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CREATING WAVES: TOWARDS AN EDUCOLOGICAL PARADIGM OF TEACHER EDUCATION
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Abstract

In this paper it is argued that teacher education has already gone through two major stages (or ‘waves’) in its development, and is perhaps about to embark on a third. The first part presents a broad history of various models in terms of three major variables: where pre-service learning is located, how the study of education is constituted, and how controls accreditation. It is suggested that Australia is likely to return to an earlier model of teacher education unless teacher educators themselves produce a better way in which to meet current criticisms. A new ‘educological’ model is proposed which involves a wider definition of the professional teacher, a pre- and in-service concentration of the development of professional judgement, and a radical reconstruction of educational knowledge.

Introduction: Current Constraints

Many people, particularly teachers, administrators, and government, now believe that current teacher education programs are an inadequate preparation for teaching, mainly because the wrong things are being taught by the wrong people and in the wrong setting. On the whole, teacher educators acknowledge that there are problems in teacher education, but believe that the major problem is not with the form and content of the programs, rather that it is the lack of time: the single year of specifically education studies that is available in most programs is totally inadequate both to introduce students to all the academic knowledge about teaching that they need to know, and also to give them sufficient practice to enable them to enter the workforce upon graduation as immediately effective and competent practitioners. Some, like myself, believe that both groups are right, and that we not only need more time to prepare teachers, but we do also need to teach beginning teachers different things, and we need to teach them in a very different way.

I see two reasons for this: first, teaching itself is now very different to what it was when a teaching qualification was first introduced. Not only are there a great many new expectations of teachers with regard to their actual teaching (make learning relevant to pupils, assist personal development, individualise teaching, use affirmative action with disadvantaged minority pupils, and so on), but there are also many other things teachers are expected to do in the school in general (such as involve the community, develop curricula to suit particular needs, take responsibility for pastoral care or work-experience programs). As a result, student teachers to-day have a great deal more to learn about teaching before they are competent teachers, and the knowledge base will continue to increase for the foreseeable future. And as the nature of teaching has changed, so also the kinds and amount of our knowledge about teaching have changed and vastly increased. So the second major reason for change in teacher preparation is that we simply no longer have the time necessary to teach to undergraduates what they need to know about teaching.

Table 1: Number of New Books Published in Education In a Given Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One doesn’t have to look far for evidence of this. Table 1 shows the number of new books published in English in a single year specifically in Education; one can easily extrapolate for the intervening years. There is simply a great deal more knowledge around than there was when the one-year Dip. Ed. was initiated. The knowledge explosion is not unique to education, of course, but the way it has been ignored, is. Table 2 shows how another disciplinary area has dealt with a similar increase in knowledge: everyone recognises that no one can read all the new fields that have grown out of what used to be English, so they have divided it up into a whole new set of different degree programs of which an undergraduate will take but one.
In contrast, education at the undergraduate level is still treated as a single field, and it still has the same amount of time allocated to it that it had in 1980. Isn’t it time the expectation that teachers can be prepared with one year of educational studies was seen for the farce that it is? People who complain that newly graduated teachers are not well prepared for teaching should recognize that it’s not that we couldn’t prepare them better within our current system, but that we aren’t allowed to.

Universities have not been listened to by the Commonwealth about this matter, so they have done what they can within this wholly unreasonable time constraint, though not without cost to their programs; it has meant continually paring content down further, and increasing the number of courses studied in the Dip.Ed. year. For instance, at present a full time university student is expected to devote about 1040 hours to study per year. At Murdoch, our Dip.Ed. students not only already spend 1170 hours per year in academic courses on campus (a 10% overload), but they have an extra 420 hours in school. Taken together, this gives them a 50% overload, in spite of which we teach less than the bare minimum that a competent beginning teacher needs to know. Primary school teachers do not have a full course in the teaching of reading, and they get but a single lecture on literature for beginning readers; secondary school teachers have nothing on language as such, let alone on the impact and use of media. Clearly it is not possible to simply increase the length or intensity of the existing courses within the single year. So the problem of the shortage of time is relatively easy to deal with — more is necessary.

Unfortunately, there is no such simple answer to the question of the content of undergraduate teacher education programs; just how much of what should be taught, by whom, and where, is a less visible but a greater and more fundamental crisis. One way of facing a crisis is to examine what has brought it on; here it might therefore be useful to step back from the immediate threats for a moment in order to consider the big picture of our past. Teacher education could be seen to have already grown through two stages (or ‘waves’, as I shall call them) and now be on the threshold of a third, though whether a third wave will be created and allowed to run its course or not is very uncertain. It is uncertain not so much because teacher educators do not know how to cope with the proposed changes, but because they do not have their own agenda for change. Because teacher educators have ignored (or dismissed as uninformed) the many criticisms of their work that have come from teachers and Ministries alike, teacher educators have had very little input into the nature of the changes which are now being forced upon them by the initiatives of the Government in the DEET (Department of Employment, Education and Training) bureaucracy. Through the combination of a lack of response and vision, teacher educators have lost control of the change agenda for their own profession.

A very short history of teacher education

1. The First Wave

The Apprenticeship Model

The second wave came when a professional preparation was offered outside schools by tertiary institutions who took control of the certification process. It evolved from two separate institutional sources, the schools and the universities. They produced two very different approaches which varied most in their construction of education as a field of study. The universities developed a strongly academic approach in which the study of teacher education meant studying how the existing university disciplines could be applied to schooling. University departments mainly taught the teaching of reading, and they get but a single lecture on literature for beginning readers; secondary school teachers have nothing on language as such, let alone on the impact and use of media. Clearly it is not possible to simply increase the length or intensity of the existing courses within the single year. So the problem of the shortage of time is relatively easy to deal with — more is necessary.

Unfortunately, there is no such simple answer to the question of the content of undergraduate teacher education programs; just how much of what should be taught, by whom, and where, is a less visible but a greater and more fundamental crisis. One way of facing a crisis is to examine what has brought it on; here it might therefore be useful to step back from the immediate threats for a moment in order to consider the big picture of our past. Teacher education could be seen to have already grown through two stages (or ‘waves’, as I shall call them) and now be on the threshold of a third, though whether a third wave will be created and allowed to run its course or not is very uncertain. It is uncertain not so much because teacher educators do not know how to cope with the proposed changes, but because they do not have their own agenda for change. Because teacher educators have ignored (or dismissed as uninformed) the many criticisms of their work that have come from teachers and Ministries alike, teacher educators have had very little input into the nature of the changes which are now being forced upon them by the initiatives of the Government in the DEET (Department of Employment, Education and Training) bureaucracy. Through the combination of a lack of response and vision, teacher educators have lost control of the change agenda for their own profession.

Table 2: Murdoch Subdivision of Undergraduate Degrees in 'English Literature' 1992

In contrast, the teachers’ colleges taught a 3-year certificate in which the educational studies component consisted principally of information about schools’ requirements of practice. The source of the college model, indeed, the genesis of the colleges themselves, was the idea that good teaching was a set of good practices which could be reproduced by following established routines. It was obviously important to expose student teachers to best practices, but because practices were performed by individual teachers, some schools and some teachers were better than others; it therefore made sense to concentrate expert practitioners in specialist institutions. Thus the teacher training colleges, once established and run by the employing authorities (governments and religious groups), who staffed them with some of their best teachers, often on secondment. These colleges often had their own ‘demonstration schools’ in which best practices could be modelled. So, although gestures toward the established university disciplines were made, the content of educational studies in the teacher training colleges was primarily information about practice – the learning ‘how to do’ of it. When students had completed this training, they were fully qualified teachers, not just in the certificated sense, but in the sense that they had their own agenda for change. Because teacher educators have ignored (or dismissed as uninformed) the many criticisms of their work that have come from teachers and Ministries alike, teacher educators have had very little input into the nature of the changes which are now being forced upon them by the initiatives of the Government in the DEET (Department of Employment, Education and Training) bureaucracy. Through the combination of a lack of response and vision, teacher educators have lost control of the change agenda for their own profession.

Table 3: The Waves of Teacher Education 1850 - 1992

2. The Second Wave

The University Model

The unified model, indeed, the genesis of the colleges themselves, was the idea that good teaching was a set of good practices which could be reproduced by following established routines. It was obviously important to expose student teachers to best practices, but because practices were performed by individual teachers, some schools and some teachers were better than others; it therefore made sense to concentrate expert practitioners in specialist institutions. Thus the teacher training colleges, once established and run by the employing authorities (governments and religious groups), who staffed them with some of their best teachers, often on secondment. These colleges often had their own ‘demonstration schools’ in which best practices could be modelled. So, although gestures toward the established university disciplines were made, the content of educational studies in the teacher training colleges was primarily information about practice – the learning ‘how to do’ of it. When students had completed this training, they were fully qualified teachers, not just in the certificated sense, but in the sense that they had their own agenda for change. Because teacher educators have ignored (or dismissed as uninformed) the many criticisms of their work that have come from teachers and Ministries alike, teacher educators have had very little input into the nature of the changes which are now being forced upon them by the initiatives of the Government in the DEET (Department of Employment, Education and Training) bureaucracy. Through the combination of a lack of response and vision, teacher educators have lost control of the change agenda for their own profession.

The Unified Model

Just as the first wave approach continues to-day, even before the formal abolition of the binary divide there was a gradual coming together of the two tertiary models of teacher education. Universities began to provide ‘methods’ courses, and some began also to offer methods courses, and some began also to offer degree programs in education that were accredited when deemed competent by the employer’s hurdle of permanency. Many teachers were allowed to dispense with the formal apprenticeship altogether; they simply entered the profession as full pay without preparation or certification. As long as one could and did only learn the routines of teaching by teaching during their first year of employment, but would use their sense of vocation, their general academic ability and liberal knowledge base to begin teaching as best practices. Thus, although they were fully qualified teachers on completion of the Dip.Ed. in the sense that they were not required to complete further formal training, they were sometimes initially incompetent in the first year or so with regard to some practices, and they had to pass the employer’s hurdle of permanency.
subjects' which meant that students spent more time on campus being taught by highly qualified academic staff more interested in disciplinary teaching certificates. However, in the Second Wave and is still played.

There were, of course, problems with both the second wave college and university models, some of which, because of their histories, have been exacerbated in the unified system. In universities it was those who were busily developing the new 'scientific' disciplines of psychology and sociology, and others in already established relevant humanities disciplines such as philosophy and history, who applied their academic interests to the school learning, and so on, but as objects of study. These interests produced the - of education subjects, which, though more obviously related to the practices of teaching than the original related disciplines, did not actually offer a foundation for teaching, partly because much of the knowledge generated is a response to the concerns of the original disciplines rather than those of teachers (Tripp, 1990).

This was not a real concern to universities, however - it didn't much matter that actual teaching practices weren't founded on those so-called foundational disciplines because the aim was simply to prepare people to learn how to practice in and from schools, which most did, after a difficult first year, becoming highly competent practitioners for the teachers. In so doing they demonstrated the dispensability of much of the practical competency skill that went on in the colleges.

The college model also appeared to work well, so long as teaching practices and what was expected of teachers didn't change much. When everyone knew what constituted good practice, and the set of routine competencies which needed to be followed to reproduce it were well established, it didn't matter that the teachers who were coming out of the college system were not highly academically trained, nor that they knew very little about the historical and philosophical and theoretical considerations underlying the rationales for the competencies they learned. They were required to reproduce established practices, not to continually learn new ones, or to critique, improve upon or re-design the practices themselves, though many have gone on to do just those things, in so doing demonstrating the irrelevance of much of the university disciplines to teaching.

So, at the risk of further oversimplification, one could characterise the university model as producing beginning teachers who had a broad understanding of some of the disciplines related to education; the college model as producing beginning teachers who had sets of best practice lessons. Although neither were adequate, each produced people with different but equally essential skills for and attitudes towards teaching. One of the tragedies of the college model was that, whereas products of the university system were required to acquire the necessary practical skills whilst working in the job, college students were never expected or given the opportunity to become fairly well-versed in the art of teaching. However, even in the college model it is a dream because it is a dream because although both have to be done within the time it took to do one or the other approach in the old binary system. The reality is that it has done neither well, nor has it brought about the current crisis.

3. Future Models

Assuming then that the present unity of the teacher education model is marked for radical change by disillusioned teaching profession, unions shifting attention from purely industrial matters to professional issues, a government intent on competency-based teacher education. In so doing they demonstrated the dispensability of much of the practical competency skill that went on in the colleges.

The second wave model implies some kind of radical departure to create some new third wave models. The second course implies some kind of reconceptualisation of the subject of teaching and teacher education, in order to overcome the contradictions in the unified model and so to enable the reversal or redirection of the trends that have brought up a crisis point to-day. So let us now examine those four options, the latter in some detail.

The Current DEET Initiative

It is difficult to know precisely what those in government and the policy forming departments of DEET see as the problems with the current teacher education programs because they have not actually defined them in any detail. Instead we have some solutions in the form of a commitment to maintain and enhance the following seven aspects of teacher education:

- a wide diversity of high quality teacher education courses between universities;
- partnerships between schools and universities which strengthen teacher education programs;
- the integration of pedagogy, research and discipline knowledge with teaching practice;
- a knowledge base which ensures that Australian teachers are given a strong grounding in their subjects and are exposed to recent developments in the relevant disciplines;
- flexibility within teacher education programs to facilitate appropriate shifts in the mix of theoretical and practical education;
- closer links between universities and teachers and trainers in their catchment areas, thereby encouraging the development of teacher education courses which are relevant and responsive to their professional needs and career development; and
- recognition by universities of teacher employer needs and the most appropriate ways to respond to them. (Beazley, 1993: 9)

These are all aspects that most teacher educators would endorse in principal, and in fact many are already developing all these in their work. The serious disagreements are arising over how best to implement and achieve them. As is so often the case, such a list of desiderata incorporates elements of a number of different views of teacher education. So as an overview of the DEET initiative, it reflects the kind of pluralistic thinking that offers a framework within which considerable innovation and development could take place. DEET's current decentralisation of competency-based learning in schools is but one approach. This paper suggests another which is different but which incorporates aspects of the competency approach. Certainly, both approaches assume that teachers could and should be better prepared for teaching.

However, it is a measure of the way in which academics are regarded by Government that university teacher education was not represented by a single representative on the board of the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQT). That is the way in which academics are regarded by Government that university teacher education was not represented by a single representative on the board of the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQT). That is the way in which academics are regarded by Government that university teacher education was not represented by a single representative on the board of the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQT). That is the way in which academics are regarded by Government that university teacher education was not represented by a single representative on the board of the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQT). That is the way in which academics are regarded by Government that university teacher education was not represented by a single representative on the board of the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQT). That is the way in which academics are regarded by Government that university teacher education was not represented by a single representative on the board of the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQT). That is the way in which academics are regarded by Government that university teacher education was not represented by a single representative on the board of the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQT). That is the way in which academics are regarded by Government that university teacher education was not represented by a single representative on the board of the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQT). That is the way in which academics are regarded by Government that university teacher education was not represented by a single representative on the board of the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQT). That is the way in which academics are regarded by Government that university teacher education was not represented by a single representative on the board of the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQT). That is the way in which academics are regarded by Government that university teacher education was not represented by a single representative on the board of the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQT). That is the way in which academics are regarded by Government that university teacher education was not represented by a single representative on the board of the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQT).
require further experience and induction programs to learn what they’ve not been taught in university. It is expensive to employ highly paid academics to teach things that are either largely irrelevant to practice (such as history or statistics) or which are relevant (such as how to teach reading) and which situation. The best way of re-organising initial teacher education to bring it more into line with learning from the universities back into schools could therefore be better learned in the actual job of teaching and learning standards. Although there are some very good reasons to be wary, some aspects would be improved by elements of both approaches to make such changes seem a plausible and worthwhile strategy.

DEET’s response appears to a competency-based approach, and although the learning of specific competencies is, and always has been, essential, I do not believe it can take place in isolation. What we really need is a broader ‘third wave’ model for teacher education that will both address the valid criticisms of DEET and other sections of the teaching profession, and will move us forward towards new possibilities for the reformulation of the teaching profession as a whole. I would argue that the development of a third wave will depend upon how teaching is viewed by the profession itself, by government, the universities, business and the community as a whole, and that will depend upon how we reconstruct the meaning of teaching. Some ideas about that issue constitute the remainder of this paper.

4. Possibilities for a Third Wave of Teacher Education

As with any process, it is necessary to specify exactly what can be considered an effective outcome. Clearly the outcome of an initial teacher education program is professionally competent teachers, and other cultural matters (their language, attitude, values, controversy, disputes, history, minorities, strengths and weaknesses, and so on); 

is well educated in the profession – specific sense of being knowledgeable about learners and their culture (development, interests, world view, fears, abilities, hopes, relationships, values, and so on);

is a ‘safe’ person for children to be with (namely, patient and understanding, never negative, cynical or abusive in their behaviour, communication, judgements or relations);

is a positively good influence on children (meaning that they are helpful to children, assist in the development of their esteem, emotions, selfhood, sociability, values, relationships, etc.);

has specific practical professional competencies (such as management, communication, and curriculum planning and evaluation skills);

is able to decisively make successful professional (practical) judgments while teaching, and

is able to understand and account for those judgments (to describe, explain, critique, evaluate, and justify them);

practises a variety of different approaches (such as diagnostic teaching, student-centred and teacher-centred learning);

develops and regularly subjects to critique professional characteristics (such as a code of ethics, keeping abreast of developments, serving the clients’ best interests, and so on);

develops and regularly subjects to critique humane characteristics (such as valuing pupils, a sense of social justice, and so on)
As that specification shows, the difference between a merely technically competent teacher and a professional educator is that the latter is one who not only has a great deal of profession-specific knowledge to draw on, but who also has developed and maintains an informed and critical stance towards the effectiveness of their actions and outcomes. The key to that kind of professionalism is expert judgement, because, although good teachers use good techniques and routines, competent use of approved techniques and routines alone does not produce good teaching. The real art of teaching lies in teachers’ professional judgement. Practitioners of the major professions are valued for their ability to act in situations where a lack of knowledge (therefore not having the right answer) demands that they make a sound judgement. Professionals are highly flexible and creative, frequently developing their own techniques and change routines to suit a situation; they make ‘expert guesses’ through reflection rather than the simple recall of prescribed answers; they use their judgement to choose a most likely ‘best possibility’ from a number of good ones, and they continually monitor their own professional performance. Therefore their values and their development as professional educators are achieved through experience with what are variously called interpretive, reflective or diagnostic approaches to teaching which are also productive of student-centred learning. The essence of professional judgement not allowing approaches is that they are ways in which teachers use their own examination of their own practice to develop their professional judgement. Needless to say, this requires considerable academic ability, a great deal of self-scrutiny, a life-long commitment to challenging, and a life-long commitment to practising it.

The general picture to emerge, however, is that the first and second waves of teacher education really only taught (1) and (7), and partly in those aspects, depending on what model was used. I would argue that all the qualities which I have listed are essential to professional teaching, and that we should therefore immediately take steps to ensure that teachers do possess them. It may be well expensive and take half a century, but also ethical decisions (Lyons, 1990). Contrary to law and medicine, however, teaching judgement can be easily conflated with a purely individual basis: every dealing a teacher has with one pupil will affect the other pupils in the class in one way or another, which vastly increases the complexity and stress of the situation. The following incident (taken from Falsehoods) is therefore key to professional judgement and as such it is essential to any reformation of teacher education. I will return to this later. Meanwhile, let me further examine and illustrate the difference between competency and professional judgement.

In teaching, few decisions are simple matters in which the teacher can identify a situation and recall and apply the correct course of action. And as in law and medicine, the judgements teachers have to make concern the well-being of their pupils, and so they are not merely practical or epistemological but also ethical decisions (Lyons, 1990). In law and medicine, however, teaching judgement can be easily conflated with a purely individual basis: every dealing a teacher has with one pupil will affect the other pupils in the class in one way or another, which vastly increases the complexity and stress of the situation. The following incident (taken from Falsehoods) is therefore key to professional judgement and as such it is essential to any reformation of teacher education. I will return to this later. Meanwhile, let me further examine and illustrate the difference between competency and professional judgement.

In teaching, few decisions are simple matters in which the teacher can identify a situation and recall and apply the correct course of action. And as in law and medicine, the judgements teachers have to make concern the well-being of their pupils, and so they are not merely practical or epistemological but also ethical decisions (Lyons, 1990). In law and medicine, however, teaching judgement can be easily conflated with a purely individual basis: every dealing a teacher has with one pupil will affect the other pupils in the class in one way or another, which vastly increases the complexity and stress of the situation. The following incident (taken from Falsehoods) is therefore key to professional judgement and as such it is essential to any reformation of teacher education. I will return to this later. Meanwhile, let me further examine and illustrate the difference between competency and professional judgement.

In teaching, few decisions are simple matters in which the teacher can identify a situation and recall and apply the correct course of action. And as in law and medicine, the judgements teachers have to make concern the well-being of their pupils, and so they are not merely practical or epistemological but also ethical decisions (Lyons, 1990). In law and medicine, however, teaching judgement can be easily conflated with a purely individual basis: every dealing a teacher has with one pupil will affect the other pupils in the class in one way or another, which vastly increases the complexity and stress of the situation. The following incident (taken from Falsehoods) is therefore key to professional judgement and as such it is essential to any reformation of teacher education. I will return to this later. Meanwhile, let me further examine and illustrate the difference between competency and professional judgement.
issues, teaching decisions and approval of the values in them;
4 Critical judgement: the critique of judgements and values revealed by reflection from a view of benefits for learners and increased social justice.

Clearly one could not expect any beginning teacher to be equally expert in all these kinds of judgement at graduation: all the evidence is that practice judgement can only be build up through experience, for instance, so there we should expect only the minimal competence necessary to learn through experience. On the other hand diagnostic and reflective judgements are precisely what one could learn most effectively in a tertiary institution. But the main point is that personal professional competencies and values come together in all of these kinds of judgement, and it is what they are, how they interact, and how they may best be learned, that initial teacher programs must therefore know and teach.10

Developing Education

There is no doubt that what a teacher needs to know and be able to do to-day is very different from even the recent past, and will continue to change with increasing rapidity. For instance, Hill and Hill (1990,3) suggest that, 'Teaching the skill of collaboration, the management, and the organisation will become more important than instruction and imparting knowledge,' as we begin to take the social dimension of learning seriously. Such views are but one dimension of the great change which is happening in education. In spite of pioneering work such as Lee Schumman's Knowledge Base for beginning Teachers, this fundamental issue has not been yet been adequately addressed. As I have recently written elsewhere about the problems with the construction of knowledge in teacher education (Tripp, 1993b), I want to do no more here that gesture at the broad outlines of an idea. First, I believe that we must develop education into a discipline per se (perhaps called 'educology') which is not just clearly and exclusively focussed on the study of education, but which studies teaching and learning from practitioners' viewpoints. While one recognises that the '...of education' subjects have developed over the last thirty years and produced a huge and ever growing amount of knowledge, much of that knowledge still belongs in, and is only used by, those working in the original 'parental' discipline. It is peripheral, if not entirely irrelevant, to educational practitioners. Development of knowledge specifically about teaching tends to have been produced under the heading 'curriculum', which has caused other problems. The difficulty with the present situation is to sort out what of the '...of education' fields properly belongs to eduology from that which belongs in the realms of other disciplines. I think we are getting to the position where we could now begin to do that.

Again, a brief contrast of past with possible practice. In the second wave models, the rhetoric was that the knowledge of the related disciplines was applied to practice through the mediation of the classroom. The reality was that this didn't often happen, and there were several reasons for this:

1. The academic knowledge developed in faculties of educational structures and children (often things teachers could do nothing about in their classrooms); little theoretical knowledge was about teaching.
2. Educational theory tended to be the related disciplines 'grand ideas' about the world rather than theories of teaching.
3. Rather than transforming, mediating and applying those theories in the classroom, the '...of education subjects' tended to use teaching as a field of study to illustrate, develop and refine the theories of the parental disciplines.
4. So-called educational theory tended therefore to remain located in the related disciplines where it served the interests of academics rather than teachers.
5. It was teachers who were expected to access the knowledge of the '...of education' subjects and apply it to improve their practice: very few university academics ever applied anything of their disciplinary knowledge either to their own teaching or to school teaching-learning.

It general and in short, academics working in the '...of education' subjects were not school teachers and did not begin to develop a classroom teaching perspective: they were practitioners of the related disciplines'; they tended to construct their subjects as extracts of the related disciplines; they used teaching-learning situations merely to illustrate their theories; very little application to teaching actually took place.

These processes are summarised in the following diagram.

Diagram 1: Changing constructions of educational knowledge.

On the far left there is the espoused ideal which appeared more in rhetorical than material form. Next is a brief description of the content of practice at each situation, the teachers' 'realm' being real people, events, things, and so on, that they deal with on a moment by moment basis in their practice. To the right of the content is a representation of what tends to happen in the second wave university teacher education model where teachers are taught the theories of the related disciplines, but attempts to get teachers to apply theories to their work usually fail because they are not taken out of their context in other disciplines, they do not engage teacher's practice. And, being already developed, they fail to develop in teachers the discursive practices necessary to translate from theory in one discipline to practice in another. On the right of the diagram is what I call the seminaristic or educational practice model which works both ways: some theorising is the reverse of the related disciplines approach: it begins with the material practice of classroom teachers and creates theory through involving teachers in the discursive processes of theorising their practice in a collaborative 'grounded theory' approach (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). But it also utilises the theories of the related disciplines, not to apply them to practice, but to gain new understandings of practice by seeing it in the light of other social and psychological theories. That process should also be transformative of the original theories. In my own research I attempt to use this paradigm, theorising teachers' written accounts of incidents in their teaching-learning experience.

If the major clients of educational knowledge should be practising teachers, then the outstanding characteristic of traditional paradigms of educational research has been the exclusion of their clients from the generation and application of the
The question facing teacher educators, therefore, is whether they are actively going to begin a reconstruction of their knowledge and associated teaching practices that will produce the kind of new forms of teacher education that will be appropriate to the twenty-first century, or whether they are going to fight a rearguard action as their existing knowledge and knowledge construction practices become progressively irrelevant and marginalised.

Conclusion

Knowledge about teaching is fundamental to all models of teacher education. What that knowledge is depends upon whose construction it is and what their interests are. Hitherto, there have been two rather different constructions of knowledge serving different purposes: the practical craft knowledge of teachers and the academic disciplinary knowledge of academics. Each has remained largely separate and taken different kinds of practice and understanding of their teaching, and the researcher gains data for more general theories of schooling and teacher's practical knowledge. Collaborative research in the classroom thus takes place between two eclectic professionals who could both be called teacher-researchers: one is a school teacher who researches their own practice, the other is a university academic who researches in the work of teachers. But in the partnership they also teach and learn from each other, so the former is also a researcher educator, and the latter is also a teacher educator.
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This paper was presented at the ATEA conference, Perth, July 1993. It is an expanded version of some of the ideas originally presented at the retreat of the Murdoch University School of Education, Contaclo Hotel, Perth, April, 1993.

End Notes

1 I use 'change' agenda deliberately because, although the changes to teacher education are being termed 'reforms' in the current debate, they are in fact a simple variation of past practices which will return teacher education to something like the old college model, if not to the original apprenticeship model. As the current proposals contain no fundamental changes to the nature of the knowledge of teaching practices of teacher education, they are not in any way reformative; but inasmuch as they propose a huge shift of power and purpose away from the universities, they are seriously radical.

2 The ideological purpose behind the term was so well achieved that no one seemed to notice that the 'foundational disciplines' weren't (and aren't) foundational to teaching. They were invented millennia after teaching had been (and still is) successfully practiced in every culture the world over. They are foundational only to a particular way of constructing the study of education. I therefore refer to them as the 'related' disciplines, because aspects of them are relevant in important ways to the study of education; but foundational in any practical sense they are not.

3 In a deep sense these are not separable of course. Our 'self' is a reification and who we are is probably best seen as a shifting nexus of (often competing) discourses. When I separate such aspects in this paper it is to draw attention in an readily intelligible fashion to some of the discourses that have hitherto been absent from academic notions of what it is to be a good teacher.

4 My thanks here to Sue Willis, who introduced me to this broader notion of diagnostic teaching. For an account of this approach, see Murdoch University course E277, or Tripp 1993a (Chapter 2).

5 One might note that this is a practice-based form of theorising very different from the way a
traditional philosopher of education would have dealt with the matter of discipline, perhaps through an analysis of the concept. It is not that the analysis is not 'philosophical', but that in it the teacher stands quite differently in relation to the subject matter of what is usually taught as the philosophy of education. It is that which has profound implications for the development of knowledge in education, and the practice of education as a discipline.

7 I stress 'my' because such analyses are always provisional and revisable, and they need to be negotiated and shared with the other participants before any claims of objectivity or validity are made. My analysis is offered as an example of the kind of points that should emerge from the incident as an agenda for reflection and further investigation, not to 'prove' anything in an 'objective' fashion. As Glaser and Strauss (1967) point out, hypotheses do not have to be true to be useful.

8 For a detailed explanation, see Tripp, 1993a, Chapter 9.

9 The same is that much more true for schemes which purport to evaluate and assess the performance of experienced teachers, particularly for promotion.

10 Whilst being an essentially applied discipline may be a necessary stage for any new discipline involving professional training to grow through, it seems to have become institutionalised as the end point of the development of the study of education as a discipline in its own right. It is no accident, but symptomatic of this lack of growth, that we still use the term 'education' for what ought to be called 'educology' (Steiner, 1981; Christianson, 1982). That not only causes a great deal of confusion in the lay community, but, even more important, it continues to prevent growth by tacitly maintaining the view that education can only be a field of action, not study. Many universities have recently established courses and departments of 'peace studies' or 'women's studies'; I know of no 'School of Women' or 'Department of Peace' (would that there were!), but I work in what is called 'The School of Education' as if the rest of the university were doing something different.

Incidentally, on similar grounds support for the use of the term educology also comes from other disciplines such as literature and music. The call is for terminology which registers the distinction between the 'literature' or 'music' that are the object phenomena of study, and 'literology' or 'musicology' as the disciplines which study them.

11 I use the term paradigm rather than model here because I see it as such in the Kuhnian sense in which it is a matter not only developing a different kind of knowledge, but of developing the research canons and institutional power structures necessary to support it. I think the previous approaches have been more eclectic models for the use of the paradigms of the related disciplines.

ABSTRACT

This article contests the ways in which preservice teacher education programs have been conceptualised, planned and implemented in universities. The article, therefore, is NOT about responding in technocratic ways alone to institutional, practising school, and employer constraints. Rather, it is about conceptualising preservice teacher education programs so that intending graduates work towards becoming reflective practitioners with a commitment to social justice. Such a conceptualisation is considered appropriate given the increasing diversity of learners and learning settings; the increasing complexity of communities and society; the growing possibilities for engaging in truly collaborative approaches to teacher education; and the expanding challenge of fulfilling the multi-faceted role of teachers both now and in the future.

The article contests existing programs using the critical reflection/teacher as reflective practitioner literature as a lens. While certain emphases are endorsed as being worthwhile in the programs, they tend to be isolated and undervalued in the contemporary context. These emphases are used as a basis for proposing and elaborating a TOTAL curriculum approach for preservice teacher education programs. The proposal focuses on four guiding principles for this curriculum approach for preservice teacher education programs. These principles (which emerge from the writer's interest in critical reflectivity in preservice teacher education programs) are contextualisation within contemporary societal trends and issues; critical reflection; collaboration or partnerships; and professional development for all persons involved in such programs. The writer concludes that it's time for this sort of TOTAL approach.

This TOTAL approach emerges as a personal view which relates to the writer's recent experiences on professional development leave in Australia, USA, Canada and UK. This, together with his long experience in coordinating and teaching in preservice programs, provide background for contesting existing programs and for proposing a TOTAL curriculum approach for the ongoing development of preservice teacher education programs in universities.

It is teachers who, in the end, will change the world of the school by understanding it.

(A quotation from Lawrence Stenhouse chosen by some teachers who worked with him as an inscription for the memorial plaque in the grounds of the University of East Anglia).

INTRODUCTION

There have been significant emphases in preservice teacher education programs in recent years. There include the contextualisation of professional practice within contemporary societal trends and issues; critical reflection in and on professional practice; collaboration or partnerships in professional practice; and accompanying professional development for ALL persons involved in such programs. The question immediately arises: How enduring are these emphases as guiding principles in the overall ethos and the total curriculum of our preservice teacher education programs as experienced by teachers in preparation? It is the purpose of this article to contest existing programs; to propose a TOTAL curriculum approach for preservice teacher education programs; and to use these emphases as a means of elaborating four guiding principles for this approach. The article concludes that it's time for such an approach, so that teachers in preparation have the opportunity to begin a journey of professional development which will hopefully empower them to change the world of the school by understanding it.

The contemporary context is inhospitable, if not hostile, to the sort of preservice program which would be totally committed to such emphases as guiding principles. Consider the following questions, for example, as they relate to the Australian context.

• How have contemporary contextual demands from the political, social and economic arenas impacted on preservice teacher education