

LF1217.5 IS 1995
Archives

JOHN FURLONG

**DO TEACHERS NEED
UNIVERSITIES?**

ISBN 0 86076 111 8



University of Wales Swansea

UNIVERSITY OF WALES SWANSEA
PRIFYSGOL CYMRU ABERTAWE
LIBRARY/LLYFRGELL

Classmark LF 1217.5 IS 1995

Location Archives

1004436949



NOT BORROWABLE

DO TEACHERS NEED UNIVERSITIES?

Inaugural Lecture

Delivered on 27 February 1995

by

John Furlong
Professor and Head of Department of Education

* * * * *

UNIVERSITY OF WALES SWANSEA
1995

Do Teachers Need Universities?

Inaugural Lecture

by

Professor John Furlong

University of Wales, Swansea.

27th February 1995

First Published 1995 by University of Wales Swansea

Obtainable from Registrar's Office, University of Wales Swansea,
Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP

Copyright - John Furlong 1995

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form, or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN 0 86076 111 8



Introduction

The passing of the 1994 Education Act was a vitally important milestone in the history of the initial teacher education in this country in that it marked the formal separation of the initial teacher education system from the rest of higher education. In the future, funding for all forms of initial teacher education in England (though not in Wales) will be the responsibility of the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) rather than the Higher Education Funding Council for England which funds all other higher education.

Even more significant however was the Act's confirmation that in the future, consortia of schools can develop their own SCITT teacher training schemes (School Centred Initial Teacher Training (DFE 1993a)) without reference to higher education. This innovation therefore poses the most fundamental challenge to those professionally involved in initial teacher education; it raises in stark and unavoidable terms, the question as to whether trainee teachers really do need higher education at all. If even a small number of graduates from SCITT schemes can achieve qualified teacher status without ever setting foot in a university or college department of education, we can no longer side step questions about the value of the contribution of higher education to a teacher's early professional development.

The aim of this lecture is therefore to contribute to the debate as to what the rationale for the continued involvement of higher education in initial

teacher education actually is. In doing so I intend to engage with the writing of Ronald Barnett, one of the most insightful contemporary writers on the 'idea' of higher education. However, before turning to my main theme, I want to begin by asking how it is that we have come to be in this position. How is it that the contribution of higher education to the professional development of teachers has come to be questioned in such a profound way? In answering this question it is useful to consider what Barnett (1990) has described as the 'sociological' and 'epistemological' undermining of higher education.

According to Barnett, higher education has traditionally been founded on two axioms. First there is the realm of objective knowledge; there are recognised truths to which students are to be introduced and about which they are expected to be able to demonstrate some assurance. This Barnett calls the epistemological axiom. Secondly, there is what he calls the sociological axiom. This is the idea that objective knowledge is most effectively maintained and disseminated in institutions which are relatively autonomous from narrow social interests (such as the state) and in which members of the academic community can enjoy comparative freedom. Truth, it has traditionally be argued, can only be pursued in institutions that are themselves freed from outside interference. However, as Barnett demonstrates, both of these axioms have, in recent years, come under attack or been put in doubt throughout higher education.

The 'sociological' undermining of higher education's role

On the 'sociological' front, Barnett argues that in recent years, higher education has been 'swept up' by the state, so much so that a large amount of what goes on is now prescribed.

Having expanded the system very rapidly and dramatically, (the state) came to have doubts about both the economic value of higher education and, in the wake of the radical movement, its wider social value. The state turned to maximising its investment in higher education.... There is a new emphasis on value for money, accountability, planning, efficiency, good management, resource allocation, unit costs, performance indicators and selectivity and reduced opportunities for tenure. Subjects within the curriculum

are favoured to the extent that they make a clear contribution to the economy: the sciences and technological subjects are supported... the humanities and social science subjects try to prove their worth by developing skills-oriented courses (p26)

Certainly this has been the experience of most of those professionally involved in initial teacher education. Indeed teacher educators' own explanations for the undermining of their role is that it has come about largely as a result of state intervention.

Direct intervention first began in 1984 with the issuing of DES Circular 3/84 (DES 1984). It was with this circular that the Government established the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) which was charged with the responsibility of over-seeing initial teacher education in Wales and England. In retrospect, the substantive changes introduced by Circular 3/84 do not seem particularly radical. However, constitutionally, the Circular was revolutionary (Wilkin 1991). For the first time it established the right of the Secretary of State to have a say in the detailed content and structure of initial teacher education in this country.

Since 1984 there has been a range of further interventions that have extended and elaborated central control and in each case further challenged the contribution of higher education. Circular 24/89 (DES 1989) reformed the organisation and powers of CATE while at the same time introducing far more detailed specification of the content and form of initial teacher education courses. Between them therefore, Circulars 3/84 and 24/89 challenged the *autonomy* of those in higher education to organise the structure and content of courses in the way they saw fit. Nevertheless, higher education still had a major role to play in the process.

More recent Circulars (DFE 1992, and 1993b) have gone much further in that they explicitly *limit* the role of higher education. For example, the secondary Circular, (DFE 1992) states:

The Government expects that partner schools and HEIs will exercise a joint responsibility for the planning and management of courses and the selection, training and assessment of students. The balance of responsibilities will vary. Schools will have a leading

responsibility for training students to teach their specialist subjects, to assess pupils and to manage classes; and for supervising students and assessing their competence in these respects. HEIs will be responsible for ensuring that courses meet the requirements for academic validation, presenting courses for accreditation, awarding qualifications to successful students and arranging student placements in more than one school' (para 14).

The Primary Circular is equally forceful. As a result of these two Circulars, teacher education in the future is intended to be narrowly focused, functional and technical with higher education playing a much more limited role than in the past.

The response of higher education

But in order to understand the full force of the present challenge to the role of higher education, it is not sufficient simply to focus on current Government regulations. We must also ask how universities and colleges have responded to earlier changes. Only by so doing can we appreciate the context into which current legislation has entered. Here it is useful to refer to evidence provided by the Modes of Teacher Education Project (MOTE) (Furlong et al 1994). The MOTTE project is monitoring changes in initial teacher education over a five year period (1992-1996). What we discovered in the first phase of our research was that by 1992, immediately prior to the introduction of the latest Government circulars, most courses had responded to the Government's increasing emphasis on practical training in the previous eight years by changing the higher education rather than the school-based parts of their training programmes. Course leaders had introduced substantial changes in the structure, content, and pedagogy of their higher education based programmes in order to make them more 'relevant' and 'practical' for students. There had also been a substantial change in personnel, with significant numbers of new lecturers being recruited directly from schools. By contrast, the changes introduced to school-based work were, in most courses, modest. In 1992, school-based work was still predominantly planned, supported and assessed by university and college tutors; the formal role assigned to teachers in the process remained minimal. Rather than sharing power and responsibility with schools and *together* finding ways of responding to Government

criteria, during the 1980s, colleges and universities had, for the most part, I would suggest, taken it on themselves to deliver a practical training.

It could therefore be argued that by 1992, those in higher education still controlled the provision of teacher education but had maintained that control at considerable cost. In moving to highly practically oriented courses, many of them had started to lose sight of what their distinctive contribution actually was. As a result, they were particularly badly placed to respond to the Government's demand that the responsibility for practical training be passed largely to schools. The cumulative effects of the sociological undermining of their work were therefore profound.

The 'epistemological' undermining of higher education

But higher education has, according to Barnett (1990), not only experienced a 'sociological' undermining; it has also been profoundly 'epistemologically' undermined too.

So the idea of objective knowledge is central to higher education. But from various theoretical quarters - philosophy of science, sociology of knowledge, epistemology, critical theory and post-structuralism - the ideas of objective knowledge and truth have come under a massive assault. What if anything is to replace objective knowledge is unclear. Pragmatism, relativism, 'metacriticism' and even 'anything goes' are all proposed. The very diversity of the alternative opinions is testimony to the collapse of some of our basic epistemological tenets (p11)

As I indicated above, British teacher educators interpret the undermining of their role as having come about largely as the result of Government intervention. In reality such an analysis is highly partial; profound epistemological difficulties must also be admitted. Those epistemological difficulties concern the nature and worth of theory understood as 'propositional' knowledge in education.

As Hirst (1995) reminds us, controversy over the role of 'theory' in education has a long history; it has been a highly complex and largely partisan debate which has shown little sign of resolution. Where there

has been agreement however is in dissatisfaction with the teaching of propositional knowledge in the form of 'the disciplines' of education - sociology, psychology, philosophy and history. The move away from such an approach to professional education in reality commanded widespread support; it was only hastened, not fundamentally caused, by the Government. However there has been far less consensus about what to replace disciplinary knowledge with. Uncertainty, in what Schön (1987) characterises as 'the swamps' of professional knowledge, is endemic. The only firm ground is at the extremes - those who remain committed to the essential role of formal theory in teacher education and those supporters of SCITT schemes who see induction into the 'craft of teaching' as sufficient in itself (O'Hear 1989; Lawlor 1990).

In 1986, Alexander pointed to the 'possibility' in British initial teacher education of moving away from a concern with theory to a concern with 'theorising'. Since then, as the MOTE project confirms (Furlong et al 1994), within the vast majority of British teacher education programmes, notions of 'theorising', 'theory as process' and particularly 'reflection' have largely displaced the teaching of theory as propositional knowledge. But the popularity of the idea of theorising through reflection has not led to conceptual clarity. As Calderhead (1989) points out, 'researchers, teacher educators and other writers in the field hold a range of beliefs about teaching and teacher education into which they have incorporated their own particular notions of reflection' (p45). In reality there are probably as many different definitions of reflection as there are supporter of the idea. Once again the very diversity of proposed alternatives to the teaching of propositional knowledge is testimony to the collapse of certainty. No wonder in the 1980s teacher educators responded to Government initiatives by embracing 'the practical'; articulating any secure version of educational knowledge other than the practical was, and remains, immensely problematic.

Those involved in higher education institutions devoted to initial teacher education therefore face a double crisis today for they are both epistemologically and sociologically challenged. The certainty of the value of their knowledge and the autonomy of their control over the content of their courses has been undermined. But as Bridges (1995) reminds us, teacher educators should not assume that they are unique in this

experience; many other fields look on us with some sympathy and a good deal of nervousness, recognising the same symptoms in their own field. A loss of certainty and a loss of autonomy is now endemic in higher education. What perhaps is distinctive however are the lengths to which the Government has gone in recent years in its attempts to control teacher education. This, in combination with epistemological difficulties that are widely felt throughout professional education (Schön 1983; 1987) and elsewhere, makes our crisis particularly pointed.

However, it is because teacher education is not alone in its current crisis that there can be no going back. Academics who yearn for the good old days of academic freedom where they alone could determine the curriculum untroubled by the complexities of engaging with the real world of schools will be disappointed. As I have argued elsewhere (Furlong 1991), the Government - any Government - will continue to want to have a strong hand in teacher education as it will in the rest of higher education; the days of complete autonomy for any of us are over. Moreover, as I will seek to demonstrate in the second half of this lecture, we do not want to go back to a world of detached 'academic' knowledge either. Higher education has a vitally important role to play in professional preparation but if it is to be relevant to the profession of the future, it must have a very different role from that which it had in the past. This will raise important challenges for those in higher education but the potential rewards could be significant.

Higher education and practical professional training.

So what then is the contribution of higher education to initial teacher education? Firstly we should recognise that those in higher education do have an important role in supporting the development of students' practical professional competence - this is a responsibility that universities and colleges *share* with schools. In my view, the assumption that higher education institutions can and should take total responsibility for this central aspect of professional preparation could never really hold water. One of the strengths of the Government reforms of the last few years is that they have forced those in higher education to recognise the importance of systematically involving practising teachers in their work. And in many courses, I would suggest that the quality of professional training offered is already significantly better for that involvement.

Nevertheless, higher education currently has a vital role to play in this aspect of training in at least four key ways.

The first way is that students benefit from being introduced to a great deal of the practical business of teaching away from the complexities of the classroom itself. For example, they need a chance to look at the national curriculum in detail, they need to work on the preparation of lesson plans and to examine different strategies for assessing pupils' work. All of this work is highly practical in nature, but particularly in the early stages of their professional preparation, there are clear advantages to students if they engage in this work away from the complexities of actually performing as teachers. Classrooms are highly complex places with a great many different things happening at the same time. Students have to learn to cope with that complexity, but there are definite advantages if parts of their practical professional preparation take place outside of the classroom.

A second contribution that those in higher education can make is through the vitally important process of modelling good practice. It is no coincidence that all of the tutors we spoke to in the MOTE research referred to above (Furlong et al 1994), regarded their own pedagogy in their higher education based sessions as one of their key strategies in professional preparation. Pedagogy was always chosen with care. Through it, tutors were able to model a wide variety of teaching strategies for their students, and as our interviews with students confirmed, that modelling was a rich source of ideas for them. Many tutors would also deploy the strategy of putting a group of students back into the role of learners themselves. Through this process, tutors could raise complex issues about teaching, learning, and the nature of knowledge in an extremely effective manner. These sorts of learning opportunities for students however demand that they are *taught* and that they work together as a group; the same ends cannot be achieved through direct practical experience in school.

A third important way in which higher education can contribute to practical professional preparation is by broadening the students' experience. Through their teaching, through the use of a well stocked professional resources centre, by arranging visits and visiting speakers, higher education tutors can broaden students' practical knowledge and skills. Again, this form of practical training is no substitute for direct

experience in the classroom; it is nevertheless a vitally important complement to it. One of the greatest stimuli to developing a deeper understanding of the principles behind professional practice is to have a broad range of practical experience oneself - what John (1995) calls 'peripatetic knowledge'. Within the confines of an initial training course, the number of opportunities to teach in different contexts is strictly limited. Nevertheless, because of their knowledge of practice in a wide range of schools, those in higher education are particularly well placed to provide students with 'indirect' practical experience of this sort.

The fourth and final contribution of those in higher education to practical professional training is of a different sort in that it concerns quality control - monitoring school-based work and making sure that schools are able effectively to perform their role. At the end of the day it is essential to recognise that any one school or any one teacher only has responsibility for initial teacher education on a year by year basis. Schools, unless they are part of a SCITT scheme, have no statutory responsibilities for initial teacher education while those in higher education clearly do. It is, after all, universities and colleges that are validated and accredited. This means that however much schools are partners in the development of students' practical professional preparation, the ultimate responsibility for the quality of that training in most cases remains with higher education. It is the responsibility of those in higher education to make sure that students are appropriately placed in school; to make sure they are well supported in school; to make sure that mentors give them the time that they should, and that their mentors have the right skills for working with them. Given that some schools will be better than others in supporting students; given that mentors change - currently about 25% per year nationally - there is a long term role for higher education here. To say that higher education carries the can and therefore has a responsibility to be involved in the detail of students' school-based work is not being arrogant (Berrill 1994) - it is to recognise that in a higher education based course those are lecturers' responsibilities.

So higher education today retains a vitally important role in the development of students' practical professional preparation. University and college lecturers have built up a great deal of expertise in supporting students' practical learning in the ways I have outlined, and for the

present at least, Government legislation places the responsibility for quality control on them. Those in higher education should not apologise for or minimise the importance of these contributions to practical professional training, for they are essential if the quality of initial teacher education is to be maintained.

However, it should also be recognised that none of these functions, essential though they are, necessarily have to be undertaken by those in higher education. Universities and colleges may be well placed to take on these tasks; there may be important economies of scale in allowing them to do so; and they may have staff who have appropriate forms of expertise. But the tasks I have identified above could, I would suggest, quite effectively be undertaken by a local education authority or even perhaps by a consortium of schools. They are not tasks that are *in principle* something that only those in higher education can do. I therefore now want to turn to the question of what, if anything, is distinctive about the contribution of higher education to initial teacher training.

The 'essential' nature of higher education

In developing an understanding of the distinctive contribution of higher education to professional training, it is necessary to begin by asking what is distinctive about higher education *per se*. As we have seen, traditional definitions of higher education centred on certainty of knowledge and academic autonomy. But in the field of teacher education, as elsewhere, these have been profoundly undermined. What then remains of the idea of higher education at the end of the twentieth century? Once again it is Barnett (1990) who provides the most persuasive answer. Barnett argues that whatever the current challenges, the essential nature of higher education is not compromised in its contemporary form if it maintains its commitment to the pursuit of truth. However, following Habermas (1970; 1974), Barnett suggests that truth is not an end point. 'Rather truth is the description we give to a particular kind of human transaction' (59)

This transaction, Barnett suggests, is a conversation, but not just any kind of conversation. Within such a conversation, participants can say what they want provided they are trying to get at the truth, provided that they are sincere, that they mean what they say, that their contribution is

internally coherent and is intelligible to the other participants in the discussion.

Participation in this sort of intellectual debate therefore imposes certain demands - people have to be heard, people have to listen attentively and participants need to be able to understand the discussion. Participants also need to be sincere, coherent and committed. But most fundamental of all, according to Barnett, is the willingness to expose one's viewpoint to the critical gaze of others.

Intellectual debate is not cosy, or permissive; it is critical judgemental and stern. Higher education in this view of truth, cannot simply be a matter of truths disseminated to the student; it is a much tougher and more demanding process. Through it, the student emerges able to begin to take up an informed position of his or her own, or at least to have some awareness of what that involves. (60)

But the commitment to the pursuit of truth in this manner is not merely something that is imposed on students within higher education. Crucially it is a discipline that is also imposed on lecturers too.

So far as higher education is concerned, the idea of a discourse freed of unnecessary constraint works on two levels. First there is the discourse in which the student is a participant, with opportunities available to the student to form and communicate ideas either with other students or with teachers. Secondly there is the discourse of academics, a discourse which advances and sustains their own disciplinary communities.

Higher education and initial teacher training

Whether or not Barnett's vision of higher education is, as he claims, appropriate for all disciplines and for all institutions, is open to debate. One could also question whether the pursuit of truth in the way that he has defined it is self evidently a 'good thing' as he asserts. If the process of engaging in a critical discourse is to be raised to the pre-eminent principle of higher education, it clearly needs more detailed justification than he provides. Nevertheless Barnett's analysis does throw significant light on

the role of higher education in initial teacher training. Moreover, as I will try to demonstrate below, his emphasis on the process of the pursuit of truth can be justified; it does have an important contribution to make to the vocational education of student teachers.

Following Barnett's line of argument it is clear that an initial teacher education programme that involves a significant contribution from higher education will be distinctive in two important ways. Firstly it will involve a commitment to engaging students in 'conversations' about educational practice - their own and other people's. These will be conversations where students are encouraged to pursue 'truth'; where they are encouraged to offer their own views; where they are encouraged to take an open and critical stance in their evaluation of practice; where they are encouraged to form their own judgements, and strike out on their own. In pursuing these objectives students will need to be sincere, coherent and committed and be willing to expose their own practice and ideas to scrutiny.

Secondly, lecturers who support their professional development will themselves have something distinctive to offer. While the topics of professional knowledge they cover may well overlap with those offered by teachers, their approach may be very different for there is a demand on lecturers themselves to be engaged in the open and critical scrutiny of their professional knowledge. They too must actively engage in 'conversations' with other colleagues in their academic community through writing, research and scholarship; they too must be actively involved in the pursuit of 'truth'.

The potential contribution of higher education to initial teacher training is therefore very different from that of the school. For while individual teachers in schools may foster an open minded commitment to the pursuit of truth, there is, as Maynard (1995) demonstrates, no guarantee of this happening. This is because the essential purposes of schools and institutions of higher education are fundamentally different. The school is not a seminar - far from it. For the practicing teacher responsible for teaching *this* curriculum, to *these* children, *now*, the imperative is to act. If teachers stopped to question every action they simply could not teach. As a result, the essential contribution of teachers to professional development is fundamentally different from that of higher education; it

stems first and foremost from the skills, knowledge and understandings that derive from that need to act.

But to recognise that higher education has a distinctive contribution to professional education does not necessarily provide a rationale for why that contribution is necessary. Having some institutions in a society that are dedicated to the pursuit of 'truth' in education may be of value to the profession at large in reasserting its own sense of professionalism, but why should students in the very first stages of professional development need to engage with such complexities themselves? Given that the central purpose of initial teacher education is to provide a form of practical preparation that is directly vocational, the value of insisting that students engage in this form of critical discourse is not self evident.

In the final part of this lecture, I want to address this question and suggest that there are two fundamental reasons why such an approach is necessary for effective initial teacher education. The first derives from the fact that teaching is a highly complex activity; the second from the fact that teaching is a profoundly 'moral' activity.

Controlling complexity

In clarifying the value of higher education's contribution to teacher education it is valuable to consider the limitations of the alternative 'technicist' approaches to professional training (Furlong 1991). Can teaching, one must ask, be learned and carried out entirely as a 'technical' process? This is the argument put forward by a number of those who support SCITT schemes. For example Hargreaves and his colleagues (Beardon et al, 1992) argue that basic teaching can indeed be undertaken at an entirely technical level; basic teaching is no more than 'competence'. It is because this is the case that *initial* teacher education can indeed take place entirely in school. For Beardon et al, the more complex dimensions of teaching, which they recognise are important, do not need to be, and are indeed best *not* addressed until later in a teacher's career. Higher education, they argue, is therefore not essential for initial teacher education; universities and colleges should focus instead on further professional development and leave initial teacher education largely to schools.

Research into how students learn to teach which I and Trisha Maynard (Furlong and Maynard 1995) have recently carried out here at the University of Wales, Swansea, would lead us to a very different conclusion. Our research made us aware that teacher's practical professional knowledge is held at many different levels of sophistication and that this observation is vitally important for understanding how students learn to teach. Thus a 'bright idea', say, for teaching about life in Elizabethan Britain to year 5 pupils, may be understood at the level of a concrete recipe or routine - a strategy which students are capable of copying and implementing without fully appreciating why it takes the form that it does. Alternatively, the same lesson plan may be understood in rich and complex ways, drawing on a sophisticated appreciation of how children learn and a flexible understanding of the substantive and syntactic structure of historical knowledge incorporated within it. Recipes for teaching include and subsume within them these more complex educational, moral and other issues in ways that novice teachers seldom recognise.

Our research on the stages of learning to teach indicated that while it is possible to 'act like a teacher' simply by following routines and recipes established by others, becoming an *effective* teacher demands a deeper understanding of the processes involved in teaching and learning. The experienced teachers we worked with were, even when they were unable to articulate the process to us or their students, able to 'frame' (Schön 1983, 1987) or interpret teaching situations by drawing on richer and more complex understandings. When confronted by new or difficult situations, they had a deeper understanding than their students of the assumptions they were making in their framing. As a result, they were able to bring that teaching more directly under their own control.

Experienced teachers, in our study, therefore demonstrated that competent teaching involves much more than behavioural skills; in learning to be effective, teachers have to develop a deeper and richer understanding of their teaching than is captured in the notion of 'competence'. They have to develop what Elliott (1990) calls 'intelligent skill knowledge'; knowledge that is still essentially practical but which nevertheless involves an implicit appreciation of the complexities on which it is based. Students, if they are to begin to control their own teaching, therefore do need to look

beneath the surface of their own and other people's practice. Effective practice, even at an introductory level, demands a deeper understanding than the idea of 'competence' normally implies; it is through developing these deeper understandings that students progressively learn to bring their teaching under their own control.

Higher education, with its commitment to the forms of critical conversation I have outlined above, therefore has an essential role to play in supporting students' practical training for it can promote the development of these deeper understandings. Given their breadth of practical experience and given the fact they too are involved in critical conversations, tutors have access to a powerful range of questions that can help students confront the complexities underlying practice. And it is through the challenge of such questioning, through being forced to look at their assumptions, articulate them and expose them to critical scrutiny, that students learn to bring their practice more effectively under their own control. What I have described as the essential purposes of higher education can therefore be seen to be vital to the development of effective forms of practical training. Once again, because of their necessary commitment to action rather than reflection, there is no guarantee that schools will take on this role.

Teaching and values

The second reason that the distinctive contribution of higher education is essential in initial teacher training is because teaching, in all its dimensions, is a value laden activity. Values are not abstract and remote, they affect every decision one makes as a teacher: what one teaches, how one teaches it, one's aims and purposes, one's ways of relating to children and to other teachers. Values in education are ubiquitous. As a result all examples of practice to which students are exposed when they are in school are by definition ideological. They are examples of *particular* forms of practice embodying *particular* aims, assumptions and values. This however is a problem if we remain committed to the idea of a pluralism of values within the profession with students developing their own professional commitments.

As part of professional training, students obviously need to be rooted in the realities of ideological commitment that come from working in particular classrooms and schools. However if values are so central to our profession, then it is vitally important that we take their education seriously. To leave such education to chance, to assume that somehow student teachers will develop an informed and rational approach to educational values simply by being immersed in particular schools, is inadequate.

I would suggest that the only secure way to reduce the impact of ideology in teacher education - from wherever it comes - is to make sure that professional education is at least in part rooted in a culture *committed* to open minded critique of practice. If values are to be fostered in a rational way, an exploration of values, including their own, must be a central part of students' professional preparation. Once again it is higher education, with its commitment to open minded critique, that is best placed to contribute to this aspect of training. As I have indicated above, lecturers take part in a professional discourse where their own professional knowledge and commitments are constantly subject to scrutiny and debate. It is this process that moves them on. Through their involvement in higher education, students engage in the same process - with each other and with lecturers. As a result they can come to have a clearer understanding of the assumptions and values they are implicitly and explicitly supporting in their school practice. It seems to me that it is only by recognising and confronting these values - by discussing the aims as well as the means of education - that pluralism within the profession can be ensured. Not to take this aspect of professional education seriously would, I would suggest, be damaging to our profession and eventually to our democracy as well.

Conclusion - the challenge and the prize of partnership

The challenges of what has happened in recent years to teacher education in England and Wales are immense. Schools are now being asked to take much greater responsibility for the professional education of young teachers than they have ever done in the past. Such a demand has considerable implications both in terms of resources and professional commitments. Yet, as I have argued elsewhere, (Furlong et al 1988; Furlong

et al 1994; Furlong and Maynard 1995) if the quality of the professional preparation of the next generation of teachers is to be maintained, then the contribution of schools is vital. To a very considerable extent the future of the profession is now in their hands.

But as I have tried to argue in this lecture, the challenges to higher education, although of a different kind, have been equally significant. The contribution of higher education to professional education has been profoundly undermined both sociologically and epistemologically, so much so that a few universities and colleges have started to question their continued involvement. This I regard as deeply worrying; worrying for the long term quality of the profession and worrying for the quality of the education of our children. Universities and colleges must, for the reasons I have outlined, continue to work closely with the teaching profession in their communities and teachers in those communities must insist that they do. But equally worrying is the fact that although the vast majority of higher education institutions remain committed to initial teacher training, an increasing number do not seem to have any clear rationale for what their continued participation can and should be in the changed circumstances that face them.

What I have tried to demonstrate in this lecture is that higher education does have a continued and vitally important role to play in the professional education of teachers. However what is clear is that that contribution is and will continue to be very different from before. There is no going back to the certainties and autonomy of the past.

But if higher education is to deliver its promise in relation to student teachers then it must do more than it did in the 1980s when it stood behind closed doors but became largely practically oriented. Schools can do that job equally well if not better. What higher education must do, through its new found partnerships, is engage in detailed debates about professional practice - both that of students and teachers themselves. Such debates must take place both inside the classroom and in the seminar room; the notion of partnership must be carried into the detail of educational practice for the benefit of students, teachers and lecturers alike. But such an engagement is immensely challenging to those in higher education for it is no longer possible for them to hide behind the certainties of

propositional knowledge untroubled by the complexities of educational practice. It is, I would suggest, equally challenging to bring the culture of higher education into school, encouraging teachers to expose their practice to critical scrutiny. But the promise of establishing a close and routine dialogue between higher education and schools is immense. It is the prize of developing a more genuine discipline of education than we have had in the past - one that is at once both practical and theoretical. From my visits to other institutions up and down the country I see the first, faltering signs of this new flowering. Other disciplines that are feeling equally uncertain in the changed circumstances that face higher education would do well to watch how we in education respond to these challenges in the years to come.

References

- Barnett, R. (1990) The idea of Higher Education. Buckingham: The Open University Press.
- Beardon, T., Booth, M., Hargreaves, D. and Reiss, M. (1992) 'School-Led Teacher Training: The Way Forward' Cambridge Education Papers No 2. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Department of Education.
- Berrill, M. (1994) Review of Cambridge Journal of Education special edition Vol 22 (3) 'Initial Teacher Education at the Crossroads', Cambridge Journal of Education, Vol 24 (1).
- Bridges, D. (1995) 'Initial Teacher Education and the Reconstruction of the University' in J. Furlong and R. Smith (Eds) *op cit*.
- Calderhead, J. (1989) 'Reflective Teaching and Teacher Education' Teaching and Teacher Education Vol5 (1) pp43-51.
- DES (1984) Initial Teacher Training: Approval of Courses (Circular 3/84) London:DES.
- DES (1989) Initial Teacher Training: Approval of Courses (Circular 24/89). London: DES.
- DFE (1992) Initial Teacher Training (Secondary Phase) (Circular 9/92). London: DFE.
- DFE (1993a) School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT). Letter of Invitation. 5.3.93. London: DFE
- DFE (1993b) The Initial Training of Primary School Teachers: New Criteria for Course Approval (Circular 14/93). London: DFE.
- Elliott, J. (1990) Competency-Based Training and the Education of the Professions: Is a Happy Marriage Possible? Unpublished Paper. Norwich: University of East Anglia, Centre for Applied Research in Education.

- Furlong, J. (1991) 'Reconstructing Professionalism: Ideological Struggle in Initial Teacher Education', in M. Arnot, and L. Barton, (Eds.) Voicing Concerns: Sociological Perspectives on Contemporary Educational Reforms, Wallingford: Trinagle
- Furlong, V.J., Hirst, P.H., Pocklington, K. and Miles, S. (1988) Initial Teacher Training and the Role of the School, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Furlong, J., Whitty, G., Barrett, E., Barton, L. and Miles, S. (1994) 'Integration and Partnership in Initial Teacher Education - Dilemmas and Possibilities', Research Papers in Education Vol 9(3).
- Furlong, J. and Maynard, T. (1995) Mentoring Student Teachers: the Growth of Professional Knowledge London: Routledge
- Furlong, J. and Smith, R. (1995) (Eds) The Role of Higher Education in Initial Teacher Education. London: Kogan Page.
- Gardner, P (1995) 'Higher Education and Teacher Training: A Century of Progress and Promise' in J.Furlong and R. Smith (Eds) *op cit*.
- Hargreaves, D. (1994) The New Professionalism. New South Wales Centre for Advanced Teaching Studies.
- Hirst, P. (1995) 'Preparing for Teaching: The Demands of Professional Practice' in J. Furlong and R. Smith (Eds) *op cit*.
- Habermas, J. (1970) 'Towards and Theory of Communicative competence' Inquiry Vol 13
- Habermas, J. (1974) Theory and Practice London: Heineman.
- John, P. (1995) 'The Subject Method Seminar and the Role of the Teacher Educator' in J.Furlong and R. Smith (Eds) *op cit*.

- Lawlor, S. (1990) Teachers Mistaught: Training Theories or Education in Subjects? London: Centre for Policy Studies.
- O'Hear, A. (1988) Who Teaches the Teachers?, London: Social Affairs Unit.
- Patrick, H. Bernbaum, G and Reid, K. (1982) The Structure and Process of Initial Teacher Education within Universities in England and Wales. Leicester: University of Leicester, School of Education.
- Schön, D. (1983) The Reflective Practitioner. New York: Basic Books
- Schön, D. (1987) Educating the Reflective Practitioner. San-Francisco: Josey Bass
- Wilkin, M. (1991) 'The Development of Partnership in the United Kingdom' in M.Booth, J. Furlong and M. Wilkin (eds) Partnership in Initial Teacher Training. London: Cassell.



LIBRARY



UNIVERSITY OF WALES
SWANSEA