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SEVEN CONTEMPORARY IDEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON TEACHER EDUCATION IN BRITAIN TODAY

Dave Hill
West Sussex Institute of Higher Education

INTRODUCTION

Teacher education in England and Wales is in the spotlight. It is under ferocious, sustained and nakedly ideological assault at three inter-related levels of discourse - the radical right middlebrow and quality media (in particular the Daily Mail and Mail on Sunday); radical right ideologists, think-tanks and academics; and the current (1991/92) Conservative education Ministerial team.

Throughout this paper, references are made to, and quotes taken from the above three types of source each of which features in a discourse of derision (Maguire, 1991).

These levels of discourse, aimed at different audiences, might be expected to use very different vocabularies, sentence structures and sentence lengths. While there are differences, in general they don't. All these three levels punch home and deride 'trendies' in education. All use populist, punchy, and social panic terminology metaphors and 'enemy within', 'scapegoatism' typical of the Reagan-Bush and Thatcher-Major project for reconstituting schooling, higher education, teacher education, adult and further education - the ideological states apparatus of the education system - into the service of late capitalist economy. The misinformation systems of the Conservative government, illuminated in such varied sources as 'Spycatcher', the Ken Loach film 'Secret Agenda' and the 1991 Alan Bleasdale television series 'GBH', show, through fact and through fiction, the handservant role of the right-wing press and the interactive relationship between that press and the Conservative leadership, over, for example teacher education as a whole, or to take one cause celebre of 1991, the events surrounding Culloden Primary School.

The 1991 attacks on Culloden Primary School, at first hailed widely after its BBC TV series as a model of non-sloppy progressive, child-centred, anti-racist, anti-sexist education (even welcomed initially by the right-wing Daily Telegraph and The Times), have been like an ideological blitzkrieg.
Kenneth Clarke, the Secretary of State for Education and Science, encouraging and encouraged by the Daily Mail and Mail on Sunday, has fulminated against 'cranky' approaches to the teaching of reading, damning not only the real books method but also the 'look and say' method, in favour of the 'phonics method', a convention extended to the institutions of teacher education promoting such approaches.

The reading methods controversy is part of the current attack on teacher education, with Tim Eggar, one of the Junior Ministers for Education and Science, encouraging and Kenneth Clarke, the Secretary of State for Education, for replacing much of it by second into the courses which have been approved. The manifested pledges for the next election.

Education Secretary Kenneth Clarke, who has condemned child-centred learning as 'silly', has not been idle. After the 'Sharon Shirl' affair in which Cambridge classicist Amnis Garfield was denied a teacher training place at Nene College, Northamptonshire, yet was offered an interview when she posed as a fictitious Afro-Caribbean feminist, he sacked some of the 'trendies' from the courses. Teachers for less time in school and more sustained time in school; and (iv) concern about the context specificity of most school-based schemes. A number of recent evaluations have borne out these criticisms (see Barrett et al. 1992; DENI 1991; NFER 1991; DES 1991a; Hill 1992a and 1992b).

From sections of the Left, inherent problems are apparent - problems of dethriving, de-privilege, de-constructing, de-reflecting and de-skilling. On the Right, however Ministers and some of the Press, such as the Daily Mail have apparently already pre-judged in favour of such schemes. Proposals to base teacher education courses in schools as well as colleges since 1990 were met with such right-wing media headlines as 'Training shake-up to beat college trendies' (Daily Mail, 4 Jan). "Is this the right way to train teachers? Clarke's aims for return to traditional methods as standards plummet' (Sunday Express, 29 Dec) and "Do we really need these colleges?" (Sunday Express, 5 Jan). Long-time radical right ideologues nished to welcome such moves, for example Sheila Lalor with her Times article 'Touch of class for teachers: Plans to train teachers on the job should be welcomed'.

Like their National Curriculum for schools, current radical right proposals for dethriving teacher training courses merely roaming the schools, to replace that teachers must not only be skilled, competent, classroom teachers, - they must be much more than that. They must be also critical, reflective, transformative and intellectual. They should enable and encourage their pupils/students, not only to gain basic and advanced knowledge and skills, but question, critique, judge and evaluate what, what effects it has and 'why', and to be concerned and informed about equality and social justice. Not just in school, but in life beyond the classroom door. This concept of a critical, reflective, moral, critical active citizenship goes beyond the Prime Minister: 'What is modernism? It is based on a metanarrative of justice and equality and morality, and unashamedly so. While recognising the political and analytic force of some formulations of plurality of 'voices', of diversity, of anti-ethnocentrism within a 'post-modernisms of resistance' drawing inter alia from Laclau and Mouffe, the perspective of this paper joins with Giourx and Arnonowitz (1991) for example, and with Boyne and Rattansi (1990), in seeking a dialogue between post-modernism and neo-Marxism.

This particular formulation of critical, active, radical citizenship is also not placed in the service of any one particular variation or formulation of anti-capitalist ideology.

Events in Eastern Europe, and discussion with Bulgarian teacher educator Iva Nestorova bring home the appropriacy of applying versions of a democratic radical socialist/neo-Marxist critique and programme to all state and poltico-economic contexts, be they the Right neo-liberal social authoritarian capitalism of Reagan-Bush and Thatcher-Major, the liberal and social democratic capitalism of Mitterand's France, Kohl's West Germany, or the Scandinavian models, or whether they be of the deformed worker states' or 'state capitals', or 'party-class' states of the 'Communist world'.

The 'missing models' of democratic socialist development, has as yet, been strangled military since September 1979. The third world against revolutionary democratic redistributive egalitarian socialism is, of course, the national power of the ruling capitalist class, its (contested) control over the ideological as well as its tight control over repressive state apparatuses, and the (again contested) hegemony of its ideology.

It is in these three constellations, and in the semi-autonomous state structures such as schooling, education, teacher education, and local government, that models contrary to the current Right's inherent and essential immorality and amorality, must be developed, critiqued, and disseminated.

PATTERNS OF INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND WALES: COLLEGE BASED AND SCHOOL BASED

The most thorough description and analysis of contemporary initial teacher education in England and Wales is Barrett, E. et al. (1992) which surveyed the 88 Higher Education Institutions offering, between them, 317 courses of Initial Teacher Training with 24,153 students.

The major forthcoming change announced in January 1992 by the Conservative Government is that as from September 1993 all secondary age phase courses shall become 80% school based and only 20% college based (DES 1992b). It is also intended that Primary age phase PGCE courses will become far more school based, together with the undergraduate B.Ed degree, which may be cut from four years to three, with the third year spent in school (Clark, K. 1992).

In England and Wales nearly all initial teacher education is, as yet, college-based. It takes the form of four year full-time undergraduate B.Ed (Bachelor of Education) degrees (sometimes called a BA.Ed - Bachelor of Arts: Education) or the one-year full-time Post-Graduate Certificate in Education, the PGCE. In 1990-91, there were 11,800 students on conventional B.Ed courses and 12,000 on PGCE courses (TES, 1990). In recent years a number of two-year B.Ed degrees, and two-year PGCE courses have been established for subjects in which there is a severe shortage of teachers (such as Maths, Science, Design and Technology).

The two 'alternative routes' to college-based teacher education that have been established since September 1990 by the Conservative government are the Licensed Teacher Scheme and
Articed Teacher Scheme. The Articed Teacher Scheme attracted about 403 students in 1990-91 and the Licensed Teacher Scheme 439, a quarter of them, non-graduates (Barrett, E. et al., 1992). So, in 1990-91 around 96% of teacher education was carried out in college-based courses, and around 4% in school-based schemes.

LICENSED TEACHING AND ARTICLED TEACHING

College-based teacher education is avoided in the Licensed Teacher Scheme whereby untrained over 24 year olds are enabled to teach in state schools without having previously undergone any teacher education whatsoever. The only formal qualifications are the age qualification, a grade C or above GCSE in Maths and English, and completion of the equivalent of two years full-time post - A level higher education. A degree is not necessary.

Indeed it is possible that someone who failed at the end of 2 years of a 4 year B.Ed degree could become a Licensed Teacher on acceptance by a school, on giving lessons (and/or in practice) by a Local Education Authority.

Licensees are appointed to a school staff, they are not, unlike Articed Teachers, supernumerary, they have their own classes. At the moment a number are already teaching, as untrained teachers, for example of foreign languages (in what, until the Licensed Teacher Scheme was, in intention, an all-graduate profession).

It is worth noting the genealogy of the Licensed Teacher Scheme, being based (in the same way that the new City Technology Colleges are - loosely based on Magnet Schools) on an United States model.

Licensing is based on New Jersey's PTP (Provisional Teacher Programme) in the USA, by which New Jersey graduates who have not followed education courses at college, are certified as teacher after satisfactorily completing a year's supervised teaching and the required 200 hours instruction at a regional centre. The Education theory in this New Jersey 200 hours instruction was general theory, not linked directly to the age range of children being taught. This is unlike British teacher education in which students are divided into Secondary and Primary age range courses (and frequently sub-divided into First/Infant and Middle/Junior age range courses). Her Majesty's Inspectorate also noted in 1989, the lack of links between teacher education departments and the schools in assessing the trained.

The lecturer taught the theory; the teachers supervised the practice. British press coverage of the HMI Report omitted to mention that 1000 PTP teachers were attracted by a massive pay rise for teachers! In the words of the HMI Inspectors of Education "the raising of salaries was a subsequent, though important development", New Jersey raised the minimum starting salary in 1985 by 23% from $15,000 to $18,500 with the prospect of a further increase in the near future of 20% plus a package of loans of $7,500 for various students, convertible into an outright grant for those teaching in (state) schools for 4-6 years.

Not only that, the average size of the 22 classes seen by the HMI was 10. It must also be noted that the American school curriculum is far more "teacher-proof" that the British, United States teachers delivering courses which are far more "off the shelf", far more pre-designed and predetermined (Hill, D., 1990).

The second way in which college-based teacher education in Britain is avoided (and the substantial immersion two years into the job. Teachers in 1991 receive 5,500 pounds for the first year and 6,500 pounds for the second year (more in London). The two-year Articed Teacher Scheme for graduates aged 22 and over, is basically an apprenticeship scheme. It was subsequently upgraded in nomenclature as the 'Articed Teacher Scheme'. This scheme in 1990-91 involves 16 pilot schemes with around 30 Articed Teachers in each.

Of the four routes into teaching, the B.Ed, the PGCE, the Articed Teacher Scheme and the Licensed Teacher Scheme, the first three lead to recognised academic awards and are subject to the requirements of CATE (the Committee for the Accreditation of Teacher Education), the Government appointed supervisory body for teacher education, but the last employs an entirely different approach to the award to Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). Unlike the Articed Teacher Scheme, which is based upon a notion of partnership between LEAs and higher education, the Licensed Teacher Scheme does not require (though it does permit and even encourages) the involvement of conventional teacher training institutions in the LEAs training programme (Whitty, G., 1991a). It should be noted that in private schools, at present attended by around 7% of children in England and Wales, a teaching qualification is not legally required. Hence many private school teachers are untrained.

Finally, it is possible that within two or three years college based teacher education will have been replaced, very substantially, by school based initial teacher education.

THREE MODELS OF INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION (ITE)

Two current models of initial teacher education are commonly presented as alternatives to each other:

1. the classroom competency / skills model;
2. the reflective practitioner model.


But these are not the only models. There is a third, a 'radical left', model of the teacher which is a distinctive variant of the reflective practitioner model - distinctive in its pedagogy and in its Initial Teacher Education curriculum content and in its intention. This model, promulgated here is:

3. the critical reflective 'transformative' practitioner model.

This model is particularly associated with the work of Henry Giroux such as, for example, Giroux and McLaren (1989); Aronowitz and Giroux (1986). See also Hill, D. (1989, 1990, 1991a).

Claims are made for a number of PGCE courses such as those at Oxford Polytechnic and West Sussex Institute of Higher Education that their courses are 'critical'. A number of recent books detail and discuss developments and their ideologies in British initial teacher education, such as Whitty, Barton, and Pollard (1987), Booth, Farling and Wilkin (1990), and Graves (Ed) (1990). The Licensed and Articed Teacher Education Schemes are set out and/or described in DES (1989a, 1989e, 1989f, and 1989g).

In practice longer courses such as 4-year full-time B.Ed (Bachelor of Education degree) courses tend to and claim to attempt to develop the reflective practitioner model, whereas, many though by no means all courses such as the 1-year full-time PGCE (Post-Graduate Certificate in Education) decide to concentrate mainly on the competency skill model.

SEVEN PERSPECTIVES ON TEACHER EDUCATION

Within ideological debate on teacher education there are a number of, by now quite well known, broad positions; The 'Radical Right' and 'Hard Centre' tend to argue for the classroom competency/skills model, the 'Radical Left' for the 'critical practitioner' model. The Radical Left model there are three identifiable categories: the social reproductive critical model, which is essentially deterministic in Marxist terms and pessimistic; the cultural political ethical and moral model, for example of Zeichner, Liston, and Popkewitz, and the ethical and moral 'transformative intellectual' model of Giroux, McLaren and Arnonowitz. The ideological debate and culture war is discussed in Hill (1989, 1990) drawing on Giroux, McLaren, Apple, Liston, Zeichner and Portuguese studies by Stor (1986) and Fernandes (1990). In the USA it has been critiqued in Apple (1989a, 1989b) and Giroux.

1. THE RADICAL RIGHT

The current culture clash is between what might still be called, despite Mrs Thatcher's resignation as British Prime Minister, the Thatcherite culture of privatised service and private interest culture on the one hand, against a socialist culture of public service and public interest.

In the first year since her demise, there has been no apparent let-up by the Conservative Government in the area of Radical Right, competitive, individualistic, privatising, hierarchicalising, elitist, differentiating, Hayekian policies regarding schools or teacher education.

'Radical Right' writers on education and on teacher education in Britain include the Hillgate Group. (Roger Scruton and Caroline Cox among others), Stuart Sexton, Anthony O'Hear, Dennis O'He讥丘村?, the cultural political ethical and moral model, for example of Zeichner, Liston, and Popkewitz, and the ethical and moral 'transformative intellectual' model of Giroux, McLaren and Arnonowitz. The ideological debate and culture war is discussed in Hill (1989, 1990) drawing on Giroux, McLaren, Apple, Liston, Zeichner and Portuguese studies by Stor (1986) and Fernandes (1990). In the USA it has been critiqued in Apple (1989a, 1989b) and Giroux.
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In the first year since her demise, there has been no apparent let-up by the Conservative Government in the area of Radical Right, competitive, individualistic, privatising, hierarchicalising, elitist, differentiating, Hayekian policies regarding schools or teacher education.
comment in a number of right-wing daily newspapers and weeklies such as the Times Educational Supplement, some controlled by Rupert Murdoch. Initial training is the first stage in a process of continuing professional development through induction and subsequent INSET. No initial training programme can equip new teachers with all the knowledge, understanding and skills which they will need in their career.

1.3 During their initial training, student, articled and licensed teachers should, as an essential part of their wider professional training, develop the following knowledge, understanding and skills:

- awareness of the statutory framework in which the National Curriculum functions;
- knowledge of subject content and teaching methods;
- skills in assessment, recording and reporting achievement;
- a view of the whole curriculum; understanding of curriculum continuity;
- IT capability;
- skills in curriculum planning and review.

The former consensual liberal democratic culture of the 60s and 70s is left looking bewildered, seeking to de-ideologise education, to retreat from the curricular wars and to camp out on the lowlands of pragmatism and competency training. It has retreated from egalitarianism on grounds of pragmatism and competency training. It has retreated from egalitarianism on grounds of pragmatism and competency training.

The NCC document, together with the CATE criteria are, in effect, a new National Curriculum for Initial Teacher Education, relating and subordinating ITE to the National curriculum for Schools.

The first three paragraphs of the NCC (1991, p. 3) document are:

1.1 The National Curriculum is now an important element in all initial teaching training (ITT) and most in-service education and training (INSET). Its introduction has provided a framework within which students, teachers, Higher education (HE) tutors and Local Education Authority (LEA) staff can work together and has helped to promote a common language form professional discussion about teaching and learning.

1.2 The need to prepare new teachers for the National Curriculum has also helped to clarify thinking about what is reasonable to expect of an ITT course. Initial training is the first stage in a process of continuing professional development through induction and subsequent INSET. No initial training programme can equip new teachers with all the knowledge, understanding and skills which they will need in their career.

1.3 During their initial training, student, articled and licensed teachers should, as an essential part of their wider professional training, develop the following knowledge, understanding and skills:

- awareness of the statutory framework in which the National Curriculum functions;
- knowledge of subject content and teaching methods;
- skills in assessment, recording and reporting achievement;
- a view of the whole curriculum; understanding of curriculum continuity;
- IT capability;
- skills in curriculum planning and review.

The former consensual liberal democratic culture of the 60s and 70s is left looking bewildered, seeking to de-ideologise education, to retreat from the curricular wars and to camp out on the lowlands of pragmatism and competency training. It has retreated from egalitarianism on grounds of pragmatism and competency training.

The NCC document, together with the CATE criteria are, in effect, a new National Curriculum for Initial Teacher Education, relating and subordinating ITE to the National curriculum for Schools.

The first three paragraphs of the NCC (1991, p. 3) document are:

1.1 The National Curriculum is now an important element in all initial teaching training (ITT) and most in-service education and training (INSET). Its introduction has provided a framework within which students, teachers, Higher education (HE) tutors and Local Education Authority (LEA) staff can work together and has helped to promote a common language form professional discussion about teaching and learning.

1.2 The need to prepare new teachers for the National Curriculum has also helped to clarify thinking about what is reasonable to expect of an ITT course. Initial training is the first stage in a process of continuing professional development through induction and subsequent INSET. No initial training programme can equip new teachers with all the knowledge, understanding and skills which they will need in their career.

1.3 During their initial training, student, articled and licensed teachers should, as an essential part of their wider professional training, develop the following knowledge, understanding and skills:

- awareness of the statutory framework in which the National Curriculum functions;
- knowledge of subject content and teaching methods;
- skills in assessment, recording and reporting achievement;
- a view of the whole curriculum; understanding of curriculum continuity;
- IT capability;
- skills in curriculum planning and review.

The former consensual liberal democratic culture of the 60s and 70s is left looking bewildered, seeking to de-ideologise education, to retreat from the curricular wars and to camp out on the lowlands of pragmatism and competency training. It has retreated from egalitarianism on grounds of pragmatism and competency training.
However, a number of teacher educators have put their heads above the parapet in publications or the media. These include Ted Wragg (1990b, c), Tim Brighouse, Maurice Crayle (1990), Diane Montgomery (1989), Peter Newsam (1989), Jean Rudduck (1989), Anthony Adams and Witold Tulasiewicz (1989), and Bill Taylor (1990), the Chair of CATE. In Craft's words 'training efficient technicians is a very worthwhile activity, but this is neither the role of teacher education, nor the requirement of the nation' (Craft, 1990, p. 77). See also Baker, R. (1990) and TES (1990b).

Another counterblast was the round robin letter signed by many University teacher educators in The Times and effective attack on two 1990 Radical Right publications, by Sheila Lawlor and Dennis O'Keefe, and various papers at the 1990 UCET Conference which attacked the Radical Right onslaught as Initial Teacher Education. In April 1991 UCET Press Conference and Release further attacked misrepresentation of initial teacher education work and suggested that the theory/practice polarisation was not an appropriate way of categorising the content of ITT courses today as the theory and the practice were fully integrated. At the Press Conference Tony Becher (UCET, 1991) of Sussex University said: 'Tony Wragg has become dominated by the training right. Some of the things they are saying are complete falsehoods'. Edgar Jenkins of Leeds University said: 'We are facing a complete disaster which would make the poll tax look like a fairy tale. If schools no longer had responsibility for training of teachers without adequate resources or the desire to train them, the cumulative effect would be on that scale'. A number of chapters in Booth, Furlong, and Wilkin (1990) critique current developments in teacher education ideologically, for example chapters by Margaret Wilkin, by Crozier, Mentor and Pollard, and by Wragg. So too does Robert Cowens' chapter in Norman Graves (1990).

Ted Wragg often writes hilariously, for example see his 'Join the Right and ring the changes' in the TES 6th July 1990, on the national curriculum, teacher training and right-wing pressure groups.

He attacks ill-informed and vitriolic attack on teacher training by the Right-wing critics of education who show the greatest reluctance to go and look at the actual schools they criticise so readily.

One fantasy put out is that the need for training actually prevents good people from being recruited. Yet when maths and science graduates were allowed straight into schools without training in the 1970s and 1980s more than 2,000 a year, many with higher degrees and good first degrees chose to take a PGCE course and only a hundred or so entered untrained.

Another is that training does nothing for people; that little knowledge is needed to teach in a primary school and that graduates with a decent knowledge of their subject can simply go into a classroom and start teaching. I have never been able to understand this contempt for training. I always fancy putting some hapless Nobel prize-winner in with 40 or so fresh Friday afternoon to test this 'you only need to know your subject' view. Some right wingers seem to counter by arguing that a Nobel prize-winner in education would not be able to cope with 4D either. This is based on the false assumption that 'education' is abstract theory. Education is intelligent action informed by analysis and reflection. Nobel prize-winners therefore, ought to be well informed and thoughtful practitioners still experimenting and well able to teach a variety of classes.

Within this broadly Centrist group the three distinguishable sub-groups are the 'Soft Centre', the 'Hard Centre' and the 'Left in the Centre'.

2. THE 'SOFT CENTRE'

This group argues that 'everything in the garden is rosy', Nirvana would exist if there were resourcing and people would 'let us get on with the job'. This is a not untypical 'producer' view, in which the employers manage, the managed are now more overtly resourcing and people would 'let us get on with the job'. This 'Hard Centre' sub-group of the Centre is particularly associated with David Hargreaves and Warnock. Warnock in a series of attacks on the B.Ed education would not be able to cope with 4D and that training does nothing for people; that little knowledge is needed to teach in a primary school and that graduates with a decent knowledge of their subject can simply go into a classroom and start teaching. I have never been able to understand this contempt for training. I always fancy putting some hapless Nobel prize-winner in with 40 or so fresh Friday afternoon to test this 'you only need to know your subject' view. Some right wingers seem to counter by arguing that a Nobel prize-winner in education would not be able to cope with 4D either. This is based on the false assumption that 'education' is abstract theory. Education is intelligent action informed by analysis and reflection. Nobel prize-winners therefore, ought to be well informed and thoughtful practitioners still experimenting and well able to teach a variety of classes.

This should not be underestimated, the dramatically increased levels of pay and power awarded (and self-awarded) within a deliberately ideologically decentralising Polytechnic and College Managements 1991 has had noticeably negative effects on the collegiality and proto-democracy of many institutions. Managers now more overtly manage, the managed are now more overtly managed. Managerial muscle flexing is now more legitimised - by law - and rather less located within liberal democratic/social democratic cultures of staff-student and management staff relationships.

In the new increasingly competitive bidding process for student numbers in the Polytechnics and Colleges Sector since 1990, prior to which the bidding process was more discrete and control over ITE and other courses more permissive) various college managements and other college teacher educators appear to act from expediency. They either act habitually, bending to every authoritative wind that blows, or selectively, partly on the grounds of avoiding retribution, cuts in funding or cuts in student numbers.
4. THE 'LEFT IN THE CENTRE'

This group comprises individuals and networks whose ideological orientations are left of centre, sometimes a little, sometimes a lot.

Groups and initiatives have been set up by BERA (the British Education Research Association), UCET (the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers), by ‘The Future of Teacher Training’ (sic) Writing Group, co-ordinated by Jean Rudduck and David Bridges, and by the ‘Imaginative Projects: Arguments for a New Teacher Education’ group whose publication was published in January 1991.

The British Educational Research Association (BERA) research group on teacher education includes Jack Whitehead, David Hustler, John Elliott, Jean Rudduck, and Dave Hill. The UCET group (Universities Council for the Education of Teachers) embraces a wide number of University teacher educators. The ‘Future of Teacher Training Group’ is open to teacher educators whose ideological orientations are left of centre, sometimes a little, sometimes a lot.

While such initiatives are welcome for those reasons implicit in political ‘reformism’ or ‘revisionism’, they fail to go much beyond a defence of and rationale for the status quo - they neglect overt and explicit issues of social justice and equality as do some recent internal Labour Party discussion documents in 1991 and the December 1991 Labour Party policy document on teacher education and training, whatever their other merits. While individually and collectively many adherents and activists in such networks are highly committed to such issues informing initial teacher education, such concerns are not made explicit, in their group activities or if they are, instead of being neon-lit, they are, in places illuminated by a flickering candle.

As organisations BERA and UCET do not have a specific political orientation, and are more heterogeneous than the other two specific issue groups mentioned here. In general, however, the teacher education papers at the 1989 and 1990 BERA Conferences were highly critical of Radical Right developments in ITE, and very supportive of the reflective practitioner model. The 1990 UCET press statement is similarly caustic about (two of) the Radical Right attacks on ‘teacher training’.

The apparent intentions and the group writings of these various groups, however, Left their personal politics might be, differ little from those of the Soft Centre. In some cases this derives from the politics of the lowest common denominator in opposing Radical Right attacks on teacher education. In other cases it may derive from other aspects of ‘reformism’ - such as moderating of views in the hope of gathering wider support, wider alliances.

While this may well have been a principle informing the writers’ individual practice and perspectives it is difficult to see how it has informed their collective booklet in any explicit way. That is to say, this highly important principle, one of active, critical, reflective agency (though not necessarily one stemming from an emancipatory egaliitarian metanarrative), is actually undeveloped, left without salience or profile in their booklet.

While the booklet has considerable value, it could have been written by the Soft Centre.

It is too early to pass similar comments about ‘The Future of Teacher Training Writing Group’ convened by Jean Rudduck and David Bridges.

The highly commendable aims of that group are:

1. To define/advance a view of: teachers as intelligent, thinking practitioners; teaching as a form of practice which has constantly to be informed by sensitivity, intelligence and reflectiveness in practice.

2. To defend/advance the distinctive contribution which institutions of higher education have to make to the development of practice thus conceived (at the same time as valuing the distinctive contribution that in school practitioners can make to that training in partnership with higher education).

3. To challenge and correct some of the totalitarian mythology about current teacher training propagated by the ‘raving right’;

4. To disentangle some of the muddle about the relationship (or otherwise) between:
   i. the character and quality of initial training;
   ii. the recruitment and retention of teachers;
   iii. the mismatch between initial training qualifications and the posts held by large numbers of teachers.

5. To demonstrate our own capacity to think and work creatively:
   i. To improve the quality of initial training and develop constructive approaches to the continuing professional development of teachers;
   ii. To extend access to initial training programmes and contribute through effective programmes of professional development to the retention and career mobility of teachers;
   iii. To provide appropriate career change and retraining support for teachers;
   iv. To work in effective partnership with practising teachers.

A number of the ten Polytechnic and University signatories to that manifesto can be regarded as Left of Centre in varying degrees.

However, like the Hextall/Lawn ‘Imaginative Projects’ group, their collaborative intentions are actually minimalistic. No doubt their intention is to maximise the breadth and depth of their embrace and impact - honourable intentions - but they are not, as a group, overtly about the development of critical reflective let alone ‘transformative’ intellectuality. Their aims are ultimately defensive and initially defensive. They are reactive, unlike the ‘Imaginative Projects’ booklet which has a proactive element. In making this criticism I am well aware that many of those involved, such as, to take one example, Donald McIntyre (1990b) have written forcefully about the need for student teachers to develop a critical understanding of the curriculum and pedagogy of their subjects’ and an appreciation of the potentialities and the
problems of achieving social justice in their own teaching. Many members of both the Rudduck/Bridges the Future of Teacher Training Writing Group’ and the Lawn/Hextall ‘Imaginative Projects’ such as Jean Rudduck and Ian Menter have substantial publications and pedigrees in critiquing the Radical Right on education and teacher education. See for example Rudduck (1989, 1990) and Menter (1988) and Crozier, Menter and Pollard (1990).

I am also aware that the group/network has hardly yet begun to function. But, as it stands, its five intentions, while laudable, are not Radical and are not identifiably Left. The only difference between this particular ‘Left in the Centre’ agenda and that of the ‘New Left’ is in its political history and individual politics of much of ‘The Future of Teacher Training Writing Group’.

The final example I wish to give here, of a ‘Left in the Centre’ (British) programme for teacher education is in the Labour Party document of December 1991, ‘Investing in Quality: Labour’s plans to reform teacher education and training’. The document was eight years away from current (mid 1992) Conservative proposals to deprofessionalise, de-critique, teacher education by placing it primarily in schools. The Labour Party plans support the role of theory, the role of colleges in ITE, and make a commitment to equal opportunities as part of a national core curriculum for teacher education. However welcome the plans are in contrast to Conservative plans, they are not identifiably Radical or Critical or Transformative.

THREE TYPES OF RADICAL LEFT DISCOURSE ON TEACHER EDUCATION: INTRODUCTION

There are three distinctive variants of Radical Left/Socialist/Marxist/neo-Marxist discourse on teacher education in late capitalist societies such as Britain. It has to be said that, other than the Hillcole Group’s espousal of teachers and teacher educators as ‘transformative intellectuals’ the following are analytical categories rather than organised groupings. These three categories are:

1. Social reconstructivist/deterministic teachers who see little space for contesting the dead hand of capitalism (in some respects, John Smyth).

2. transformative teachers outside the classroom committed to the autonomy of intellectuals and of students within a pluralistic discourse within the classroom committed to the autonomy of intellectuals and of students within a pluralistic discourse within the classroom (e.g. Zeichner, and associates);

3. transformative intellectuals or public intellectuals whose belief in social justice and egalitarianism inform teaching within as well as outside the classroom (e.g. Giroux and associates such as Aronowitz, McLaren).

Finally, I intended to set out some of the distinctive views of Henry Giroux and associates in the Critical Theory of Henry Giroux. This includes their concepts of the transformative and ‘public’ intellectual: their attack on the limited problematising emancipatory goal of much radical theorising; their attack on the politically limiting and weakening liberal pluralism of some post-modernists and modernists; their associated critique of uncritical acceptance of difference; student experience and voice; their call for critical utopianism; and their defence of the transformative role of the teacher.

Secondly, in ‘Criticism of Giroux by the Madison School - Kenneth Zeichner, Tom Popkewitz, and Dan Liston’, I highlight their attack on Giroux’s notion of organic intellectual, and on his alleged denial of intellectual and student autonomy by his relatively predesignated political project.

Thirdly, I criticise what is, in many ways, an admirably trenchant, lucid and informed paper by John Smyth. While the words are combative I find the critique in the paper less so, fitting to some extent (though he might deny it) into what is in some respects a pessimistic social reproductionist Radical Left model. This is to say that here I am posing Smyth within what I am suggesting in a third Radical Left model, admirable in analysis and critique, combative in tone, showing little sympathy with the pluralistic autonomy of Zeichner and associates, but also being far more cautious about the possibility of, and possibility of effectiveness of, critical utopian transformative action by teachers as organic intellectuals.

Along with other Radical Left and neo-Marxist analysts, Giroux asserts that teacher education programs are designed to create intellectuals whose social function is primarily to sustain and legitimate the status quo. However he attacks:

5. ASPECTS OF THE CRITICAL THEORY OF HENRY GIROUX AND HIS ASSOCIATES (STANLEY ARONOWITZ, PETER MCLAREN) AND THEIR RADICAL LEFT MODEL OF THE CRITICAL UTOPIAN TRANSFORMATIVE INTELLIGENTIAL

Giroux’s (1991) most recent book of a decade long annual book production is written, as was an earlier work (Giroux, 1985), with Stanley Aronowitz.

Giroux’s work calls for teachers to act as ‘transformative intellectuals’3.

A ‘Transformative Intellectual’ is:

one who exercises forms of intellectual and pedagogical practice which attempt to insert teaching and learning directly into the political sphere by arguing that schooling represents both a struggle for meaning and a struggle over power relations. Teachers who assume the role of transformative intellectuals treat students as critical agents, question how knowledge is produced and distributed, utilise dialogue, and make meaningful knowledge, critical, and ultimately emancipatory.

(Giroux, H. and McLaren, P. 1987)

Giroux’s expansion of the category of transformative intellectual embraces the interrelationship between the political and the pedagogical:

Central to the category of transformative intellectual is the necessity of making the pedagogical more political and the political more pedagogical. Making the pedagogical more political means inserting schooling into the political sphere by arguing that schooling represents both a struggle to define meaning and a struggle over power relations. Within this perspective, critical reflection and action become part of a fundamental social project to help students develop a deep and abiding faith in the struggle to overcome economic, political and social injustices, and to further humanise themselves as part of this struggle.

Giroux, H. 1988, pp. 128-5)

The failure of left educators to move beyond... the language of critique... (which) fails to define teacher education as part of an extended counterpublic sphere... and tends to remain trapped within the logic of social reproduction... their language fails to grasp and acknowledge the concept of counter-hegemony.

(Giroux, H. 1988, pp. 161-3)

Giroux and McLaren (1991, p. 156) criticise ‘orthodox radical educational theorists whose work hovers over, rather than directly engaging the contradictions of the social order that their efforts seek to transform’. They attack what they see as the overly deterministic reproduction theorists. For Giroux and McLaren (1991, p. 157):

the programmatic impetus of much radical educational reform remains fettered by the limited emancipatory guard of making ‘the everyday problematic’... the language of critique that informs much radical theorising is overly individualistic, Eurocentric, and reproductive, radical educators fail to acknowledge that the struggle for democracy, in the larger sense of transforming a dehumanising developmentalist sphere, takes political and ethical precedence over making teachers more adept at deconstructive ‘double readings’.

They critique those who have ‘failed to develop a radical notion of hope and possibility’, indeed those such as Dan Liston who they see as anti-utopian. They criticise Liston (1988) as presenting ‘a vision of education driven by a college into a dystopian form of Scienitism’.

Having attacked Radical Left social reproductionists, Giroux also criticises the pluralistic autonomist school of Radical Left Critical theorists associated with Zeichner.

Giroux (1991, p. 117) attacks such of his critics in ‘Post-modern Education’ as ‘critical pedagogy at its worst... closest... to the liberal democratic tradition in which teaching is reduced to getting students merely to express or access their own experience... a banal, unproblematic notion of facilitation, self-affirmation and self-consciousness’... ‘It is not enough for teachers merely to affirm uncritically their student’s histories, experiences and stories... (this is) to run the risk of idealising and romanticising them’ (Giroux, H. and Aronowitz, S. 1991, p. 130).

While rejecting ‘the postmodernism of reaction’ associated with Baudrillard and Lyotard as nihilistic, he also attacks (liberal) postmodernism (and, I would say the same applies to liberal
modernism) 'for democratising the notion of difference in a way that echoes a type of liberal pluralism...difference often slips into a theoretically harmless and politically deracinated notion of pastiche'.

Within the British educational context similar comments can be made about multi-culturalism as opposed to anti-racism, an argument I tried to develop in Chapter Two of Hessari and Hill (1989) (though regrettably not in the chapters developing classroom activities), and one made, for example, by the Inner London Education Authority (1985b).

Multi-culturalism can be recognised as an advance over assimilationism but it is not enough. Giroux's (1991, p. 51) position on 'difference' is similar. While it is an advance on a mono-cultural denial of 'difference', an undiscriminating plural approach is precisely that, undiscriminating and uncritical:

to acknowledge different forms of literacy is not to suggest that they should all be given equal weight. On the contrary...their differences are to be weighed against the capacity they have for enabling people to locate themselves in their own histories while simultaneously establishing the conditions for them to function as a part of a wider democratic culture. The represents a form of literacy that is not merely epidemiological but also deeply political and eminently pedagogical.

Giroux (1991, p. 108) and his associates are insistent on the necessity of the political and transformative role of the teacher. With Aronowitz he writes:

Education workers must take seriously the articulation of a morality that posits a language of public life, of emancipatory community, and individual and social commitment...A discourse on morality is important...it points to the need to educate students to fight and struggle in order to advance the discourse and principles of a critical democracy.

In this enterprise:

educators need to take up the task of redefining educational leadership through forms of social criticism, civic courage, and public engagement that allow them to expand oppositional space - both within and outside of school - which increasingly challenge the ideological representation and relations of power that undermine democratic public life. (Giroux, H. and Aronowitz, S. 1991, p. 89)

Giroux (1983c, pp. 202-3) sets out in more concrete terms what students need to actually learn.

Students should learn not only how to weigh the existing society against its own claims, they should also be taught to think and act in ways that speak to different societal possibilities and ways of living. But if the development of civic courage is the bed-rock of an emancipatory mode of citizenship education, it will have to rest on a number of pedagogical assumptions and practices that need to be somewhat clarified.

1. First, the active nature of students participation in the learning process must be stressed. This means that transmission modes of pedagogy must be replaced by classroom social relationships in which students are able to challenge, engage, and question the form and substance of the learning process.

2. Second, student must be taught to think critically. Depending of course upon grade levels, students can learn to juxtapose different world views against the truth claims that each of them make.

3. Third, the development of a critical mode of reasoning must be used to enable students to appropriate their own histories, i.e. to derive into their own biographies and systems of meaning. That is, a critical pedagogy must provide the conditions that give students the opportunity to speak with their own voices, to authenticate their own experiences.

4. They must learn how values are embedded in the very texture of human life, how they are transmitted, and what interests they support regarding the quality of human existence.

5. Fifth, students must learn about the structural and ideological forces that influence and restrict their lives. Dennis Glessen and Geoff Whitty speak to this issue when analysing the role social studies can play in addressing it:

A radical conception of social studies starts with the recognition that social processes, both within and outside of school, influence and restrict the life chances of many students. What social studies can do is to help them become more aware of their assumptions and more politically articulate in the expression of what it is they want out of life. This can direct them towards an active exploration of why the social world resists and frustrates their wishes and how social action may focus upon such constraints.


Tom Popkewitz (1991, p. 231) criticised Giroux's concept of 'transformative intellectual'. Popkewitz attacks what he calls "popularist scholarship (which) accepts global dualisms between the oppressor and the oppressed...asserting the researcher's direct attachment to...oppositional social movements. The category of progressive is assigned to the practices associated with oppressed groups".

A very brief summary of Popkewitz's, and indeed Ken Zeichner's, depiction of critical theorists such as Giroux, that they regard as essentially anti-pathetic the relationship in Giroux's thesis between:

1. political commitment and the pedagogy of a political project with prefigured aims on the one hand; with
2. the democratic development of individual autonomy of the intellectual. "The engagement of the intellectual is continually juxtaposed with the struggle for autonomy" (Popkewitz, T., 1991, p. 241).
3. the democratic development of individual autonomy of the learner, the student, faced with a political project and commitment, with the desire of the teacher as intellectual to 'transform' his or her students.

Ken Zeichner (1987, p. 25) writing with Dan Liston also criticises the overt political project and agenda of Giroux.

In the major article they co-wrote setting out their three levels of reflection, Liston and McLaren suggest that "in Giroux and McLaren's attempt to 'politicise' schooling we feel they blur an essential distinction between the teacher as educator and the teacher as political activist".

Zeichner and Liston emphasise, against Giroux, it is important to note that 'reflexive teaching' is not viewed as synonymous with any particular changes in teacher behaviours. The program seeks to help student teachers become more aware of themselves and their environments in a way that changes their perceptions of what is possible. The hope is that these expanded perceptions and an enhanced 'cultural literacy' (Bowers 1990) will affect the degree of 'reflectiveness' expressed in student teachers actions, and that more reflective actions will lead to greater benefits for the teacher and for all of his or her pupils.

I now want to amplify on differences among left educators, which I have categorised above. In particular I wish to examine the Zeichner-Giroux argument, which essentially is about the role of teachers as 'transformative' intellectuals. Liston and Zeichner (1987, p. 117-8) do associate themselves with 'the important role for teacher education' in efforts to bring about more emancipatory educational practices in our public schools believing that a more critically oriented approach to teacher education, in conjunction with other educational, political and economic reforms, could help to create a 'more democratic and just society'. But they 'caution against the portrayal of teachers as political activists within the classroom. While they themselves 'have proposed reflective, critical, or emancipatory programs...motivated by a specific desire to rectify social and educational inequality and injustice'...they believe that, by definition, a reflective and critical approach to the moral education of teachers would:

recognise this plurally and enable future teachers to identify and choose between sufficiently articulated and reasonably distinct moral positions...the goal of a reflective and critically oriented teacher education program is certainly not moral inculcation, but rather a reflective examination of educational goals and alternative course of action.

(1987, pp. 121-2)

While they are 'highly cautious' about (Giroux and McLaren's) 'civic minded action within the classroom' Liston and Zeichner (1987, pp. 124-5) encourage it outside the classroom believing that 'teacher education programs should begin to examine the conditions of schooling and teachers' work inhibit prospective teachers' chosen goals' and Liston and Zeichner (1987, pp. 133-4) argue for 'a much more aggressive political stance by teacher educators not within the classrooms, but in relation to the organisations and agencies that allocate resources and rewards affecting teacher education programs' and in efforts to democratise schools that would give teachers and parents greater control over the school curriculum and school management. They do however agree, with Giroux (and McLaren
and Aronowitz) that ‘the social relations and educational practices within programs need to reflect the emancipatory practices that teacher educators seek to establish in schools’.

Liston and Zeichner (1987, pp. 126-7) locate themselves within ‘the Radical Tradition in Teacher Education’. They ‘share a set of commitments and common purposes which challenge dominant ideologies and practices in teacher education… and have attempted to develop teacher education programs which are both critical and emancipatory’.

They note the ‘variety of conceptual lenses and theoretical principles’ within this radical view of teacher education.

To summarise their debate with Giroux and McLaren, they agree with the above definition, aims, roles of prospective teachers, actual teachers and teacher educators – except within the classroom.

7. RADICAL LEFT REPRODUCTIONISM - AN ATTEMPT TO CRITICISE SOME REPRODUCTIONIST ASPECTS OF JOHN SMYTH’S ANALYSIS

In this section I wish briefly to rehearse the major criticisms of the economic reproductionist model associated, for example, with the correspondence theory of Bowles and Gintis, and the material aspects of Althusser’s notion of ideology, and the cultural reproductive model of Bourdieu.

Such criticisms are very clearly and explicitly set out in Mike Cole (1990), in Henry Giroux (1983b) work by Mike Apple (1982) and Geoff Whitby (1981).

I wish then to locate some aspects of John Smyth’s forcible and incisive analysis of late capitalist educational developments within the reproductionist model and to critique those aspects.

Firstly, then a very brief critique of reproduction theory taken from Giroux.

Reproduction theorists have over-emphasised the idea of domination in their analyses and have failed to provide any major insights into how teachers, students, and other human agents come together within specific historical and social contexts in order to both make and reproduce the conditions of their existence. More specifically, reproduction accounts of schooling have continually patterned themselves after structural-functionalist versions from which the idea that history is made ‘behind the backs’ of the members of society. The idea that people do make history, including its constraints, has been neglected. Indeed, human subjects generally ‘disappear’ amidst a theory that leaves no room for moments of self-creation, mediation, and resistance. These accounts often leave us with a view of schooling and domination that appears to have been pressed out of an Orwellian fantasy; schools are often viewed as factories or prisons, teachers and students alike act merely as pawns and role bearers constrained by the logic and social practices of the capitalist system.

By downplaying the importance of human agency and the notion of resistance, reproduction theories offer little hope for challenging and changing the repressive features of schooling. By ignoring the contradictions that exist in schools, these theories not only dissolve human agency, they unknowingly provide a rationale for not examining teachers and students in concrete school settings. Thus, they miss the opportunity to determine whether there is a substantial difference between the existence of various structural and ideological modes of domination and their actual unfolding and effects.

Whereas reproduction theorists focus almost exclusively on the economic reproductive model, cultural theorists ensure the consent and defeat of subordinate classes and groups, theories of resistance restore a degree of agency and innovation to the cultures of these groups. Culture, then, is constituted as much by the group itself as by the dominant society. Subordinate cultures, whether working-class or otherwise partake of moments of self-production as well as reproduction; they are contradictory in nature and bear the marks of both resistance and reproduction. Such cultures are forged within constraints shaped by capital and its institutions, such as schools, but the conditions within which such constraints shaped by capital and its institutions, such as schools, but the conditions within which such constraints function vary from school to school and from neighbourhood to neighbourhood. Moreover, there are never any guarantees that capitalist values and ideologies will automatically succeed, regardless of how strongly they set the agenda. As Stanley Aronowitz reminds us, ‘in the final analysis, human praxis is not determined by its preconditions; only the boundaries of possibility are given in advance’. (Giroux, H. 1983b)

In his paper to the 1991 Bath University Conference ‘Reconceptualising Teacher Education’ John Smyth gave a trenchant and valuable critique both of Radical Right wing strategy in conformity schooling in Australia, and in other late capitalist systems. He also takes part in the intra-Radical Left debate concerning space, resistance, the role of the teacher and teacher educator, the role of the intellectual, and Radical Left discourse.

As part of this debate I wish to criticise aspects of his argument. For Smyth (1991, p. 12) the reality of participative, locally based, and reflective approaches is that such local initiatives do not amount to a redistribution of power, but rather they constitute limited discretionary control over the implementation of decisions and directions determined centrally. Reflection then, becomes a means of focussing upon ends determined by others, not an active process of contesting, debating and determining the nature of those ends.

Certainly in Britain, with the imposition of the (new) National Curriculum for Schools in England and Wales following the 1988 Education Reform Act, and the effective introduction of a tighter National Curriculum for Initial Teacher Education in England following the 1989 CATE criteria and the 1991 National Curriculum Council document on Initial Teacher Education, the scope for resistance, for the development and dissemination of oppositional discourses is restricted. Smyth is correct in asserting the restrictive nature of such changes. However many writers have shown, theoretically, how spaces for counter-hegemonic activity remain. For example, Gramsci and Giroux; how some British departments of teacher education can and do subvert government wishes concerning the curriculum and seize the opportunities afforded by restructuring a system (Whitty, 1991) and how restructuring of school budgetary and management powers as part of the British Government’s Local Management of Schools (a classic example of Smith’s decentralising from above) can be used for a different agenda, one of autogestion or of local workers’ democratic control (Hill, D. 1991b).

Smyth (1991, p. 25) calls for teachers to link consciousness about the processes that inform the day-to-day aspects of their teaching with the wider political and social realities for then they are able to transcend self-blame for things that don’t work out and to see that perhaps their causation may more properly lie in the social injustices and palpable injustices of society.

Smyth (1991, p. 29) does, in his paper, contribute clearly to developing ‘a socially culturally, and politically reflective’ discourse, but he is very wary and too dismissive of ‘radical’ discourse that emphasises notions like emancipation and other core concepts of contemporary radical discourse and Smyth (1991) quotes approvingly what seems to me to be an unduly negative and jaundiced view by Nash that:

I wish to make a four-fold criticism of this stance, relating to:

1. Firstly, a rhetoric of inspiration has a valuable function per se for any political/ideological/educational project, in engaging emotion and desire, in thrilling, in motivating. To say that ideology is related to the domain of the affective is to assert that ideology must be understood as operating within a politics of feeling – ‘structures of desire that hollow out and constrain emancipatory struggle’ (Giroux, H. and McLaren, P., 1991, p. 190). Certainly some of my own writing is intentionally written in the rhetorical register.

At a non-critical theory level Benjamin Bloom links the affective and cognitive domains of intellectual development, and it is a commonplace of political science analysis of the politics of charisma that links excitement, feeling high, a pleasurable body state, the production of extra adrenaline - that is, the psychology and physiology of pleasure, with cognitive messages.

2. Secondly, a rhetoric of inspiration it has a valuable function in popularising, in...
attracting and moving those particular audiences 'so constituted to need it', or so constituted as likely to develop a desire to need it.

The initial section of this paper refers to the success of the Radical Right in using three different levels of discourse for three different audiences - the academic, the three levels of the press, (highbrow/quality, middle brow, and popular press), the party political, each reacting to and feeding on the other, to popularise and disseminate the vocabulary and concepts of a discourse of derision, (about the Loony Left, schools, 'teacher training'), together with the vocabulary and concepts of its own rhetoric and inspiration.

3. Thirdly, while it may be true that such emancipatory concepts are frequently not tied to a realised local political programme, to claim that they are 'never' so articulated is either sloppy writing or sloppily and under-informed.


The Inner London Education Authority's two major reports aimed at combating under-achievement by working class children, 'Improving Secondary Schools' (The Hargreave Report), and the 'Improving Primary Schools' (The Thomas Report), and various of the anti-elitist, anti-hierarchical education reforms of the 1974-1976 Portuguese Revolutionary Governments informed and influenced by educators such as Paolo Freire, as too has been the education reforms of the 1917 Russian Revolution.

4. My fourth criticism of Nash and of Smyth who, for example, 'proposes... that of others. There are examples of emancipatory and mobilising concepts of radical discourse being articulated in a concretely referenced discussion of political transformation tied to a realisable local political programme. And these are some of the best known (to which might be added the initial education reform following the 1917 Russian Revolution).

To these must be added the efforts of thousands, or hundreds of thousands of groups of intellectuals, school teachers, teacher educators, radical school governors, political militants and activists, municipal socialists who have not only been inspired by emancipatory rhetoric, but who have collaborated in or developed and actually, in some cases, realised and effected a local political programme. (So effectively that in some cases the structures through which they worked were abolished, conformed, punished, or castrated by a vengeful and worried Conservative central government - for example with the abolition of the Inner London Education Authority in 1990, and the constricting and reduction in powers of local education authorities).

As another example, the Hillcole Group (1991) book is a collaboratively developed and critiqued series of proposals, including a proposed new Education Act, which seeks to interrelate Radical Left theoretical analysis, with national and local political restructuring with classroom practice; and Hill (1991) attempts to relate a series of policy proposals to critical Radical Left theory, as does Hill, D. (Ed.) (1992).

WHAT BRITISH INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION NEEDS: A RADICAL LEFT IDEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

The critique and proposals of the Radical Left as a whole differ from those of the Centre and the Radical Right. It rejects total school-siting/basing of ITE and it also rejects overwhelming school-based ITE. It rejects assaults seeking to displacement, replace, and exclude critical reflection, social justice and egalitarianism. The Radical Left does accept reform in ITE. But the rationale and suggested implementation of, for example, increased use of school focussing, or a national curriculum for ITE, differ from those of the Radical Right and the Centre ideological perspectives. They are drawn from different ideological perspectives and have different intentions.

Initial Teacher Education should be based on:
1. resistance to totally or overwhelmingly school-based teacher education i.e. retaining a substantial college-based role;
2. the development of macro and micro-theory regarding teaching and learning, in which the socio-political, economic and ideological and cultural contexts of schooling and education are made explicit;
3. the development of effective, skilled, classroom teachers able to interrelate and critique theory and practice - their own and that of others.
4. the development of teachers as critical 'transformative intellectuals' and democratic participative professionals and citizens committed to a particular moral/gavidade social justice based on an interrogated and critical cultural diversity (social class, racial, gender, sexuality) radical democratic egalitarian political project.

These points reflect a particular view of the general and impure concept of the 'reflective practitioner'. As has been elaborated this term, like the term 'democratic' or 'community involvement', has been open to a variety of interpretations in US and Britain. This last point is an attempt at increased, political precision, beyond the umbrella term of the 'reflective practitioner' and draws in particular on the work of Henry Giroux and his associates.

A number of Initial Teacher Education courses seek to do so themselves on the above principles, or at least, on the first three of these principles, that is to say, at Zeichner's second and third levels of reflection.

This position emerges also in a number of critical Initial Teacher Education courses which are briefly set out in a number of recent books and articles. Examples are Clay, Cole and Hill's (1990); Cole, Clay Hill's (1991), Cole, Clay and Hill in Mayo (1990) and in Troyina and Sikes (1989) which describes the BA and QTS (Qualified Teacher Status) at Warwick University based on biographical life histories in the conviction that personal experiences and understanding provide an ideal basis from which to begin to explore why we, and others hold particular beliefs and values and why we, and they, do things in certain ways. Two other courses are set out in Hill, D. (1989). The mandatory third year 60 hour B.Ed. course at West Sussex Institute of Higher Education 'Schools and Society' (1988-89), and the optional 20 hour Year One and Two B.Ed. courses 'Contexts for Learning' at (1987-89) at Brighton Polytechnic. The PGCE course at Sheffield University attempts an innovative approach to the formation of the reflective, critical teacher and is described in Rugguck, J. and Wellington, J. (1989).

Such courses are clear attempts at combating current anti-theoretical and anti-critical attacks on British teacher education. In Troyina and Sikes (1990) reads:

Training students to be more functionaries in our schools rather than educating them to assume a more creative and, dare we say it, critical role, is tied to a particular moral-gavidade social justice based on an interrogated and critical cultural diversity (social class, racial, gender, sexuality) radical democratic egalitarian political project.

Research evidence suggests that many teachers continue, consciously or otherwise, to make important decisions about the organisation, orientation, and delivery of the informal and formal curricula on grounds which are racist, sexist and discriminatory in a range of significant ways. Should we therefore succumb to a system of teacher education/training in which these practices could well be reproduced systematically? Or should we, instead, develop re-service courses geared towards the development of a teaching force which reflects in a critical manner on taken-for-granted assumptions, which can articulate reasons for contesting some of the conventional wisdoms about pupils, their interests and abilities, and which, ultimately, might influence future cohorts? In short, shouldn't we be encouraging students to be intellectual about being practice?
CONCLUSION
There is a very brief conclusion to this paper. It is that under Radical Right governments, media offensives and attempts at strengthening control and hegemony over, and conforming, the schooling and teacher education ideological state apparatuses, the Left has, with few exceptions, vacated the ideological battlefield and got 'Left in the Centre'. This is true of the fact of erstwhile Left writers, educationists and ideologists in Britain in their alliances with vapid liberal progressivism and uncritical pluralism - a retreat from the cultural and educational advances of the 1970s and 1980s. And it is true too, I suggest, of the current anti-transformativist direction of some elements of Radical Left theorising and teacher education course development in the USA. It is also reflected in a return to the negativistic pessimism of reproductionists on the one hand and negativistic nihilism of some post-modernist theorists on the other.

This paper calls for the development of pro-active debate both by and within the Radical Left in late capitalist economies. But more than that. It calls for direct engagement with liberal pluralist (whether Right, Centre or Left in the Centre) and with Radical Right ideologies and programmes.

And it calls for the defence, extension and development of Radical Left programmes of teacher education and of schooling founded on a critical theory of social justice and egalitarianism.

ENDNOTES
1. For the events surrounding and developing from Culloden Primary School in 1991 see articles in the Mail on Sunday and Daily Mail by Lightfoot (1991a,b), Gordon (1991) and Massey (1991b,c).

2. Gordon, A. (1991) Teacher is the pupil in a class of her own Mail on Sunday, 5 May all glowing report included the following "XXX is one of the first 400 graduates to start training under the Government's controversial articled teacher scheme. The aim is to improve standards in Britain's schools with staff who are not brainwashed by trendy theories expanded in teacher training colleges. The brave new breed of teachers are paid £5,000 a year to gain experience on the job for four days and go to college for formal institution only one day a week. A Department of Education spokesman said: We are more interested in teachers being able to teach than teachers with too much theory". The Winter 1991/92 responses are Daily Mail (1992), Sunday Express (1991, 1992), Lawlor, S. (1992).

3. The concepts, of cultural contestation, of the transformative power of education are developed in Giroux (1983a, 1989a, 1989b), Aronowitz and Giroux (1986); Giroux and Aronowitz (1991), Giroux and Simon (1988); Liston and Zeichner (1987); Giroux and McLaren (1987, 1988b); Sarup (1986, 1982); Cole (1988); Fernandes (1990). A fascinating example and analysis of an attempt to transform an education system in accordance with some of these perspectives is contained in Stoer (1986). Stoer discusses the left-wing Revolutionary period in Portugal from 1974 until the first Constitutional Government of 1976 and its socialist reforms such as democratic management of schools (the election of headteachers by school staffs - with candidates frequently running on party political platforms), the Cultural Dynamisation Campaign of the MFA (the left-wing 'Armed Forces Movement' that carried out the Revolution of April 1974).
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