The Irish Journal of Education, 1991, *xxv*, pp. 25-41.

TEACHER EDUCATION: BACK TO THE FUTURE

Michael O'Hara
University of Ulster at Coleraine

Changes in the structure and content of teacher education in recent years in the United Kingdom are considered against a backdrop of the major theoretical and pedagogical issues which have, until now, been the source of creative tension in the field. Although the wide range of issues in teacher education which spawned such a substantial literature in the late 1960s and 1970s are no nearer resolution, they are rarely aired in the current discussions about changes in initial teacher training. Debates about proposed new patterns of teacher training appear to be increasingly taking place in political contexts where the main issues seem to revolve around cost effectiveness and speed of course delivery, with the result that professional educators are being marginalized by their political masters. It is argued that the constant changes in the arrangements for initial teacher training are creating a situation in which preparation for teaching is being pushed back to a skills-based, unreflective, and anti-intellectual activity.

In the halcyon days of the late 1960s and early 1970s, teacher education was a growth point in higher education. Hundreds of young people flocked to the colleges and institutes of education to follow courses towards a teaching career. The new BEd degree had elevated the status of teaching to an academically respectable professional career, and the two-year teacher training courses faded into the educational mists to be buried along with 'monitor' and 'sitting with Nellie' traditions. It was a time of hope and optimism for teacher education with the new degree offering a route to an all-graduate profession. An extensive literature developed which gave rise to a climate of reflection and analysis of the key issues in the field and, across the United Kingdom, the wide variety of teacher education degree courses which sprang up provided a rich backdrop against which the unfolding issues could be examined and reflected upon.

However, it quickly became apparent that a degree for teachers was not a panacea for all training ills. The issues surrounding the field were both conceptual and ideological. What were the core elements of a good preparation for teaching? How could courses best be structured and delivered? How was curriculum content to be selected and organized? What did the world of the schools and the classroom demand of new graduates? What could be realistically

achieved over a three- or four-year training period? The prevailing mood was about finding structural and educationally sound patterns of course provision and attempting to reconcile and adjudicate between competing positions. Compared to what was to happen in later years, political pressure was negligible and autonomy ruled. The field of teacher education and the world of the new graduate profession started to wash its linen in the educational literature with a vigour which seemed to augur well for a revitalized academic and intellectually stimulating future. But what were the burning issues of the day and what happened to them? Were they to become the issues of the future and how would the future handle them?

RESEARCH

'There is no gap more glaring than the failure to equip the teaching profession for its altered contemporary function' claimed Lynch and Plunkett (1973) almost twenty years ago, and it was arguably, sentiments such as this that focused minds and attention on the developing debate about teacher education. An immediate problem was that the area did not have a very strong or developed literature, and research for the most part concentrated on 'selection and prediction' and on the measurement of student attitudes to different parts of their courses. Although Cope (1970) argued that much more research must be initiated 'to assist in clarifying objectives, analysing processes and evaluating change', Wragg (1974) appeared cautiously optimistic about a perceived upsurge in research into teaching which he thought might be signalling the ascent out of the 'deep trough in teacher education in the UK.' There seemed to be no dispute about the need for a much broader research base to support teacher training and the building of such a base progressively began to take shape. What could not have been predicted, however, was the ideological battle of the late 1980s and early 1990s between the professional educators and the political mandarins for whom research would not be a major issue.

THE CRITICAL GAP

Morrison and McIntyre (1973) caught the mood of some sections of the educational establishment in the early 1970s when they suggested that many training courses were piece-meal and that much of the work could not but be extremely superficial, intellectually trivial and unlikely to have any long-term influence on student teachers. In a similar view, Elvin (1971) claimed that students had to learn so many bits of things that they were 'overworked and understretched'. Furthermore, Moorhouse (1969) thought that the arrangements

for training on the new BEd courses looked like a 'steaming jungle' with graduates running the risk of becoming 'stock-pots for ill-digested academic theory.' So what needed to be done?

Clearly the experience of courses had to provide opportunities and conditions for students to assimilate, criticize and then use educational concepts (Ree, 1970), but there was also an urgent need to attempt to focus the thrust of courses on the requirements of the classroom. A difficulty with the latter, however, was the considerable distrust and wide-spread failure in communication between teacher educators and teachers (Morrison & McIntyre, 1973). The distrust possibly arose from the perception that the trainers had lost contact with the world of the classroom, but yet continued to be the 'authority' in preparing teachers. The breakdown in communication between the parties could reasonably be laid at the door of the trainers, who obviously had failed to communicate their purposes, strategies and techniques to the profession in an effort to solicit its support for the training enterprise.

The gap, therefore, between the training institutions and the schools continued to be filled with the myths associated with the long-standing conflict between academicism and the needs of the classroom teacher (Taylor, 1969). Too much emphasis was still being placed on theory at the expense of practice, the argument went, and Perry (1969) was convinced that, although young teachers were ineffectively trained at college in some aspects of teaching and not at all in others, they soon found themselves in a second training system (schools) which was extremely efficient. It was the very low level of professional identification in pre-service courses with the field of education and the school, argued Clark and Marker (1975), which 'promotes the continuing disharmony between training and reality of the teacher.' Evidence was also produced by Morrison and McIntyre (1967) which led them to conclude that the influence of the training institutions does not survive the influence of the schools, and that training programmes appear to have only 'a transitory and marginal effect on students' subsequent classroom behaviour.' This perceived mismatch between the focus of training programmes and the concerns of the school came to be seen as the crucial and critical area in teacher education; as Koerner (1963) cautioned, unless a much more reliable way of connecting training programmes with the on-the-job performance of teachers could be found, there should at least be much less rigidity in the structure of courses and more modest claims made for them.

The CATE (Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education) requirements of the 1990s have claimed a concern to make this connection. Training institutions have been directed to involve teachers and the schools in the delivery of courses, teacher educators are to have 'recent and relevant'

teaching experience, and courses across the UK are to fulfil minimum requirements in terms of course content and school experience. Although the rhetoric was seductive, the rationale was weak, the motivation politically suspect, and the logistics unrehearsed. The CATE demands may have spoken to the condition of some sections of the teaching profession, but generally speaking teacher educators were left 'cold' at the extent of the reforms, which lacked a research base and were initiated without due consultation with the training institutions.

But does training actually make much of a difference to the job of teaching (see Allen, 1963)? This was an issue that had always been just under the surface in speculations about the future of teacher education since there never did exist any real evidence to suggest that trained teachers were more effective than untrained teachers. Was there, in fact, a need to reconsider the extent to which training courses altered or confirmed commonsense understandings of what teaching was about, as Mardle and Walker (1980) suggested? Perhaps the whole notion of what constituted effective training was in need of reconstruction. It is only now, perhaps, in the 90s that the long-awaited reconstruction is beginning to take place, and is the first step the articled and licensed teacher schemes with their emphasis on large-scale school-based training? Are these the vanguard of the sanely conceived, pedagogically based and academically rigorous teacher preparation programmes which are required for the next century or are they merely a cynical attempt to confirm and institutionalize the so-called commonsense understandings already referred to? Maybe, of course, they are no more than a 'knee-jerk' political reaction to a perceived disenchantment with current patterns of training.

THEORY VERSUS PRACTICE

A recurring problem in teacher education, and one which was particularly germane in the 1960s and early 1970s, was the perceived gap between theory and practice in the education courses of concurrent and consecutive initial teacher training programmes. 'There is a lack of integrating theory in pedagogy ... in its place there is principally a body of maxims', lamented Bruner in 1966, and Morrison and McIntyre (1967) claimed that while this gap remained, and college staff were unable to bridge it, it was most unlikely that students would be able to do it for themselves. If that were the case, continued these authors, we should not be surprised if the theoretical study of education is dismissed as being irrelevant to the practice of teaching. There was a need for courses to emphasize the relationship between 'academic' and 'professional' aspects of education to

help bridge the gap between theory and practice, but Bartholomew (1975) cautioned that solutions to this problem could only realistically be sought in practical contexts and 'by the recognition that the relationship of theory to practice is provided by human activity which in itself is indeterminate.' So how do we turn what we know into action? Harris (1978) argued that the fault of education theory is that it tends 'to ignore what teachers and children actually do in favour of pre-defined characterizations and concepts.' So what are required, Harris continued, are 'energies to be applied towards finding out what education means to those who are actually doing the educating and being educated, and this means starting with the agent, not the theoretician.'

Educators have responded to the theory-practice hiatus in different ways (see McNamara, 1976). These have varied from advancing arguments to discount practitioners' criticisms to proposing research programmes to investigate the problem, or becoming involved in curriculum development projects in an attempt to devise more appropriate syllabi. As none of these reactions had much effect on practice, McNamara's personal reaction was to return to the classroom as a teacher and from that situation to reflect on theory, research, and teaching. He described his experience as harrowing 'in the recognition of the unrelatedness of theory and practice' and called for funding to promote practical and relevant thinking and research into training procedures. Much more research needs to be undertaken with researchers in schools to force them to think realistically about the practical problems facing teachers, he continued, and universities need to be provided with the means to investigate the curriculum and the organizational problems facing schools. (Twenty years later, universities are no nearer to getting these means, but then teacher preparation is in a process of reconstruction and is not seen as a complex activity any more.) In any event, the theory-practice dichotomy is much more complex than the acknowledgements of its existence identified above. The issue is still pertinent to-day, but, like many problems in teacher preparation, it is grossly under-rehearsed in a climate which appears to be more concerned with the rationalization of course patterns and the speed and cost effectiveness of course delivery.

TRAINING OR EDUCATION?

In the early 1970s, the need for a core curriculum was seen, in some quarters, as a requirement for getting some kind of rationalization into teacher education programmes and the proponents surely could not have had premonitions of a future with CATE and the national curriculum. While Tibble (1971) certainly saw a need for a reasonable degree of uniformity in the new BEd, the uniformity

implied, it seemed, would only come about in the wake of the unravelling of those academic and professional issues, long since buried, which related to the basic structure and ingredients of courses. Of crucial importance was the basic distinction to be drawn between 'training' and 'educating'. Certainly the term training became less and less popular in the mid-60s as a description of what should take place in the preparation of teachers because it implied a mechanistic (almost cybernetic) process which seemed to remove thinking and reflection from the core of professional preparation, and further carried traces of the stigma of the normal school. Being trained, argued Hilliard (1971), involves 'knowing how', but being educated involves 'knowing that' as well as 'knowing how.' Indeed the concept of an institution that teaches students 'how to teach' may be inappropriate and narrow (Eason & Croll, 1971) because it suggests a single skill which, in some sense, 'is divorceable from having something to teach and from knowing "why" and "when", as well as "how"'. To train a teacher, or anyone, Eason (1970) had argued earlier, may involve an education as well as something more, but certainly not something less. In any event, how can anyone train someone else how to teach? Surely the most that training institutions can do is to create the circumstances in which it becomes possible for students to find themselves as teachers. Such a process might involve substantial periods of practical teaching in school, reflection on the complexities of the teaching and learning milieu, and a secure base of academic studies (grounded in children's learning) to form a backdrop against which the developing experience of courses can be pressed. In such contexts, students might become educated in the theory and practice of education and, in the process, acquire and hone skills and competencies in teaching as they find themselves as teachers. This, arguably, is a slow process of maturation and takes time. Both of these elements were, of course, the hallmarks of the concurrent pattern of initial teacher training.

TRAINING MODELS AND THE PROBLEM OF 'MAINS'

Locked into any discussion about 'educating for teaching' or 'training for teaching' was the entire question of the preferred route to a teaching qualification. In the 1960s and 1970s, the choices were largely restricted to the concurrent three- or four-year model or the consecutive one-year Post-Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) model. Although there has never been any real evidence available to suggest that one particular model of teacher training is superior to any other, there has traditionally been a lot of support for the concurrent model in the literature. Submissions to the Crowther, Newsom, and Robbins committees, for instance, all stressed the value of concurrency while

Eason (1970) claimed that 'the experience of developing and teaching such courses, possessed by something approaching 10,000 college teaching staff, is a national asset, not necessarily replaceable nor lightly to be discarded.'

Supporters of the concurrent model saw (and indeed still see) the route to teaching as involving two main strands, 'main subject' studies and professional studies. The former involves students taking one or two academic studies (outside of their education work) in depth and to a high level, while the latter refers to those other aspects of courses concerned with preparing to teach. So, in a sense, this combination was about 'educating' students (personal development) and, at the same time, training them to be classroom practitioners. In this model, 'mains' and 'professional' education were to be seen as happening together over an extended period because of the perceived value of incubating, reflecting on, and integrating all aspects of courses.

Although earlier versions of concurrent courses saw 'mains' work as having something very specifically in common with the ways in which subject areas were taught in schools, and although this demand was still very much in the literature in the 1960s and 1970s, the generally accepted shape of the model simply has the two major areas of study treated in parallel or concurrently. The claim, therefore, was (and still is) that an extended time studying an academic subject and a professional course would allow for lots of cross-fertilization. It would also permit the 'main' subject to be, in a sense, fodder for educational studies through allowing students opportunities to reflect on the nature of teaching and learning, while at the same time, through their professional studies, requiring them to wonder about the nature of teaching and of children's learning. Although it is not a feature of concurrent courses to have this sort of focus built into the design of programmes, it nevertheless remains a serious consideration for educators involved in concurrent courses which have a clear separation between 'mains' and 'professional' work.

In the 1990s, the separation of 'mains' and 'professional' work remains important. In primary courses for example, CATE requires that 'main subjects' be clearly separated from education studies. Further, the range on offer must reflect the subject areas of the primary curriculum and must be relevant. The further provision of curriculum courses in the main subject (perceived as the pedagogical application of the subject) is then intended to provide students with a form of specialism for primary teaching. But the links between the mains and the curriculum courses are distinctly nebulous. Subject studies, it is claimed, must be subjects of the primary curriculum. But how can they be relevant to the needs of the trainee primary teacher? The CATE documentation is not very clear on this. It could hardly concern the matching of content since this would trivialize

the notion of an academic interest. Given that the logical 'real' main subject for teaching - the study of education - is not perceived to be academically rigorous enough to 'educate' trainee teachers to a high level (nor does it provide them with 'something to teach'), a rationale can still be articulated which points to the potential of subject studies in giving students a thorough grounding in the literatures of their different specializations in the expectation that these would feed directly into students' work in the national curriculum.

Such studies could also be instrumental in the development of the students' personal knowledge and critical faculty in the specializations - an expectation required of any undergraduate study. Through their involvement in this process, students could develop insights into the languages of their specializations, the structures which hold them together, the principles which bind them, the truth tests which support them, the research procedures which advance them, and the contents which justify them and help identify their uniqueness. By this definition, it could be argued that subject studies are valuable for students, not only because of their 'relevance' for the primary school, but also because of the importance of the experience of the practice of the subject at the highest level. It is, therefore, only through studying the subject for its own sake, reshaping their own thinking in the light of its traditions and internalizing its values - becoming in some measure critics, historians, scientists, and mathematicians - that students will come to have that inwardness with their subject which will help them function effectively as co-ordinators and resource teachers in the primary school. This is, perhaps, a reasonable explanation for the place of the subject study in initial teacher training, but is it the CATE position? That is not easy to answer in the absence of a developed CATE rationale. To at least embrace an explanation of the kind advanced, however, might go some way towards making sense of the CATE subject study requirements and influence, in a real sense, the design and delivery of the 'education' component of courses. All we have, however, is a statutory requirement for subject studies in initial teacher training which should both serve students' personal development and be relevant for intending teachers.

The consecutive model of teacher education which has also been around for quite a long time has always looked like a training model. In the course of a one-year PGCE programme, students who are already graduates are trained to teach in either primary or secondary schools. For secondary teaching, graduates are prepared to teach their subject, and there has traditionally been a general acceptance that this route to teaching is a cost-effective and speedy method of supplying schools with well educated graduates who also have been trained. While there is certainly substantial support for this type of preparation for

secondary teaching, the support for this model in supplying primary teachers is not so broadly based. The primary teacher is seen as a generalist, not a subject specialist, who requires a specialist knowledge and awareness of children's learning and the competencies to manage, further, and develop that learning in conducive environments. The development of this kind of expertise takes time, and although many courses supply teachers through this route, detractors worry about its relative effectiveness for primary teaching. But, as has already been pointed out, there is no evidence available which points to the greater effectiveness of any route.

At the beginning of the 1990s, political expediency, flavoured with notions of speed of delivery, cost effectiveness, and quality control (dressed up as CATE), took control of the ideological high ground in teacher training while the flags of the national curriculum and CATE fluttered in the parents' charter breeze. Most courses for secondary teaching are now based on the PGCE pattern and it is becoming increasingly easier to envisage a movement for the wide-spread adoption of PGCE courses for primary school teachers also. After all, the argument goes, the model itself is well established and respected across the UK, and it certainly is extremely cost-effective. It can regulate the supply of teachers better than the concurrent model; there are no problems with 'main' subjects in the PGCE; and current evidence shows that the model can meet the requirements of both CATE and the national curriculum. But perhaps the strongest political argument in favour of the PGCE is that its structure allows ease in the delivery of variations quite quickly. It was not too difficult to extend the PGCE to 36 weeks a few years ago, and any further extension (now increasingly unlikely) would not create serious logistic problems. Indeed, the fact that additions to courses can happen without major problems suggests that this structure will not only handle recent demands for two-thirds of students' time to be spent in schools relatively easily, but it will also manage the provisions of the articled and licensed teacher schemes without too much difficulty.

Up to now the four-year BEd model has survived relatively unscathed from this ideological cleansing operation, except for the requirement that one year out of four should be spent in school. Cynics see this as the thin edge of an educational wedge which will eventually see the four-year concurrent model metamorphize gradually and slowly into a 2 + 2 pattern where the equivalent of two years of subject study will be followed by two years in teacher training. Such a development, however, might start to look a little like the licensed/articled schemes - and not too unlike the basic structure of the consecutive PGCE model.

BACK TO THE FUTURE

The wide range of pedagogical and epistemological issues which surround the field of teacher preparation and which spawned a very substantial literature through the 1960s and 1970s are no nearer resolution. Indeed they are now rarely aired. They have included those identified above (i.e., research issues, the piece-meal nature of courses and the communication gap between schools and training institutions, the dichotomy between training and educating, the relative merits of the different patterns of course provision, the place of the 'main subject', and the theory/practice debate) as well as a range of issues to do with those more specific aspects of courses such as 'education studies,' 'curriculum studies,' 'methods courses' and 'teaching practice.' Branches of literature have, over the years, attempted to examine problematic practices associated with these course components; disputes about the content and pedagogy of each have been opened up; the relationship between the parts has been examined; and the thorny issues of sequence, progression, and continuity have been extensively explored in relation to making judgments about how course experiences would come together and the extent to which they made sense. More specifically, the flavour of the debates has had to do with the structure of 'main' courses and the relationship between the 'mains' and the other course elements; the selection of content in education 'theory' courses and its significance for classroom practice; the number of curriculum and/or method courses to be included in programmes and whether or not it is possible to learn to teach something while also learning about the 'something' at the same time; and the organization and management of teaching practice as well as its success or otherwise in permitting the informed practice of the art of teaching.

Where are these issues now rehearsed? Have they been resolved and are they now obsolete? Clearly, of course, they are still very much alive but scant attention is now paid to them. Indeed, it may well be true to say that the advent of CATE was the first real signal that the face of teacher preparation was changing and that an anti-intellectual, anti-academic, skills-based approach was on the way. Clothed in a rather obvious political ideology and with an intention to control the teacher preparation sector, CATE was the precursor of a national curriculum. The new curriculum was seductively set in front of a public which knew about recession and unemployment, and its concerns were dressed in a rhetoric about righting the wrongs of the schooling system, giving equal educational rights and opportunities to all, and getting Britain securely back into the world education league tables. The package became almost irresistible in the public domain. Who could argue against the raising of education standards, a

well-educated work force, and a knock-on effect which would bring economic prosperity, the end of recession, and a drastic reduction in unemployment?

The CATE criteria are literally what they say they are - criteria to be applied in an effort to make decisions about the suitability of a course to prepare teachers. With all the authority of a government body, CATE made (and still makes) demands of courses, without educational explanation, that required sweeping structural changes. In four-year courses, there will be 100 days (20 weeks) spent in schools and, so that students can teach and assess the core subjects of the national curriculum, 'in every primary course at least 100 hours should be devoted to the teaching of mathematics, 100 hours of English and 100 hours of science and design and technology taken together. Work in each of these three subject areas should include a minimum of 60 hours contact time, supplemented by work in school and directed private study (Great Britain: Department of Education and Science, 1989). Where do these figures come from? Who thought them up and why? Is there a research basis for them or even an articulated rationale? They look like a set of somebody's best guesses. But whose guesses? The answer, of course, is that they are notional and appear to be about right or adequate in the judgment of some group or other.

So without a rationale for the structures, content, and organization of teacher preparation, in the absence of a research base to give its dictates credibility, and without any acknowledgement of the sources or origins of the best guesses behind its pronouncements, CATE took charge of the world of initial training and shortly afterwards threw up local watchtowers to guard over the national curriculum which came in its wake. Naturally enough, schools expect new teachers to be trained in the delivery of the national curriculum and CATE was there to ensure that teacher preparation institutions did just that. In the schools, teachers had to deliver, profile, assess, and keep records, to say nothing of keeping themselves informed of the different subject requirements which seemed to come in never-ending waves. Between times, however, someone kept forgetting that children still needed to be taught. Each time the educational world appeared to settle, the rules changed. A review of Standard Attainment Tasks or a reduction in attainment targets would shift the goal posts to the chagrin of a weary teaching profession.

Meanwhile in the teacher preparation institutions, CATE 1 was replaced by CATE 2, which was replaced by CATE 3 - and on it went - as the political winds attempted to expose the last of the progressive knights and dissipate the final vestiges of their progressive ideologies. The institutions were tugged and torn by the competing demands of their various taskmasters. The trainers themselves required academic substance and rigour and grounding in pedagogy, validating

bodies insisted on research-based teaching and demanded intellectually comparable work across institutions, the schools demanded relevance and work which was steeped in practice, the inspectorate insisted on what they thought the schools needed, and CATE wanted what the political masters wanted. In this uncertain climate, teacher education was being buffeted by conflicting demands.

But is there a calm in sight in the world of teacher preparation? Is the shake-out now complete and will it all coalesce into a pattern and shape for teacher preparation in the 21st century? The signs are not good. Initial readings of the educational climate suggest that it will be political forces that will continue to shape the face of teacher preparation for a long time to come, and that the law of the market place and the consumer society will dominate the structure and delivery of courses. This is hardly too surprising as a quick glance at recent developments in teacher preparation shows. Once upon a time there was an un-CATED world in which courses had real autonomy and were validated by the Department of Education and Science (as was the case in the days of the two-year course) and, more recently, by the universities since the advent of the BEd. Then CATE started to make its demands without any appeals to thoughtful judgment. First of all, the PGCE was extended to 36 weeks because more space was needed to fit in all the required bits. Then it needed to become more school-based. Let there be 80% of course time spent in schools the cry went up. Loud protests were heard, so with the stroke of a pen, this pronouncement was quickly changed to two-thirds of time in schools. Let there now be a very close relationship between schools and training institutions, CATE continued, with teachers becoming equal partners in the training enterprise. But how will such a scheme be funded, the institutions responded, because schools will require, *pro rata*, a substantial slice of our funding? Quite rightly so, came the response, start working out the details and remember that partnership means giving the schools what the schools want.

But what of the four-year concurrent model, can it possibly survive? The chances are not good if we look closely at the long-range forecast. Like the PGCE, it has been affected by CATE, and in recent months has been instructed to prepare for an extension of school experience equivalent to 25% of course time. It also has been told to get its 'partnership with schools act' together. So while the PGCE is moving rather quickly to restructure itself, the BEd model is just beginning to see the storm clouds in the distance.

With all this activity going on in the field of teacher preparation, attention seems to have been diverted away from the articled/licensed teachers' schemes which once attracted so much notice. Have they died off or are they (as some suspect) quietly wearing away at the soft underbelly of initial training with their

exemplary model of school-based teacher preparation which substantially involves teachers in the content, delivery, and assessment of students? The cynics, of which there are an increasing number in education in general and in teacher education in particular, would claim that the articled/licensed schemes were always a pilot for the future shape of teacher preparation. The articled scheme is essentially a two-year PGCE course in which students are trained in schools, and staff from the training institutions and the schools co-operate in the supervision of the process. The students are paid a bursary which increases in value in the second year of the training to reflect the increased contribution which the articled teacher will be making to the work of the school. Licensed teachers, on the other hand, must be 26 years of age, have the equivalent of GCSE Mathematics and English and have successfully completed two years in higher education. Under the scheme, LEAs would assess the training needs of trainees over a two-year period and provide some of the courses needed. The remainder will be bought in from the training institutions. At this moment the only problem with these schemes to be heard in the corridors of power has to do with the additional expense involved, particularly with the articled scheme. The criticisms in the education world are, as might be expected, legion. The scheme does, however, have the potential to be much cheaper in the long term. Of greater importance, the articled teacher format politically and ideologically catches the educational climate and represents, to a large extent, control of the system, ease of delivery, and ultimately good husbandry.

Is this scenario possible without a major upheaval in the system? In the first instance, the basic difference between the articled and licensed schemes is bound up with the requirement of subject study - to degree level in the case of the articled scheme and the equivalent of two years in the case of the licensed scheme. This should not be a major issue. Both schemes are essentially extended PGCEs, are lodged in the schools, and are controlled by a training institution, LEA and school partnership. They both represent forms of training which, in many ways, embrace recent government thinking about the development of teacher preparation. Given that the logistic and financial issues associated with the schemes are resolvable (and there is no real reason to suppose that they are not), the current PGCE model of teacher training could be seen to be structurally poised to follow suit. The ability of the PGCE to extend itself over a longer period has been shown again and again. Further the most recent insistence that two-thirds of course time should be spent in schools, the development of an equal partnership with schools in the delivery and assessment of courses, and the transfer of a *pro rata* slice of funding from the teacher preparation institutions to the schools, all seem to point towards a collapsing and rationalization, in the

not too distant future, of licensed, articled, and PGCE models into a form of articled training scheme.

But would the four-year concurrent BEd model not create a major problem in this speculative thesis and resist involvement in any such rationalization with an argument about structural incompatibility, and therefore eventual educational tissue rejection? On the contrary, it is quite possible that the BEd model would have relatively little difficulty in changing to fit a new teacher preparation model of the type described. At the moment, CATE requires two years of subject study and the development of the training partnership advocated for PGCE-type models. As already indicated, the BEd has also been required to look towards the equivalent of one year being spent in schools. It is not too difficult to imagine the subject studies in the BEd being separated out from the other course elements to avoid problems in the delivery of college- and school-based work. And if subject studies are concentrated into the first two years of courses, the way is then open to develop a two-year training programme which would be a concurrent blend of school and college-based work and would be structured along the lines demanded by the other models. Have we now gone forward to reach the past? The possible rationalization of teacher preparation guessed at now looks like the James model (Great Britain: Department of Education and Science, 1972) with its advocacy of a basic 2 + 2 pattern of subject studies followed by education studies, but with slight modifications. It looks as though we have had to go to the past to get to the future, and the cost, in terms of quality of the curriculum of teacher preparation courses, is likely to be very high.

CONCLUSION

Perry (1969) has cautioned that schools 'retrain' newly qualified teachers and put them under social pressure to accept the beliefs and attitudes that are common to the staff. In support of this view, White (1975) claimed that the aims of courses must be to equip students 'to survive and teach effectively under these conditions, building in an understanding of the weaknesses in some current practices and a knowledge of some of the available alternatives.' Where in the available literature on the proposed structural changes for teacher preparation, with its heavy reliance on school-based work, is this pertinent and very thorny issue rehearsed? Gorbutt (1975) caught the mood of many teacher educators nearly twenty years ago, when he called for the rejection of the teacher as an educated amateur or a craftsman or a competent practitioner of educational science (because there is no agreed corpus of knowledge), and looked towards the model of a teacher as a self-critical problem-solver who can analyse an

educational situation, devise a programme of action, operationalize it and then monitor and evaluate it. The 'apprenticeship', 'craft' and 'sitting with Nellie' tone of the current view of the future of teacher preparation shows scant respect for, let alone an awareness of, this most fundamental underpinning of a course for *intending* teachers. If this is the case, then Mardle and Walker's (1980) view of 'researcher' as an important stage in the *education* of the teacher is likely to join all those other redundant academic, intellectual, pedagogical, and child-centered teacher-preparation issues. And, since continuing INSET provision has not yet been conceived within a framework of staff development for teachers, it looks as though the gap between researchers and teachers will become increasingly wide. The two groups indeed may rarely meet and teachers will view educational research with an even greater deal of suspicion and worry about its relevance to the world of the classroom.

Green (1977) has reported on an ideology in our general social order that 'depends upon a mystification which effectively obscures alienation.' Teacher educators, he claims, must work for a more 'authentic speaking to combat mystification.' Educators of teachers, continued Green, should be concerned with the creation of the kinds of conditions that might make possible 'a critique of what is taken to be ''natural'', of the ''forms of illusion'' in which persons feel so completely at home, no matter how alienated they are, how repressed.' In a politically controlled and led educational world, such a view nowadays would ironically be seen as a politicizing of the curriculum. The issue, however, will probably not arise anyway. Provision for teacher preparation unfortunately appears to have less and less commitment to preparing teachers who are truly reflective, who have a feeling for the complexities of the 'black box' of the classroom, and who have the kind of skills in developing learning and teaching encounters which have been shaped in a sound theoretical frame.

Sadly, it looks as though the field of teacher education is becoming sanitized, streamlined, and programmed to prepare teachers to deliver a core curriculum in the most cost-effective, speedy, and skills-based way practicable. The academic and pedagogical issues in teacher education may well be buried beyond recovery by political steamrolling.

REFERENCES

Allen, E.A. (1963). Professional training for teachers: A review of research. *Educational Research, 5*, 200-215.

Bartholomew, J. (1975). Theory and practice: An as yet unaddressed issue. *Education for Teaching, No. 97*, 67-77.

Bruner, J.S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Clark, D.L., & Marker, G. (1975). The institutionalization of teacher education. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher education. Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Cope, E. (1970). Teacher training and school practice. *Educational Research, 12*, 87-98.

Eason, T.W. (1970). *Colleges of education: Academic or professional*. Windsor, Berks: NFER Publishing Co.

Eason, T.W., & Croll, E.J. (1971). *Staff and student attitudes in colleges of education*. Windsor, Berks: NFER Publishing Co.

Elvin, H.L. (1971). Colleges of education: Their achievements and prospects. In F.H. Hilliard (Ed.), *Teaching the teachers*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Gorbutt, D. (1975). Redesigning the teacher education programme in NELP. *British Journal of Teacher Education, 1*, 47-54.

Great Britain: Department of Education and Science (1972). *Teacher education and training*. London: HMSO.

Great Britain: Department of Education and Science (1989). *Future arrangements for the accreditation of courses of initial teacher training: A consultation document*. London: Author.

Green, M. (1977). The matter of mystification: Teacher education in unquiet times. In D. Gleeson (Ed.), *Identity and structure: Issues in the sociology of education*. Nafferton, N. Humberside: Nafferton Books.

Harris, D. (1978). Making sense of educational theory. *British Journal of Teacher Education, 4*, 67-74.

Hilliard, F.H. (1971). Theory and practice in teacher education. In F.H. Hilliard (Ed.), *Teaching the teachers*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Koerner, J. (1963). *The miseducation of American teachers*. Baltimore MD: Penguin.

Lynch, J., & Plunkett, H.D. (1973). *Teacher education and cultural change*. London: Allen & Unwin.

McNamara, D. (1976). On returning to the chalk face: Theory not into practice. *British Journal of Teacher Education, 2*, 147-160.

Mardle, G., & Walker M. (1980). Strategies and structure: Some critical notes on teacher socialisation. In P. Woods (Ed.), *Teacher strategies: Explorations in the sociology of the school*. London: Croom Helm.

Moorhouse, C. (1969). A consumer's view of the BEd. *Forum, 12,* 49-50.

Morrison, A., & McIntyre, D. (1967). Changes in opinions about education during the first year of teaching. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 6,* 161-163.

Morrison, A., & McIntyre, D. (1973). *Teachers and teaching.* Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.

Perry, L.R. (1969). Training. *Education for Teaching,* No. 79, 4-10.

Ree, H. (1970). The real exam results. *Times Educational Supplement (London),* 6 November, page 2.

Taylor, W. (1969). *Society and the education of teachers.* London: Faber & Faber.

Tibble, J.W. (1971). The BEd: Degrees of difference. *Education for Teaching,* No. 84, 17-20.

White, D. (1975). Replacing Nellie as a teaching model. *Education for Teaching,* No. 97, 78-87.

Wragg, E.C. (1974). *Teaching teaching.* Newton Abbot: David & Charles.