It seems clear also that the normative viewpoint is to see schools as places for children and adolescents, rather than for adults. Correspondingly, there is a widespread predilection among the lay public to under-value (or at least to underestimate the impact of) education as a societal phenomenon influencing the nature, form and structure of adult experience — partly, we think, because the educational process involves clients who are neither legally nor intellectually involved in the socio-political processes of the adult world. For the most part, theirs is a world of preparation and initiation, not of responsibility and participation. It is our observation that, as a society, we seem to hold markedly pejorative views about the nature and importance of the child and childhood, especially in relation to concepts such as citizen-

ship, responsibility, rights, privileges, freedom and autonomy. In seeking to explain this, we are forced to the conclusion that the Australian social experience is predominantly patriarchal in terms of power structures both in family and public life, and male-dominated in terms of sexual mores and intra-societal patterns of human relationships. In short, women in Australia act as the adjuncts of men, occupying subordinate rank in private and public power structures and especially in institutionalized hierarchies such as school systems and government public services. Since childhood is that phase of life controlled by women (or women substitutes), the child as object is defined in relation to the secondary and inferior social status of women rather than to the primary and superior status of men. Thus, when a society models itself primarily in terms of 'maleness' and the father-figure, rather than integrating these with the complementary and, arguably, equally significant human factors of 'femaleness' and the mother-figure, one might expect, proportionately, that children — especially female children — and adolescents, to a lesser extent, will be relegated to positions of least importance and influence within the social structure.

For their part, teachers work in a pre-adult world. Teaching is therefore a 'soft' occupation; it is carried out in an environment co-extensive with the environment of home and mother. Because of this, the formal role of teacher is socially undervalued — in the extreme case, socially denigrated — and by extension it tends to be construed as a relatively low status and innocuous social role. If our conjectures are accurate, they provide partial explanation for the fact that we have given little analytical and empirical attention in this country to the task of defining the concepts 'teacher' and 'teaching' in relation to the theory and the practice of education in society. If the models of teacher and child presented above are valid descriptions of a normative world-view, this state of affairs is not difficult to understand. In a country which upholds the principle of education for all its people, teachers and children, paradoxically, simply do not carry a sufficiently high priority in the societal scheme of things. In the world of children and adolescents however, teachers do possess power and authority. Thus, children in schools, by virtue of their diminutive social status, are potentially vulnerable to psychological if not physical harm, since, for the large part, they are the recipients of an exercise in power which is far more absolute — because it is exerted on the least powerful and influential members of society — than that which is exercised by the most powerful politician or bureaucrat in adult affairs. The consequence of this for the child is that he will experience a humanitarian quality of life in the classroom to the degree that the individual teacher approaches the exercise of power with maturity, justice and compassion.

Fortunately, however, we think there is one widespread characteristic among those who choose teaching as a career, which serves to counter much of the risk of child abuse suggested by the foregoing analysis. We think that a gross determining factor predisposing many young adults to a career in teaching is a desire to work in an environment which allows an integration of professional practice with a generalized commitment to caring for and nurturing children. It is a psychodynamic factor which appears as an integration of

'malesness' and 'femaleness' characteristics into personality.* Typically, people in this group hold benevolent attitudes towards children. They express a desire to work with children or to guide adolescents in their development, and they have a belief in the importance and social significance of the childhood and adolescent phases of life which seems strikingly at odds with evident societal norms.

All the same, the possession of warm and loving attitudes towards children and (as our experience strongly indicates) a not infrequent underlying passion to become a crusading educator, do not of themselves carry the assurance that they will continue to be the predominant motivating influence when the novice is confronted by the realities of school and classrooms. Most pertinent-ly, if the neophyte enters the work world of the teacher with inadequate training and incomplete socialization into the professional role (that is, before he has come to terms psychologically with the demands placed on the teacher in the school) he will be presented with compelling arguments — by virtue of his experience — which contradict his idealized models of child and teacher. In the most impressionable and questing years of his professional career, the novice teacher may well find that his idealism is threatened by an incipient and professionally debilitating cynicism. Moreover, the problem is greatly compounded if the novice completes the formative years of his career with inadequate or indifferent professional and administrative support, especially in reference to the managerial, instructional and organizational requirements of classroom practice. In the extreme, the young teacher may be unable to conquer those influences, internal and external, which urge him to reorganize his ideal models in the direction of the pejorative models described earlier in this paper.

The foregoing and incomplete exploration of some of the value-norms which might underpin preferred societal models of 'teacher' and 'the nature of the activity of teaching in society' ultimately relates to the form and quality of programmes of teacher preparation varyingly approved, tolerated or denigrated by society. We cannot know the total spectrum of value-norms, nor the complete set of relations between them. In order to effect some understanding of social phenomena we invent normative-ideals or artificial models of what we think society either is like or ought to be like in its organizational character. Within the contexts of these models we then invent 'ideal-type' sub-organizational (intra-societal) units. Each unit is a sub-system of the ideal-type social system. At the same time, each unit is an abstract and simple account of what is, in reality, a complex and confusing array of objects, processes, interactions, and relationships. By inventing conceptualizations of ideal-type units of societal organization, we enforce the attributes of order and — to use another of Max Weber's concepts — 'artificial simplicity' on to a

* In observing some six preservice teacher intakes in dip. ed. type programmes, the authors have detected little evidence of latent or manifest power-seeking as a determining factor of the career choice. An occasional case does arise where the student needs to be counselled out of the preservice programme for one or more of a variety of reasons. There is, though, the worry that in due course some students will 'discover' a latent tendency to pathologically enjoy the exercise of power over children and adolescents in schools, or to use power indiscriminately as a means of compensating for an otherwise unsatisfying career experience.

world which otherwise would be beyond comprehension and analytical understanding. Such is the probable nature of sociological inquiry and method. One of these intra-societal units is under inquiry in this paper — the teacher training and education unit. In order to provide ourselves with an artificially simple account of this unit and one, therefore, which might enable us to generate workable possibilities for eventual social action we require a set of assumptions which separate the concepts 'teacher' and 'teaching' from the complex and confused societal background. We need a sociological model of these concepts and their inter-connections, accepting that the model is only one of a possible array of equally valid and reliable models. The choice must be made, however, despite the fact that it will expose a corresponding set of value-biases.

Assumptions

1. Teaching in its formal, societal aspects is an intentional activity. The primary intention of teaching is to provide children with access to a range of desirable experiences through which they may gain increased levels of knowledge and understanding about themselves, and about the nature of human existence, in order that they may achieve full, intimate, and participatory membership in the condition of being human. The criterion of desirability is usually applied to the task of identifying experiences which are thought to possess intrinsic and/or instrumental educational value. In school systems, teachers engage in teaching with the intention of providing other people (children, adolescents, adults, pupils, students, scholars, etc.) with access to desirable (educational) experiences.

2. Because teaching is a human activity of serious, permanent social and personal consequence to young people, teachers are people who possess balanced, healthy, mature, and humanitarian attitudes towards themselves and other human beings.

3. Teaching is an active, culturally-oriented art form, a developed and developing craft, and — in its specific twentieth century aspects — an applied social science. As an artist and craftsman a teacher will have acquired knowledge, understanding and practitioner-skill of and within a range of disciplines and subject matters and he will have interiorised the cultural value and meaning of these in the context of both professional and general social conduct and experience. As an applied social scientist the teacher will select and apply in schools a range of educational technologies and their associated methods. Thus, teaching is an expression in practice of acquired skills, abilities, methods, and cultural perspectives, especially in relation to the transmission of information, the communication of ideas, the imparting of knowledge, the organization and humanitarian management of educational environments, the participation in human interaction with youngsters, the fostering of healthy and substantive human relationships, and the art of arousing the enthusiasm of others for learning and knowledge so that ultimately they are enabled to continue their own education without the formal intervention of the teacher.

4. The person as teacher will be confident and assured in his interpersonal skills. He will have achieved, and be continuing to achieve, self-knowledge — knowledge of his strengths, weaknesses, and dispositions — to think and act in certain idiosyncratic ways — sufficient to the task of subordinating his own personal needs, from time to time, to the needs of others. In the psychosocial context of educational practice, the teacher's task is to devote ungrudgingly substantial proportions of energy and effort in facilitating the development of other personalities.

5. Teaching is an experimental and exploratory activity. It is a search to uncover the nature, structure, and extent of human experience and relationships, and to understand the complexities, nuances, spontaneities, consistencies, and singularities of the human interactional event. Through experimentation and exploration, teaching serves as a bridge linking people with people, and people with knowledge, and its goal is to facilitate an intimate act of communication between the learner and knowledge not yet acquired.

6. As an adult with professional, social, moral, and legal responsibilities and powers, the teacher stands as a 'model person' before his pupils, his peer group and his community. This model may, of course, represent varying degrees of acceptability, desirability and authenticity to those who put it under scrutiny.

7. In its form as an 'abstract concept', the idea of 'teacher' signifies a Weberian 'ideal type'. We have employed 'ideal type' thinking in our derivation of these assumptions to assist us, methodologically and analytically, in the task of deducing that pattern and style of preservice curriculum which most clearly approximates the 'ideal type' in concept and in experience in its effects on students aspiring to become teachers (cf. Weber, 1949, 1964, 1972).

The Issue of Concurrency

Concurrency of academic study and professional preparation is a programme style which in certain essential aspects is superior to the traditional B.A./B.Sc. Dip. Ed., or '3 + 1' consecutive programme. By extending the period of time over which the student is initiated into the teacher role, concurrent programmes may facilitate professional socialization *prior* to first appointment. The lengthier period of time available for preparation (three or four years) also promotes the study of educational knowledge to a level of understanding which is hardly possible within a truncated dip. ed. year. Moreover, if the programme includes an extended period of internship, experienced by the student in a school-based environment offering professional and administrative support and guidance, there is opportunity for him both to acquire professional skills and practitioner self confidence and to consolidate these into a framework of practice which is adequate to the requirements of classroom teaching. However, the concurrent programme suffers from a number of shortcomings which the authors think weaken its overall effectiveness as a preservice curricular approach. Also, we think it might be possible to combine the programmatic strengths of traditional concurrent and consecutive approaches by designing a curriculum which is consecutive in time and structure but which is concurrent in terms of its educational and profes-

sional impact on the student. Before outlining our proposed curriculum, a number of the more critical shortcomings of the standard concurrent approach should be identified.

1. Specialization and Early Commitment

Concurrent programmes lead to the award of specialized, practitioner-oriented degrees. Thus, they require students to make an early commitment to a teaching career. Also, they pre-empt transfer into other fields and professions upon graduation. Even if the first year of the programme is designed in common with the first year of a general degree in arts or science, the extent of commitment demanded towards the end or immediately subsequent to completion of the first year begins to lock the student into an increasingly irrevocable career choice. While many beginning university students are quite sure that they are suited to a teaching career very many others who elect to take a concurrent programme are not. Moreover, by electing to take an academically and professionally restrictive programme, the student is denied much of the value generally associated with the university experience. Whereas undergraduate studies are expected to offer an intellectually 'liberating' and 'broadening' experience to students, specialized degrees confine them to the experience of a narrow range of vocationally-biased and educationally restricted studies. Similarly, because they are directed towards eventual professional practice, concurrent programmes emphasize extrinsic and instrumental goals at the expense of goals which relate more directly to the intrinsic educational and developmental needs of students.

It seems to us that the general educational potential inherent in the undergraduate degree should not be compromised by the inclusion of professional preparation courses. Rather, we think that the undergraduate degree, in its undiluted form, should be regarded as the first — academic/educational — phase of the teacher's preparation. While completing his undergraduate studies the student can choose to commit himself to a teaching career, but we think that he should be permitted to make this choice freely and independently of the parent institution. Moreover, if he wishes, he can investigate the nature of teaching both as a formal social activity and as a potentially satisfying career for himself *while* he is pursuing his undergraduate studies — he has ample time to do this during university vacations — and it would take little time and effort on the part of the university and the school system to facilitate this through collaborative action. However, to insist on an early commitment to teaching puts the student into a 'forced choice' situation, a practice which we think is antagonistic to the university's educational purposes. A more educationally defensible approach is to allow the student to regard teaching as *one* of a number of possible career options available to him after he has completed his undergraduate education.

2. Curricular Limitations of School and University

Compounding the problem of early commitment is the fact that the curricula of both secondary school and university undergraduate programmes emphasize academic specialization. In order to gain a place in the university, the secondary school student is virtually obliged to take an academically

specialized programme of studies in his final years at school. Likewise, the normative practice in universities is to expect students to specialize in one or two subjects in order to qualify for a degree. The consequence of this for the student is that during the period comprising his last two years at secondary school and his first three years at the university he is funnelled into a narrow band of subjects before he is even aware of the full range of knowledge-contents available for study. Moreover, if he elects to take a concurrent preservice degree, not only will he be obliged to specialize in his academic programme, he will also find himself specializing in professional training subjects as well. These constraining aspects of academic and professional specialization within the format of the undergraduate degree seem to be at odds with the desirability of having teachers in schools who possess a broadly based, culturally enlightened, and academically substantive educational background *before* they enter full-time service.

3. *Integration Problems*

By and large, concurrent programmes attempt to integrate academic and professional preparation by the parallel study, development and practice of disciplinary-based knowledge, educationally-centred knowledge and practitioner-related skills, abilities, and strategies. For example, students might study the Piagetian stage/phase theory of intellectual development and follow this up by classroom observation of the behaviour of children. The object of these observational exercises might be to attain understanding of the relation between dominant modes of intellectual functioning at particular stages of development and the actual patterns of learning behaviour manifested by individual children in the classroom setting. So far so good. If it were merely a question of observing instances of behaviour in order to grasp the essential meaning of the theory, all would be well. Students would be engaged in a pattern of integrated learning activity which is very familiar to them. The activity eminently suits their well developed student role. It is part of a well established, role-related family of experiences which requires the individual to participate in his personal programme of learning. However, there is a vast difference in principle between the 'integration phenomenon' of experiencing an intellectual understanding of the behaviour of real children in real classrooms (as a consequence of classifying observed behaviours of children into categories, which then may be explained, linked together, and made intelligible by theory) and the different order of the 'integration phenomenon' which is the joining of this understanding to the experience of 'being a teacher' and of actually supervising and guiding the behaviour of others in the classroom (cf. Jackson, 1968). The former and less complex integration task (hereafter referred to as Integration 1) does not require the exercise of teaching skill, of organizational and managerial abilities, of leadership and adult responsibility, or of professional conduct guided by a code of ethics and monitored by a set of administrative rules and procedures. *It does not require a transformation of role.* Rather it is only when the student attempts to 'become' the teacher that these factors related to the teacher role begin to evoke an awareness in him that some new form of integration is required (hereafter referred to as Integration 2). This new integration phenomenon is one which pervades all aspects of personality; it focuses in on the entire 'per-

son' of the student, not only on his intellectual status and his dominating student-related experiences. In order to come to terms with integration 2, the student needs to recognize that he is deficient in certain categories of knowledge and experience, especially those which will facilitate the professional role transition process, and he needs to discover and establish a working set of new hypotheses about himself, his relationship to those who are to become his clients and colleagues, and about those unfamiliar skills and abilities which he now discerns he will need in order to become a practising teacher. Whereas previously he possessed the self-knowledge that he is a competent student and person, he now begins to doubt the adequacy of himself as one who is to form the crucial mediating link between pupils and learning. The initial confrontation with the demands of integration 2 are experienced by the student (with individually varying degrees of intensity) as a series of self-concerns (cf. Fuller, 1969; Fuller and Bown, 1974). The popular version of these self-concerns speaks of the student's need to survive his first experiences of classroom teaching. 'Survival' in this context clearly relates to the student's self-perception that he is in some serious way inadequately prepared — psychologically and technically — to engage in teaching. The only way that the student will resolve this self-concern will be by carrying out some teaching in the classroom — teaching moreover which *he* believes was successful quite apart from any encouraging remarks made by the supervising teacher or university lecturer. When he has attained the knowledge that he has in fact carried out some successful teaching, the student will be beginning to come to terms with the needs of integration 2. In short, integration 2 is dependent upon the student's acquisition of practitioner and personality-centred competencies and the demonstration in practice that these competencies are adequate to the requirements of classroom teaching. In dealing with the requirements of integration 2, the student must effectively reconstruct his concept of himself in such a way that he accepts the role of teacher as an authentic and internally consistent state of his person. He must *be* a teacher in appropriate situations; e.g., in the classroom of the school, not merely someone who is purporting to be, or preparing to be, a teacher.

There is a third type of integration phenomenon — integration 3. It is connected with the proliferation of role-states which are subsumed under the generalized role of teacher in society. A small sample of role-states of the teacher includes the following: tutor, instructor, counsellor, manager, organizer, coach, leader, responsible adult, professional practitioner, parent substitute, citizen, diagnostician, community representative, supervisor, guide, mentor, first-aid attendant, referee, arbiter . . . and so on. Quite clearly, in order to experience and become familiar with this plethora of role-states, the novice teacher will need a lengthy period of apprenticeship *subsequent* to completion of training. Likewise, if he is to begin his teaching career with some degree of acquired skill and professional competency he will need an extended period of internship during the preservice programme. While the young teacher is attaining integration 1 (during the undergraduate degree period), and while he is attaining integration 2 (during his internship period and into the years of his full-time apprenticeship in the school) he will be moving towards a state which we term integration 3. In due course, the young teacher will learn — and internalize this learning — that the actual activity of

formally teaching children in classrooms is only part of the teacher role in society. This internalized knowledge of the wider scope and significance of the teacher role — indeed, of the understanding that the teacher is or should be the primary facilitator of the educational effort in society — comprises the content of integration 3.

In our judgment, the underlying assumption of the standard three or four year concurrent programme of teacher training and education is that it is possible to account for the three types of integration referred to above within a curricular framework of parallel academic and professional studies and practical experiences. If the components of the programme are structurally integrated, the rationale follows that the student will experience a similar integration as he moves through the programme. Thus, programmatically structured integration becomes transformed into an internalized, personal awareness of professional and academic integration in the experience of the student.*

The authors disagree with the foregoing arguments. Our position is that 'integration' fundamentally is a complex, developmental concern of the student. Moreover, we think that rather than being a simple concomitant of experiencing a concurrent programme, the process of integrating knowledge, experience and skill according to a developmental sequence of integration phenomena is best facilitated by a programme which relates each integration process with an appropriate phase of a consecutively organized curriculum. Indeed, if the developmental argument is the correct one — and there is a growing body of research evidence from overseas which suggests that it is (cf. Iannaccone, 1963; Fuller, 1969; Katz, 1972; Fuller & Bown, 1974) — there are strong empirical grounds for questioning the validity of the concurrent approach to teacher training and education. For example, in discussing the concerns of preservice students as a developmental conceptualization, Fuller (1969, p.223) goes so far as to suggest that, "Education students may need to teach before enrolling in even a first education course." Fuller also remarks that, "After concern with pupils appears" (a concern we would associate with the late stages of integration 2), "then instructional design, psychology and other education courses may seem more relevant." In other words, when the student begins to direct his attention to the needs of pupils it is reasonable to infer (a) that he has overcome a substantial part of his anxiety that he might prove inadequate as a person and a teacher (b) that he has internalized the role of teacher, and (c) that he has reached some degree of psychological harmony with the demands of the role. At this stage in his development the

* We are not denying that this may well be the experience of some if not many students. After all, intelligent, perceptive, and committed young adults will make strenuous efforts to accommodate themselves to the demands of a structurally integrated programme. Unfortunately, the only yardstick against which the merits or the deficiencies of concurrent programmes may be measured with any degree of empirical confidence is that of the bachelor degree plus a one year diploma in education programme. As a teacher training format, the traditional versions of the diploma in education are manifestly inferior to the quality of training offered within a concurrent approach. Ironically, however, the fact that the '3 + 1' programme preserves the integrity of the undergraduate degree as a general educational experience is often overlooked when comparisons are made in respect of the training aspect. We have already suggested that this integrity is put at some risk within the concurrent programme mode.

student is more likely to approach educational knowledge and practitioner training with enthusiasm that was lacking before. These ideas reflect a developmental sequence of events in the experience of the preparing teacher and strongly suggest the appropriateness of a consecutive programme mode.

On the other hand, present day consecutive programmes; i.e., those requiring a pass or honours undergraduate degree followed by a one year diploma in education, are probably less effective in facilitating teacher development than concurrent programmes. The simple and compelling argument against the established consecutive approach is that during the diploma phase, the study of foundational knowledge of education (psychology, sociology, philosophy, history and educational theory), the study of professionally related subjects (teaching methods, instructional planning, specialist electives) and school observation and teaching practice are compressed into a single academic year; i.e., a period of approximately nine months in most universities. The student, having recently graduated from a relatively protracted three or four year programme of undergraduate studies finds himself completely disoriented by these absurd demands. Suddenly he seems to be attempting to do in one year that which he quickly (and accurately) realizes would hardly be possible in two or three years. It is as though he has entered a long distance running event but finds that while he is under starter's orders he is expected to produce a time that would win him the gold medal in the Olympic hundred metres. Neither he nor the Education Department staff can sustain this frantic pace. After the first few weeks, both resign themselves once more to the simple fact that there just isn't enough time for it all; enthusiasm gives way to despondency; the keen edge of commitment and anticipation is blunted on the heartwood of academic expediency; students commiserate with students, staff with staff; and before autumn is over all look forward longingly to the summer holidays.

4. *Training and Education — Conflicts and Confusions*

In our judgment, universities tend to be indifferently successful as teacher training institutions. This is due partly, we think, to the fact that universities characteristically and understandably give low priority to any activity, such as teacher training, which is believed to be of inferior academic status. The business of training teachers meshes uneasily with the traditionally valued roles and functions of Australian universities. In one very important sense this is fair enough. Universities carry an obligation to society to uphold the highest traditions of scholarly excellence and integrity in their teaching programmes and research activities. Moreover, this obligation is often interpreted by the university as an intrinsic attribute of the nature of the university as an institution, setting it apart from other institutions, endowing it with its own distinctive educational character and providing the necessary justifications for its continued existence.

Unfortunately, this heightened sense of academic responsibility combined with the fact that the university's academic staff have completed a lengthy and successful initiation into the academically-biased world view of the university community, tends to create a distorted perspective of the nature of the training experience and its linkages with academic preparation and research. This distortion of view seems to appear as a confused belief that the

training needs of teachers can (and should) be satisfied in an academic environment, with the content of the courses drawn from legitimated areas of university study. The strongest evidence that this is so comes from an observation and analysis of the decision-making behaviour of the university's various academic boards. When presenting course proposals to these boards, departments offering professionally-oriented programmes are virtually forced to prove that their training courses are not training courses at all, but are, in fact, tightly organized pieces of disciplinary knowledge. This creates enormous confusion and conflict within these departments and in due course the negative consequences of this distorted perspective are transmitted to and suffered by the students themselves.

Not only is there institutionally-related confusion and conflict in this kind of thinking, there is a sizable measure of epistemological error and ambiguity as well (cf. Chipman, 1977). The training experience is seen as a low priority and trivial instance of knowledge — perhaps more specifically as an aspect of knowledge made suspect because of its apparent lack of substantive content. It would appear that in the university's typology of epistemological states, the highest position is accorded to those states of 'knowing that' and 'knowing how' (Ryle, 1968, chapter 2) at the highest levels of abstraction and in the realm of the most generalizable theoretical statement (Symes, "Introduction"—). On the other hand, those 'knowing that' and 'knowing how' states of knowledge relating to practitioner skills, competencies, and understandings of the technological environment of school teaching are accorded the lowest position in the university typology (Symes, "Introduction"). In the catalogue of academic priorities practitioner training — as distinct from 'intellectual' training — sits in relation to academic preparation as perhaps does bicycle riding to the physics of particle dynamics. Learning how to ride a bicycle does not require a university education, whereas learning about particle dynamics — to some desirable level of advanced conceptual understanding — does. Similarly, learning how to write legibly and horizontally on a blackboard has no justifiable place in a university degree, whereas learning about the theory of human communication is clearly worth a unit or two in a teacher education programme.

However, practitioner training may require intellectual training as an accompaniment. This is clearly shown by Gilbert Ryle, who distinguishes between 'habits' and 'intelligent capacities'. It is in this distinction that some understanding of the meaning of the problem of epistemological ambiguity resides. Ryle (1968, p.42) argues that:

We build up habits by drill, but we build up intelligent capacities by training. Drill (or conditioning) consists in the imposition of repetitions . . . (This is the way) the child learns the alphabet and the multiplication tables . . . The practices are not learned until the pupil's responses to his cues are automatic . . . Training, on the other hand, though it embodies plenty of sheer drill, does not consist of drill. It involves the stimulation by criticism and example of the pupil's own judgment. He learns to do things thinking what he is doing, so that every operation performed is itself a new lesson to him how to perform better . . . Drill dispenses with intelligence, training develops it.

When the university confuses the inculcation of practitioner-type habits with practitioner training in related intelligent capacities it does violence to its charter as an institution of learning. For example, learning the skill of composing sentences in keeping with the vocabulary and grammatical competencies of nine year old children is an aspect of training which involves a highly developed, intelligent capacity; it demands a heightened sensitivity and knowledge of the intellectual capacities and dispositions to learn of nine year old children. It also requires a knowledge of and competency in the craftsmanship of writing. Quite clearly, students cannot be 'drilled' in this intelligent capacity; they need training. On the surface of it, learning to write sentences appropriate to the level of language development of nine year olds, might seem to be an activity far too trivial in its intellectual demands to be dealt with in a university programme. With the aid of a more penetrating analysis of the nature of this practitioner skill, the opposite conclusion might emerge.

A second aspect of the epistemological problem is this: Universities, or perhaps more appositely, university lecturers, may themselves be conditioned to valuing only certain narrow manifestations of epistemological sensitivity. Many practising teachers are aware of this, we believe, and in due course, so too are many student teachers. The obvious explanation of this lies in the fact of disciplinary specialization as the route to be taken in becoming a university academic in the first place. The other and more generally applicable explanation is linked with the university's expressed purpose of facilitating the intellectual education of students. The conservative and (we think) prevailingly normative value-position of the university is to identify intellectual education with the achievement of states of knowledge in one or two (respectable) areas of knowledge. Academic respectability is attached to the university's hardest form of currency — the cognate disciplines, or those derivative sources of knowledge which possess definable epistemological boundaries. These claim as the grounds on which their territorial rights are legitimated the presence of such attributes as a discrete body of knowledge, a professional literature which is alive and well in the present and which demonstrates the existence of an ongoing dialogue within a self-governing and self-accrediting professional peer group, a unique and disciplinary centred research methodology and accompanying research activity, an internally consistent and systematically organized theory or group of theories, and, last but not least, an extant community of disciplinary adherents ranging in authority, prestige and ascribed kudos from the insignificant masses of tyros (e.g., first year university students) to the meagrely populated but celebrated rank of professor. In aspiring to join the ranks of a disciplinary community, one must demonstrate familiarity with the scholarly basis of the discipline — one must pay homage at the court of intellectually oriented knowledge. In the particular manifestation of the industrial complex of knowledge which is the university, the education of the mind reigns supreme; on coming to the university the student must, as it were, expect to be educated from the neck up; therein lies the focus of the intellect. In virtue of its institutional nature the university seems to drive relentlessly in the direction of a blinkered epistemological vision.

A third aspect of the problem is the low priority status assigned to teaching activity in the university. Teacher training, rather than being valued as a potential means of increasing one's intelligent capacities is seen as an unnecessary requirement for the academic who is appointed, in all events, to do some teaching. Again the confusion between training and (intellectual) education is evident. Teachers are not trained (in the sense of developing practitioner competencies) they are created, so to speak, as a consequence of acquiring knowledge based on the cognate disciplines. Within the ethos of the university, the axiom is that it is knowledge rather than training which makes the teacher. Skills of a purely technical or practitioner variety are epistemologically inferior — they do not qualify one to become a member of any self-respecting disciplinary community.

Finally, what about lecturers in education themselves? In our judgment (having had experience as students and staff members in five different universities), lecturers in education — including ourselves — tend to differ only marginally from lecturers in other departments and faculties in respect of their institutional perception of role. That is to say, they see themselves not as trainers of teachers but, rather, as leaders in a disciplinary-based discourse with students. No doubt, for the very large part, this is how it should be. However, the fact remains that the burgeoning needs of students, soon to be practising teachers in schools, are resolved only fractionally by this continuance of the preferred concept of the university experience; in fact, if these needs are ignored or circumvented by the university, the preservice student is precipitated into states of heightened frustration and anxiety over his chances of developing even marginally adequate teaching competency prior to being thrown into the arena of the classroom. Novice teachers, awaiting their first tour of duty in the trenches, as it were, can stand only just so much platonic dialogue 'about' teaching.

The standard methods employed as the means of reducing the incidence and onset of these lurking neuroses are the following: Within the traditional diploma in education format, universities offer the student the little more than palliative treatment of a few weeks of practice teaching. In concurrent approaches, some universities try for a closer approximation of the extended internship, either sending students to schools for an uninterrupted couple of months of practice teaching, or interspersing continuous weekly school visits (one or two days per week) with ongoing university studies and arranging this to culminate in several weeks of practice teaching. In either case, it is undeniable that the student needs to come into contact with real children in real classrooms, and that he must reach a point where he can manage the classroom unaided or unsupervised by an experienced teacher or lecturer. No amount of university-based dialogue or simulated teaching activity can substitute for the foregoing experiences. Indeed, and this is not easily admitted by education lecturers, very much that goes under the name of 'simulated teaching', — micro-teaching, interactional laboratories and the like — actually is experimental, research oriented, and carefully controlled activity

which is untested in average classroom conditions. While much of this is certainly helpful and may occasionally enable students to perceive personal weaknesses in such areas as voice projection and teaching style, it is at best only a dilettantish rehearsal and thinly veiled specious substitute for a more complex, pervasive, and demanding role. Moreover, it is almost always at odds with prevailing norms and standards of practice in the school system at large and, in so being, it may well provoke further anger, frustration, and despondency among students when they encounter teaching as it actually is in the average (uncontrived) situation.

In the proposed alternative curriculum of teacher training and education which is outlined below, one of our guiding premises is that there must be some rationalization of roles and functions of the various institutions connected either directly or indirectly with the preservice and inservice training and education of the teacher, and that a crucial aspect of this rationalization is the need to allocate roles and functions according to the varying kinds and levels of competencies and resources possessed by each contributing institution. Within the logic of this kind of thinking, due attention is more likely to be given to the unique characteristics of each institution, thus giving promise that these uniquenesses will be seen as parts of an interacting whole. Furthermore, greater assurance should follow that institutional competition might give way to co-operation, thus reducing resource duplication and duplication of human effort, and eliminating, therefore, much of the economic wastage which accompanies these undesirable situations. The essential thrust of the following proposals is that teacher training and education is properly a collaborative and co-operative enterprise between individuals, groups, professional bodies, and institutions in society.

*Proposals for a Four Phase Consecutive Programme of Teacher Training and Education**

Phase 1 — Undergraduate Studies

As a general educational principle, it is proposed that *all* teachers should possess an undergraduate degree. We see undergraduate studies as comprising an essential and fundamental part of the teacher's educational preparation. Moreover, the quality of undergraduate studies, especially in the aspect of scholarly excellence, should not be compromised by substituting practitioner training or professional studies courses for those which serve to introduce the student to the significant bodies of knowledge and forms of intellectual experience commonly referred to as the cognate disciplines.

On the other hand, the selection of a given programme of undergraduate studies should be left very largely to the discretion of the student who, in all events, will be guided by the requirements of approved programmes offered

* The proposals are purposely open-ended in concept. Within the logic of the design a wide variety of alternative programme structures could be envisaged. Our aim is to suggest a flexible planning structure which is compatible with existing and proposed undergraduate curricula in universities and with approaches to the teaching of foundational knowledge in university faculties and departments of education.

by the university. Also, we offer no prescriptions about the form and structure of the university curriculum. This is a matter for the individual university. It is also one which continues — in respect of all levels of education — to be debated among philosophers, educationists, and others with great vigour and great difference of opinion. It is an issue, in fact, which sits at the frontier of educational research (cf. Elam, 1964; Hirst, 1974; Oakeshott, 1962; Phenix, 1968; 'Report of the Harvard Committee', 1946; Whitfield, 1971). Notwithstanding these epistemological uncertainties, we think that the university experience, in holistic terms, represents a unique curriculum in itself, embodying a potential for human development of a kind which is unavailable elsewhere. Part of this generalized curricular experience is the aspect of informal social education which, in the ideal case, integrates with formal academic studies to generate heightened levels of self-awareness, social poise and self-confidence, developed critical faculties and a questioning attitude towards any form of dogmatism, unsupported opinion and propaganda. Potentially, undergraduate studies offer the young adult the best means of attaining integration 1; i.e., of engaging in that process which results in personally acquired knowledge in depth and breadth in a number of substantive areas of study and which leads the student to states of understanding of himself and of his relationship to others and to society. The importance of integration 1 to the student is that it signals completion of a personally significant part of his intellectual and social education, readying him for a career choice and allowing him, because he has not committed himself to an irrevocable career choice, to keep his options open while he is attempting to come to terms with knowledge — knowledge moreover which, until it is acquired (internalized and integrated with personality), cannot be employed in decision-making or in the critical self-assessment of career suitability.

Phase 2 — The Teaching Internship

Following completion of his undergraduate education it is proposed that the student spends one year as an interning teacher in a school. The internship requirement is linked with our concept of integration 2; i.e., the process through which the student reorients himself towards a novel, professional and socially responsible adult role. However, this reorientation is now built on the foundation of integration 1; i.e., the student employs his resources of knowledge and understanding, together with the acquired social and intellectual powers which comprise the content of these resources in personality, in the more complex and widesweeping task of 'being a teacher' and of facilitating the educational development of others. We think that one year of internship is a minimum amount of time in which to effect this kind of professional development. A lengthy and real world experience of teaching is the best means, we believe, of dealing with the issues of professional socialization and practitioner training. Because it follows completion of undergraduate studies, it permits the student to concentrate unambivalently on the task of adjusting and accommodating to the demands of the teacher role, and perhaps more pertinently, on the task of assessing realistically the suitability to himself of a long-term career in teaching.

Secondly, it is proposed that the basic internship unit be comprised of a 'master teacher' and two interns. The role of the master teacher is nothing less than to facilitate the integration 2 needs of the intern. Specifically, the master teacher provides professional guidance and support and tuition in teaching methods and procedures, administrative support and tuition in the administrative aspects of the teacher role, diagnostic feedback and remedial instruction to interns in respect of their developing teaching styles and patterns, opportunities for observation and analysis of teaching, and, perhaps most significantly of all, collegial friendship, encouragement, support and understanding commensurate with the needs of the intern to deal with a variety of concerns that will be encountered inevitably during the internship year.

Thirdly, it is proposed that each intern take responsibility for *half* of a standard teaching load. The internship is not a full-time teaching position. It is a period of training and role transition. Our purpose in suggesting a half load is to ensure that the intern has sufficient time available for planning, observing, recognizing, analysing and eliminating teaching weaknesses, modifying plans and teaching strategies, preparing instructional aids, assessing the degree of success of particular units of instruction, discussing matters with his interning partner, supervising teacher, administrative, adjunct and specialist personnel in the school and community, reflecting on the nature of the teaching role, establishing a balanced and healthy perspective of himself and his work in the school, and so forth. Where this is administratively possible, we would expect also that the master teacher be afforded some reduction in teaching load so that he is more readily accessible to interns for consultation and guidance.

Fourthly, it is proposed that interns be appointed to schools before the conclusion of the school year which precedes the internship period; i.e., for the two to four weeks available after the student has completed his final year of university studies. This is to enable the intern to familiarize himself with the school — its policies, organizational characteristics, teaching programmes, administrative structures and schedules. It would also enable him to begin a collegial acquaintanceship with the teaching staff of the school, observe some teaching, meet some of the pupils he will eventually be working with, and familiarize himself with the arrangements in the classrooms and staffrooms in the school. Finally, it would allow him to study the school curriculum and carry out some initial planning of instruction before the commencement of the new school year, thus improving his chances of coping adequately with the first few frantic weeks.

Fifthly, and as a precursor to the internship experience, it is proposed that, while they are undertaking their university studies, students be given the opportunity to visit schools, observe teaching, talk to teachers and administrators, perhaps act as teacher aides and resource personnel in school classrooms and in some instances possibly teach a number of lessons. Students could have some or all of these experiences during university vacations. Most university academic years do not exceed some thirty-two weeks of lectures and examinations, whereas the typical school year is at least of thirty-nine weeks duration. These activities could be sponsored and co-

ordinated jointly by universities, individual schools and/or regional centres and teacher liaison units in universities.*

Finally, it is proposed that the selection of master teachers be the responsibility of the university acting in collaboration with school systems, professional teacher organizations, individual school principals and experienced practitioners. The internship is conceptualized as part of an overall programme of teacher training and education sponsored by the university. As the practitioner-training component, the internship would carry credit towards a university award. This requires that master teachers be part-time staff of the university. Thus, master teachers would be answerable to the intern and to the university in so far as the assessment and instruction of the intern are concerned.

Phase 3 — The Foundational Aspects of Education — A One Year Course of Study

It is proposed that on successful completion of the internship, students return to the university for a year of intensive study of the foundational aspects of educational knowledge. This proposal is in keeping with Fuller's suggestion (1969, p.223) that: "Education students may need to teach before enrolling in even a first education course" (i.e., education 'subject' in Australian parlance), a suggestion based on research findings and one which we strongly support on the basis of extensive experience and what seems to us to be a compellingly logical argument.¹

Our intention in making this proposal is to enable the university to capitalize on the practical experiences and professional perspectives gained by students during their internship year. Phase 3 of the proposed curriculum is designed to facilitate an integration of successful practical experience with substantive knowledge of educational principles, theories and critical perspectives. Whereas diploma in education students, by and large, approach foundational knowledge of education (psychology, philosophy, etc.) with about as much enthusiasm as a condemned man approaches the gallows, we have noted without exception that experienced teachers returning to university for additional educational study, approach this foundational knowledge with great enthusiasm. It is glaringly evident that the latter group are people who have, for the most part, successfully achieved integration 2; that they are, developmen-

* It is stressed that these activities are not to be viewed as compulsory requirements for students contemplating a teaching career. They are rather intended as an obligation-free set of experiences made available to the student so that he can explore one of a number of potential career options.

¹ Compare: Ryle, 1968, p. 31 —

Efficient practice precedes the theory of it; methodologies presuppose the application of the methods, of the critical investigation of which they are the products. It was because Aristotle found himself and others reasoning now intelligently and now stupidly and it was because Isaac Walton found himself and others angling sometimes effectively and sometimes ineffectively that both were able to give their pupils the maxims and prescriptions of their arts. It is therefore possible for people intelligently to perform some sorts of operations when they are not yet able to consider any propositions enjoining how they should be performed. Some intelligent performances are not controlled by any interior acknowledgements of the principles applied in them.

tally speaking, comfortably through phases of self-concern experienced by teachers; and that they are seeking the means of achieving integration 3. While recently interning students are only just beginning to come to terms adequately with integration 2, we are confident nonetheless that they would be disposed to seek an understanding of the meaning of their experience of educational practice in schools — an understanding which we believe they will see to be available through a serious reflective study of an ongoing dialogue within the foundational areas of educational knowledge. By contrast, if students are encumbered by their felt anxieties and fears of practitioner inadequacy, such dispositions are unlikely to be present. This seems to be the unfortunate lot of the diploma in education student, if not equally of his counterpart in the concurrent programme.

It is noted at this point that the first three phases of the curriculum require a minimum of five years for their completion. Thus, it is proposed that students receive an award for the two full years of university sponsored studies and practical experiences taken in addition to their undergraduate degree. Perhaps an appropriate award for this two year programme would be a Bachelor Degree in Education (Professional Studies). At the conclusion of the five year programme, the student would be appointable to his first full-time teaching position.

Phase 4 — Inservice and Continuing Education and Training of the Beginning Teacher

There is a range of professionally related activity and knowledge with which the general practitioner must become increasingly concerned if he wishes to increase his understanding of and expertise within the teacher role. We see the organization of inservice and continuing education to be best dealt with at the regional level, rather than at the State or National levels. For example, the beginning secondary school teacher of physics will be expected to participate in the school's sports and recreation programme. The provision of inservice courses in team coaching, refereeing, and methods of organizing outdoor and indoor recreational activities is therefore suggested. Secondly, a young teacher may develop an interest in the special problems of teaching the slow learner, the physically handicapped or the emotionally disturbed youngster. Here, of course, are areas of teaching speciality which are eminently suited to the collaborative involvement of school systems, universities, teachers colleges and, say, health commission personnel. Thirdly, teachers need to become familiar with the general nature of the work of adjunct professionals working in schools — e.g., school guidance counsellors, psychologists and social workers. Fourthly, the education of the newly arrived overseas migrant is an area of specialization desperately needing specially trained and sympathetic teachers — and of course we could go on and on in developing a catalogue of social needs related both to schools, pupils and parent groups, and to the developing needs of individual teachers as they proceed through the years of their career. To summarize: we see Phase 4 of the programme to be one of indeterminate duration, and one which demands a concerted effort

of collaboration between State Education Departments, Professional Teacher Organizations, Universities, Colleges of Advanced Education, (appropriately) the teacher himself, community groups, and a range of co-operating agencies which are able from time to time to offer specialized services and expert guidance in a number of educationally related areas.

In addition, the university could play an especially important continuing education role in developing post-graduate courses suitable for both beginning and experienced teachers, in advanced professional studies, and in focusing attention on "internally initiated" (educational) "research" . . . (and in) "teaching which draws upon and leads into the frontiers of the discipline currently under investigation" (Chipman, 1977) and acting as a clearing house of information and interpretation of current research findings and new developments. Teachers colleges and colleges of advanced education, however, could concentrate their attention on the task of applying new educational knowledge in school practice, seeking the means of translating descriptive research knowledge into prescriptions for improved educational experience in schools, and of linking new techniques of learning and instruction in the subject matters with the tried and tested techniques being practised in the classroom. Indeed, we think that the CAE/Teachers college is the appropriate headquarters for this inservice and continuing education phase of teacher training and development, and that rather than striving to emulate the university these institutions could play a most important role in bridging the gap between the practising profession of teachers and the universities. In their turn, they too could serve as a clearing house of information and expertise about practitioner-related knowledge and skill, thus providing a necessary mediating link between the university-oriented activity of basic research and theorizing and the need to interpret knowledge gained by this activity in ways which make it of real and durable value to those at the centre of educational action in the schools.

Finally, it is our view that the university — in its preservice programmes — has attempted, and still attempts, to deal with those professionally-related competencies which we think are better left to the inservice phase of teacher training and education. We think these practices are detrimental to the university and its preservice clients. Most disturbing of all is the mistaken belief — generally among students — that a brief course of lectures, a few visits to schools and an analysis of case study material, to take an example, is adequate to the task of teaching 'slow-learning' children. These may sound like harsh accusations, but the fact is that very many teachers are asked to teach special classes with no more than this background of training. It is far better, we think, to locate the newly qualified teacher in a general practice environment. Once and for all we should eliminate the practice whereby beginning teachers are given 'slow-learner' groups (with their array of special and often clinically-related problems) on taking up their first full-time appointment. Instead, it seems to us that the inservice, not the preservice, phase of teacher training should be geared to training teachers for specialist educational roles. With just a modicum of change within a group of collaborating institutions this breakthrough in educational practice could be achieved. It is a question, we believe, of rethinking institutional priorities and of allocating responsibilities

to institutions which are commensurate with their unique capabilities. This said, the university should restrict itself to doing what it is designed to do; i.e., carrying out teaching and research in the disciplines, developing theoretical understandings of research findings and interpreting the meaning and significance of new knowledge for the benefit of others and of society. The university is not the appropriate place to teach student teachers how to make up school timetables or how to manage the requirements of playground supervision and basic classroom organization. That these activities are non-trivial in the milieu of the school is true enough, however they *become* trivial and indeed irrelevant when they are spuriously re-located within a university course. On the other hand, the university ought to be very interested in the moral implications of normative standards of practice in school management, say, for when it involves itself in this activity the university is properly relating its educational programme to the disciplines and to research. In short, if the university truly collaborates with the school, both parties will be in a better position to identify their most appropriate roles and functions, and neither will be confusing its priorities with those of the other. One way of achieving this happy union, we think is to recognize that teacher training and education is an ongoing process; that it has a clearly defined 'in-school' component; and that it cannot be intelligently and humanely pursued by one institution acting unilaterally or in open competition with another.

Summary Comment

In reference to the six curricular questions raised earlier (pp. 3-4) the authors feel guardedly confident that the first five of them could be dealt with adequately by an implemented programme based on the foregoing proposals. The sixth question will be addressed in the final section of this paper. On the other hand, the outcomes of such an implemented programme will be determined by those who participate in it — lecturers, teachers, students, and others. The curricular decisions we have taken are not identical with actual experience. That is something which is relatively independent of the decisions and which can only be determined ultimately by the individual participant.

We think, also, that the proposals — as written statements — are logically consistent with the assumptions about the 'teacher' and 'the nature of teaching' that were outlined previously. However, it is important to note that the assumptions are 'ideal-type inventions', devised in order to establish the grounds of logical validity and educational defensibility on which to justify those curricular decisions eventually taken. Once again it needs stressing that validity and defensibility are attributes of a written curricular plan and not necessarily of the perceptions and experience of those who participate in the plan.

This said, we are limited to making the following claims for our proposed preservice programme. Firstly, the proposals embody *our* interpretation of the needs of preservice students — an interpretation based on judgements drawn from our observations, experiences and discussions with a variety of involved persons. Secondly, the proposals seem superior to both concurrent and traditional consecutive programmes; that is, they seem to provide a sounder logical and psychological account of the processes which are experienced by

students during the preservice and early inservice years. Thirdly, the proposals have been arranged to correspond with developmental conceptualizations of the preservice and inservice experience — conceptualizations which are supported by empirical evidence. Finally, the proposals represent a plan to account for *our* understanding of the way teachers develop; they seem to match with our reconstruction of our own developmental experiences — they are the best 'meant utterances' we can generate at the present time.

Educational Ideals and Economic Realities

"It is now the Money theory which corrupts the church, corrupts the household life, destroys honour, beauty, and life throughout the universe. It is *the* Death Incarnate of Modernism, and the so-called science of its pursuit is the most cretinous, speechless, paralysing plaque that has yet touched the brains of mankind."

John Ruskin, 1862.

Our final task is to consider the implications of our proposals in respect of economic cost and the related factor of potential economic and personal disadvantage for students created by increasing the preparation period to five years.

The majority of university qualified teachers have spent four years in preparation. In their fifth year they expect to be paid a full salary *if* they are teaching in a full-time position. In their sixth year, they would expect normally to be earning a salary at the second incremental level.

In order to equalize the economic burden of students, it is proposed that they be paid *half* a first year salary for the internship year, and that they receive a further half salary during the fifth (university) year. It is also proposed that upon taking their first full-time appointment they be paid at the second incremental level. This plan partly balances the salaries books; i.e., the student has received the same income he expected to receive over the five year period under examination. The State Education Department has provided the *same* salary to the teacher that would have been provided under the old system. Moreover, the Education Department has received the same level of service for the same cost; i.e., a half teaching load per intern for a half salary. Over the two year period following completion of the undergraduate degree, each student has received the income he previously anticipated and the Education Department has met a salaries bill during the internship period equal to that which it had previously budgeted for.

The increase in cost occurs during the fifth year; i.e., Phase 3. During this year the student is not supplying his services in schools yet we are suggesting he be paid a half salary. It is proposed that this cost could be offset largely by a reorganized teachers scholarship plan. Briefly, we suggest that students be offered scholarships — by competition — at the conclusion of the internship year. Hence, rather than pay scholarship allowances over a four year period as at present, scholarships would be paid over a one year period only but at a higher amount; i.e., equivalent to half a full-time teaching salary. There are

two obvious advantages to this. Firstly, more scholarships would be available than at present — this is quickly demonstrated by simple arithmetic as follows. Suppose a student on scholarship received \$2,500 for four years: total \$10,000. Suppose the current first year full-time salary is \$10,600:50% = \$5,300 which represents a saving of \$4,700. For each \$5,300 of savings, one additional scholarship could be provided. Secondly, scholarships awarded under this plan would be provided to students who are almost totally committed to a teaching career. In so far as the teaching service is concerned they are the safest of economic bets. Thus, the payment of scholarship allowances and benefits to students who may not ultimately become teachers is largely avoided by this plan.

However, a percentage of students at universities — those on teachers scholarships — would be economically disadvantaged by the foregoing proposals. It seems to us that in keeping with the philosophy of 'no enforced commitment' which we feel is an essential aspect of our curriculum design, together with the recent introduction of the Tertiary Education Assistance Scheme — a Scheme available to all undergraduate students not receiving other scholarship allowances — this initial disadvantage is considerably reduced.* In fact, it equalizes the competition for limited TEAS funds by putting all undergraduate students on the same economic footing; i.e., all students are now required to demonstrate their level of real need for financial assistance.

It is proposed that the master teacher's allowance be set at \$1,500 (based on salaries and allowances levels — June, 1977) to be paid per annum while he is supervising two interns. Realistically, we think it is necessary to make the position of master teacher financially attractive as well as (hopefully) professionally rewarding. In order to offset this cost against the education budget, it is proposed that financial resources currently used to pay for practice teaching, part-time lecturing in such dip. ed. type subjects as teaching methods, and observation lessons, be transferred into the master teachers salaries account. In all events, the master teacher will be taking over these responsibilities himself.

Finally, we are aware that both our educational and economic proposals cannot conceivably hope to enjoy the unqualified support of all concerned parties. All the same, the proposals do seem to address themselves to the major shortcomings in traditional approaches to teacher preparation. We hope our colleagues elsewhere will give them critical scrutiny, that they will advise us in the errors of our ways where this is necessary, and that they will join us in our efforts to reappraise and reconstruct approaches to the training and education of the teacher in keeping with the cultural and social potential of this country.

References:

CHIPMAN, J.L.C., "The Epistemology of Education", Chapter 30 in *Teacher Training: Anticlimax to Education*, Fielding, A.J., D.M. Cavanagh & R.E. Widdowson (Eds.), Wollongong: The University of Wollongong, 1977.

* We realize that TEAS allowances are means tested at the time of writing but it is outside the scope of this discussion to enter into a debate on the pros and cons of this issue.

- ELAM, S. (Ed.), *Education and the Structure of Knowledge*, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.
- FULLER, F.F., "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization," *American Education Research Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 2, March, 1969, pp. 207-266.
- FULLER, F.F., & Bown, O., "Becoming a Teacher" Chapter 2 in K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher Education: The Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*, Chicago: University of Chicago, 1975.
- General Education in a Free Society*, Report of the Harvard Committee, Oxford University Press, 1946.
- HIRST, P.H., *Knowledge and the Curriculum*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.
- INNACONE, L., "Student Teaching: A Transitional Stage in the Making of a Teacher", *Theory into Practice*, 2, April, 1963, pp. 73-81.
- JACKSON, P.W., *Life in Classrooms*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- KATZ, L.G., "Development Stages of Preschool Teachers," *ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education*, Urbana, Illinois, 1972.
- OAKESHOTT, M., *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays*, London: Methuen, 1962.
- PHENIX, P.H., *Realms of Meaning*, New York: McGraw Hill, 1968.
- RYLE, G., *The Concept of Mind*, Penguin, 1968.
- WEBER, M., *the Methodology of the Social Sciences* (Translated by E.A. Shils and H.A. Finch), New York: Free Press, 1949.
- WEBER, M., *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, (Translated by A.M. Henderson & T. Parsons), New York: Free Press, 1964.
- WEBER, M., *Basic Concepts in Sociology*, (Translated by H.P. Secher), New Jersey: Citadel Press, 1972.
- WHITFIELD, R.C., *Disciplines of the Curriculum*, New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.

Teacher Representation and Some Problems for Changing Structures of Teacher Education

by Lyn Yates
LaTrobe University

Two issues concerning the structure of teacher education are important in Australia today, and have significance for how the substance of that education, and of what is involved in being a teacher, are conceived. One is a long-established debate about the role of teachers in the schools (in contrast to 'academics') in deciding the direction which teacher education should take and in taking responsibility for it. Although this issue is long-established (in the perennial complaints of teachers and their associations about the lack of relevance or the unsuitability of the level at which training institutions work) recent movements, encouraged by the Schools commission (Karmel Report, 1973, ch.11; Schools Commission, 1974, chs. 1,9), towards a greater school-based curriculum development and a regionalization of in-service provision have given the question new force. The second issue of structure concerns the function and relation to each other of different education programmes which a teacher may undertake in the course of his career. These include, for example, the relationship of 'general education' to preparation for teaching, of initial to in-service education and of both of these to provisions for the new teacher in his first year in the school. Again, this issue has been given new force in recent years due to Schools Commission funding enabling an expansion and greater experimentation with forms of in-service education and to a re-assessment by training institutions of their role in the light of likely reductions in initial teacher education.

In considering policies with regard to the above issues, reference is often made to schemes which have been devised in other countries, and in particular to the work of the James Committee in England (see, for example, Turney, 1977; Skilbeck, Evans and Harvey, 1977). The present study attempts to provide a closer look at the comparative example which England has provided in the last decade by setting the particular proposals which have been raised there in the context of their formation and development. On the one hand it considers the fate of policies concerning new forms of teacher education which developed in the late '60s and early '70s. On the other hand, it uses an analysis of documents produced by associations representing teachers and teacher educators in England both to identify issues about the knowledge-basis of teaching which are seen to underlie issues of teacher education, and to look at some intended and unintended aspects of the role teachers' associations have been able to take in the development of policy.

Development of Teacher Education Policies

In the late '60s in England, a considerable development of interest in the first year of teaching, and its relation to the education and training of