

January 1978

Teacher Representation and Some Problems for Changing Structures of Teacher Education

Lyn Yates
LaTrobe University

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



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

Recommended Citation

Yates, L. (1978). Teacher Representation and Some Problems for Changing Structures of Teacher Education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 3(2).
<https://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.1978v3n2.2>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol3/iss2/2>

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

teachers, took place. Two major research projects (Taylor, Dale and Brimer, 1971; Bolam, 1973) and a programme to disseminate their findings, were sponsored by the government. Successive governments also began three different inquiries into the views of various bodies connected with education as to the future direction of teacher training: the Select Committee inquiry of 1969-70; a survey of Area Training Organizations in 1970; and the James Committee of 1970-72. The last Committee was instructed to consider specifically *the education, training and probation of teachers*.

All submissions to these committees by associations representing teachers and teacher educators made reference to the need for more attention to be given to provision for the first year of teaching, and for greater involvement of school teachers in teacher education programmes. Most mentioned the desirability of creating a new role of 'professional tutor' or 'teacher tutor' to this end.

The James Report (*Teacher Education and training, 1972*) proposed a number of major changes in the role of the first year of teaching in teacher training. The idea of 'induction' in the school situation, and of immediate practical training, became the pivot of the second cycle in a teacher training continuum of initial, induction and in-service phases. It was to be the concluding phase of requirements for the B.A. (Ed.), a new 'professional' degree which was to be validated by new national and regional committees, on which teachers were to be strongly represented. As well, teachers in the schools were to take a greater part in teacher training: a new school-based 'professional tutor' would have a good deal of the responsibility for the induction year, and would also be involved in initial training (in the area of school practice) and in co-ordinating the in-service programmes of teachers in his school.

Opposition to the James Report by professional associations and unions began to take place several months before the Report was published, and was voiced in individual publications, in statements and letters to the press, and at a meeting convened by the National Union of Teachers (NUT) in November 1971, to which representatives of a number of other associations were invited. Criticisms were raised about the ambiguity of the position of the first year teacher ('licensed teacher') in the new induction year proposals as both teacher and student. Questions were raised about the status of the proposed awards and the logistic implications of the structure of the cycle for the allocation of students and new teachers to school

The White Paper, *Education: A Framework for Expansion (1972)*, rejected the cyclical pattern of the James Report and the new form of degree validation it proposed. A teacher was to be firmly qualified and to receive a degree before the first year of teaching, though

The government share the view of the James Committee that a teacher on first employment needs, and should be released part-time to profit from a systematic programme of professional initiation, guided experience, and further study. (par. 64).

This process was to be known as 'induction', although 'probation' would continue to be a component in it. The school-based 'professional tutor' was to

play a role in this year, but the other suggestions of the James Report, as regards a role for the tutor in initial and in-service teacher training, were not mentioned.

After the publication of the White Paper, a number of official and unofficial pilot schemes implementing new induction provisions were instituted, but the entire programme has been emaciated by economic circumstances, and the time-table for the national implementation of the provisions, due originally to begin in 1975-76, has continued to be postponed. A number of accounts of progress and problems with these schemes has been given by their evaluators (D.E.S., 1974; Bolam, 1975; Hill, 1974, 1975; McCabe, 1974, 1975; Baker, 1976).

Knowledge, Training, and Entry to the Profession

An analysis of documents produced by professional associations and unions over this period indicates, in addition to the external financial situation, that there were two difficulties in developing a teacher education policy which would give greater authority to teachers. The first of these relates to a divergence in the understandings of different groups within the occupation as to what are the central needs of the teacher. The two tendencies here are towards seeing teaching in terms of skills and practices which are best acquired by emulation and apprenticeship, or towards seeing it as based on a form of reflection and theoretical consideration which requires reference to institutions and writings outside the immediate school situation. These different directions have implications for the knowledge or competencies teacher education should focus on, and when and where these are best provided. The second difficulty seen by the associations suggest, relates to some issues of teaching as an occupation in the context of other occupations. These include issues of how individuals qualify for entry to an occupation, how arguments over pay and conditions can be made, the significance of the assessment of training, and where, how, and by whom acceptability to the profession is to be judged.

The two issues just outlined (education as a content or competence, and education as qualification or certification) occur in the documents produced by professional associations and unions at three important points in the developments referred to in the first section. They first appear in submissions to the committees of inquiry in 1969 and 1970, and although all the associations referred to the need for training to include a good academic background and to produce 'professional expertise', in specific terms their emphasis differed. Three submissions, from associations which specifically represented head teachers (the Association of Head Mistresses (AHM), the National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT), and the Head Masters' Association/Head Masters' Conference (HMA/HMC), emphasized the need to develop and assess an 'on-the-job' competence. They wanted more school-based training. In addition, the NAHT expounded the need for new teachers to learn from experienced teachers a certain attitude to the job (in 'Evidence Submitted to the Select Committee', 9 December, 1969), and the AHM raised the danger of making (academic) entry standards too high (in evidence submitted to the James Committee, May 1971). The NUT and other associations

representing assistants placed more emphasis on the need to reform the courses in the training institutions. They insisted on the need for teaching to be seen as part of higher education, but also for this higher education to be made more relevant to the occupational task. The associations representing the training institutions (the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education (ATCDE), the Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) and the Association of University Teachers (AUT)), emphasized the value of their own role in the training of teachers. They argued that a theoretical content in training, deriving its standards and awards from traditional academic institutions and processes, was vital to the achievement of 'professional status', and to the production of effective members of the teaching profession.

Secondly, the two issues above underlie the responses of the associations to the James proposals, in which the first year of teaching was to constitute also the final year of the professional qualification and initial training. On the matter of necessary content in teacher training, the associations of heads, who had already placed more emphasis in initial training on the need to develop and assess attitudes manifested in the role in the school, were happy to accept the new proposal to incorporate the first year of teaching in training (HMA/HMC 1971; AHM 1972). However, to some of the other associations, especially the NUT and the ATCDE, the matter of the form of qualification being proposed assumed over-riding importance.

Prior to the James Report, both the NUT and the ATD had referred to the first year of teaching as a 'bridge', and had argued that it should be seen as both 'the beginning of true professional responsibility and the last phase of initial training' (NUT, 1970; ATCDE, 1971). The James Report echoed these words in its plans for the induction year as the final phase of the professional degree (3.20, 3.33-3.35, 6.13), but both the NUT and the ATCDE found its proposals unacceptable, and both began to refine their earlier proposals in a way which clearly distinguished 'qualifying to teach' from 'professional recognition', and which removed the first year of teaching from an association with pre-training (NUT, 1972, 1973a; ATCDE, n.d.).

Two issues seem to be involved in these associations' rejection of the James proposals. The first is the long-established NUT policy that 'unqualified' individuals should not take charge of a class. The NUT argued in its response to the James Report (1972) that to have teachers take charge of classes before receiving their qualification would endanger the performance of the occupational task (in the attitude which pupils and parents would take toward such teachers).

The attitude of the NUT just outlined has been tied, historically, to a campaign to establish the status of the occupation as a specialized task which can (and should) be adequately performed only by those who have established by a qualification their possession of the extensive knowledge required in the task. In opposition to this, professions such as medicine and law do have well-established induction periods as part of training, and if the concept of a 'licensed teacher' (the first-year teacher who is not yet fully qualified) would

be unacceptable to parents, this would itself be due in some part to the way the NUT's own extensive publicity department chooses to publicize the issue.

The second reason for the rejection by these associations of the James proposals for the place of the induction year in training concerned the matter of the qualification itself. In this Report, the year was to form part of the requirements for a degree, the B.A.(Ed.), and this was to be a degree assessed and validated differently from existing degrees. It would be a 'professional' degree, in which teachers would form part of both the validating and assessing bodies (6.13, 6.18). The comments made by the associations in response to this indicate that, in a situation where they were seeking to show that the training and knowledge-base of teaching are equivalent to those of other professions, they felt that they could not afford to use an award with a different basis from them. Here the James Report, because of the interlocking elements in the proposals it made, was instrumental in shaping — and in some respects altering — the positions taken by the associations in regard to the induction year and to the school-based component of training.

The third area in the debate over the induction year, in relation to the type of knowledge on which teaching is based concerns the position of 'professional tutor' or 'teacher tutor.' In early submissions to the Select Committee and the James Committee, most associations suggested the need for a teacher tutor who would play a greater role in dealing with students on teaching practice, and in liaising with training institutions. These were followed by two reports which proposed the role of 'professional tutor.' The James Report recommended extensive responsibilities in teacher training, for this role, but the White paper, *Education: A Framework for Expansion*, confined the role of professional tutor to the induction year. Following the White Paper, all the associations have drawn up detailed policies as to the characteristics, conditions of work, and work programme of such tutors.

The introduction of a role of professional tutor in the schools raised two possibilities: a change of location for part of the teacher training process, and a different characterization of the responsibilities of the teacher. It also raised the possibility of a change in what is seen as the knowledge-basis of the occupational task. One interpretation of these possibilities was put most strongly by the National Association of Schoolmasters (NAS, 1973). The NAS insisted that the role should be known as 'teacher tutor,' that its essence was to pass on to probationers the experienced teacher's expertise as a teacher, and that training of the tutor by colleges and departments of education is therefore inappropriate. This implies a new place in teacher training for demonstration, practice, and the forming of judgements through experience in comparison with knowledge based on theory: that is, a greater development of tacit or intuitive knowledge.

Alternatively, the idea of the professional tutor was seen as an opportunity for a much more thoroughgoing development of teaching as a theoretically-based task, since training of this type could now take place at all stages of the occupational career. This line of argument was taken by the ATCDE (1973), which preferred the tutor to be involved in the three cycles of the James concept, and which described the role of the tutor as a 'middleman and inter-

preter' between 'training institutions and the profession.' Both the ATCDE and UCET (1973) also saw a role for colleges and departments of education in developing courses to train the tutor.

On the issue of the teacher tutor, the NUT at first stressed the need for training in formal courses at tertiary institutions (in NUT, 1973b), but later, following a survey of local branches, it suggested that teachers should play a central role in designing and staffing any courses (NUT, 1975). These statements again raise a problem which was seen in the response to the James Report's proposed form of qualification. This is that, while these associations want the status of the knowledge and training base of the occupation to be demonstrated by the award of a degree, and while they accept (post-James) that, for this to be effective, they must still accept the traditional validating agencies, the same associations object to some consequences which seem to arise from this situation. One such consequence is the subjectively acknowledged implication that institutions other than school teachers have a greater expertise in teacher training, and a higher status, than the school teachers and the schools. A second is the problem that the traditional academic validating agencies may not give sufficient weight to what the school teachers see as the real skills needed by the teacher. An illustration of this problem is that, while all the associations mentioned this dissatisfaction in their initial submissions to the committees of inquiry, later, following the publication of the White Paper, only the NAS asked that teachers have a voice on the boards of validation of courses and the resulting awards in training institutions.

Some Implications for Australia

A study of the development of policies on teacher education in England over the last decade raises a number of issues concerning how representation of members of an occupation mediates the effect of those members on policy. Clearly not all elements of the situation in England are relevant here: the centralized policy-making and negotiation there differs from the mixture of state and federal funding and policy-making here, and the range of associations in England has both similarities and differences to the various associations which have arisen in Australia. Two aspects of the developments in England, however, do seem worthy of consideration by school teachers and those involved in teacher education when contemplating the future of teacher education in Australia.

First, in relation to voicing of policies, the discussion above has alluded to some basic differences among associations on policies related to the occupational task and the training of teachers. The most obvious of these has occurred where groupings of associations have reflected and emphasized the existence of different groupings or segments in the occupation. This is especially so with teachers in the school and teachers in training institutions (although differences are also seen where a group, such as head teachers, is part of a larger grouping in contrast to where they are represented as a separate group). Nevertheless, at the beginning of this period, the submis-

sions made to the committees of inquiry by the various associations referred to the need for greater interaction between the two groups by such devices as the teacher tutor, and a greater interchange of personnel between institutions. In later developments however, especially on the question of the appointment, role and staffing of professional centres to take charge of the induction year, the two groups have been seen in competition with each other. Here, when the associations were faced with external pressures from the government, the fact that they were representing the occupation in largely segregated form has been important. The ATCDE (and its successor, the National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education, NATFHE) in particular has been, above all, concerned with a situation where a majority of its members might face redundancy. The effect of this on the ATCDE's policies can be seen in a comparison of the Association's statements made prior to the White Paper, where the induction year was seen as an area for activity by the schools, with only a small role for the colleges (ATCDE, 1971), with statements made after the White Paper, where the Association approached the year markedly in terms of the opportunities which it may provide for employment within colleges (ATCDE, 1973, 1975).

Secondly, in England it is clear that the diversity of teachers and the associations which represent them has helped shape the areas in which they are able to influence policy. Thus, although all the associations pay considerable attention to formulating policies on broader issues related to the induction year and teacher tutors, they present a weaker voice in relation to promoting change (the need to improve the induction year, or for school teachers to play a greater role in teacher education) than in slowing or impeding it (the difficulty of establishing agreement on the introduction of a new position such as the teacher tutor or new structures for the organization and validation of courses). As well, especially in terms of their statements on the teacher tutor, the associations show a greater concern with the more immediate issues of conditions and salaries than with broader issues of control and of shaping the development of the teacher.

In Australia, particularly in the context of moves towards greater school-based curriculum development, the question of the relation between immediate and concrete issues and more long-term influences on these is one which teachers need to consider. In particular, in relation to teacher autonomy and teacher education, associations have been concerned with issues such as the post-hoc control exerted through inspection or external examinations, and with effects on conditions, such as the payment for supervising student teachers. The issues of what are the central needs in teacher education and what role teachers should play in this have — with the exception of the work of subject-associations — been seen generally as peripheral and not as an area for many positive initiatives.

Two additional points about directions for research are suggested by this study. These are associated with the value and limitations of the type of approach which has been taken here.

First, one point of the article is to show some of the complexities (historical, structural, political) of the development both of programmes and of teachers'

ideas about needs and priorities. If some of these complexities are acknowledged, this will have some implications regarding the inadequacy of teacher education programmes which are introduced or evaluated either in ways abstracted from their social context, or on the basis of immediate unreflective responses about needs or satisfaction (no matter what quantitative validity these have).

Secondly, the study concentrated on some possible constraints affecting teacher involvement in teacher education, rather than on the direction such involvement should take. One point that needs to be considered further is the implications of the differences that exist in how teachers and teacher educators understand the basis of a teaching practice, and of the type of knowledge which is derived. A possible way out of this is to concentrate on structures which allow diversity to be reflected. But it also seems important that all those involved should give more attention to the question of the adequacy of their own and other groups' understandings.

References:

- A.H.M., Evidence Submitted to the Committee of Inquiry into the Education and Initial training of Teachers, A.H.M., 1971.
- A.T.C.D.E., The Professional Education of teachers, A.T.C.D.E., 1971.
- A.T.C.D.E., Executive Committee Statement on *Teacher Education and Training*, A.T.C.D.E., n.d.
- A.T.C.D.E., *Education: A Framework for Expansion* — A Commentary, A.T.C.D.E. (Executive Committee Statement), 1973.
- A.T.C.D.E., In-service Education and Training for Teachers in Schools: Discussion Paper on INSET Provisions, A.T.C.D.E., 1975.
- BAKER, K., A Review of Current Induction Programmes for New Teachers, *British Journal of In-service Education*, 2, 1976.
- BOLAM, R., *Induction Programmes for Probationary Teachers*, University of Bristol, 1973.
- BOLAM, R., The Teacher Induction Pilot Schemes Project, *London Education Review*, 4, (1), 1975.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE, *Teacher Education and Training* ('The James Report'), London, H.M.S.O., 1972.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE, *Education: A Framework for Expansion*, (White Paper), London, H.M.S.O., 1972.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE, Helping New Teachers: the Induction Year, *Reports on Education*, no. 84, March 1974.
- HILL, D. The Liverpool Pilot Scheme for the Induction of Probationary Teachers — a Progress Report, *British Journal of In-service Education*, 1, (1), 1974.
- HILL, D., The Preparation of Teacher Tutors in Liverpool, *British Journal of In-service Education*, 1, (2), 1975.
- H.M.A./H.M.C., Our Schools and the Preparation of Teachers: Part II, H.M.A./H.M.C., 1971
- McCABE, C., The Initial Planning of a Probationary Year Course, *British Journal of In-service Education*, 1, (1), 1974.
- McCABE, C., Developing In-service Patterns in Schools, *British Journal of In-service Education*, 1, (3), 1975.

- N.A.S., Comment on the White Paper, *Education: A Framework for Expansion*, N.A.S., 1973.
- N.U.T., *Teacher Education: The Way Ahead*, N.U.T. 1970.
- N.U.T., James: A Critical Appraisal, N.U.T. (Executive Statement), 1972.
- N.U.T., The Reform of Teacher Education, N.U.T. (Policy Statement), 1973a.
- N.U.T., The Induction of New Teachers and the Role of the Professional Tutor, N.U.T., 1973b.
- N.U.T., Discussion Paper on the Induction of New Teachers, (Ad. hoc. Committee on Teacher Education), February 1975.
- Schools in Australia*, ('The Karmel Report'), Report of the Interim Committee of the Australian Schools Commission, Canberra, A.G.P.S., 1973.
- SCHOOLS COMMISSION, *Report for the Triennium 1979-81*, Canberra, A.G.P.S., 1978.
- SKILBECK, M., EVANS, G., & HARVEY, *In-service Education and Training: Australian Innovations*, Canberra, Curriculum Development Centre, 1977.
- TAYLOR, J.K., DALE, I.R. & BRIMER, M.A., *A Survey of Teachers in their First Year of Service*, University of Bristol, 1971.
- TURNEY, C., (ed). *Innovation in Teacher Education*, Sydney, Sydney University Press, 1977.
- U.C.E.T., The In-service Education and Training of Teachers in the Light of the White Paper: *Education: A Framework for Expansion*, U.C.E.T., 1973.