

1985

Teacher Curriculum: A Failed Paradigm of Practise and Procedure

D. M. Cavanagh
University of Wollongong

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



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

Recommended Citation

Cavanagh, D. M. (1985). Teacher Curriculum: A Failed Paradigm of Practise and Procedure. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 10(2).
<https://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.1985v10n2.5>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol10/iss2/5>

TEACHER CURRICULUM: A FAILED PARADIGM OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

D. M. Cavanagh
University of Wollongong

Introduction

An examination of recent literature concerning teacher training suggests that in many parts of the western world it is constantly under review. Major Reports (Martin: 1964; Bell: 1971; James: 1972; The Senate: 1972; Williams: 1979; Correy: 1980; Auchmuty: 1980) and the popular press have written and continue to write about various aspects of the teachers life. Some of these are analyses of what is the case, others are about what could be the case whilst others dwell on the shortcomings of the teaching profession. The U.K. for example has its infamous Black Papers whilst in Australia the same concepts concerning standards occupy media space. Teacher unions continue to say what is lacking within educational bureaucracies, and State and Federal Governments respond in an ad hoc fashion to the pressures of budget, coercion and whim.

At the teacher training level in Australia a multitude of Reports and submissions about teacher training are the order of the day. At the base of this hive of activity is the apparent dissatisfaction felt concerning the appropriateness of the training regimes that "equip" the student teacher for the task of teaching. At the academic level there is sufficient evidence concerning the unsatisfactory nature of the training programs (Fielding, Cavanagh & Widdowson: 1977) and their conceptual bases (Fielding & Cavanagh : 1983) to warrant further curriculum analysis with the view to identifying just what are the bases for this unsatisfactory state of affairs.

This paper has three purposes. It is an attempt, first to examine the curriculum antecedents that operate within N.S.W. in teacher training programs in order to see whether there are any significant factors operating there that might be applicable to the understanding of the problems associated with teacher training in N.S.W. Secondly the analysis focuses on several theoretical considerations which attempt to identify the beginnings of a methodology for analysing and understanding the nature of the situation. Finally in attempting to come to grips with the manifest

problems of teacher training as a theoretical curriculum exercise I am mindful of the sentiments expressed by V. Lynn Meek (1983:11) who succinctly puts the situation when he states "that clearly, an activity which may be judged as being "effective" in terms of the interests of one group may be detrimental to the interests of another". Thus part three is concerned with what could be the case, given the acceptance of an assumptional base for decision making.

The NSW Case

In the late sixties and early seventies NSW relied on a massive overseas campaign to recruit teachers to fill the shortfall caused by inadequate manpower planning for teaching and the high incidence of teacher resignation. Teachers colleges were expanded both in number and diversity, university staffs in education faculties increased, scholarships and other cash incentives were offered to recruits, and salaries increased especially during the early seventies, for practicing teachers. The problem of inexperience within the teaching profession manifested itself in the statistics of the late seventies where the average age of the teaching population in NSW was 25 years. This in experiential terms the average teacher had 4 - 5 years of teaching experience. If the calculations had been done for an extraction of the age group in managerial positions no doubt this experiential factor would have been much the same. The usual bottlenecks had arisen within the promotion sector of the service with some people on the promotion lists facing the prospect of never being able to reach a managerial position. Coupled to this situation were problems associated with; non mobility, lack of alternative job positions, fewer resigning, leave replacing resignation, reduction in funding services as the economy reorganised its priorities away from educational expenses throughout all sectors, and the consequences of a rapidly changing social structure.

Within this vastly changed milieu, teacher training for the most part has remained the same, with institutional inertia being accepted as the rationale for curriculum decisions regarding teacher training. Such an approach to teacher education and training whilst being pragmatic on a number of fronts cannot stand up under any evaluative considerations and will of necessity fall foul of the current accountability syndrome prevalent, although in its infancy, in Australia where the population at large is demanding that education be brought to account. As yet we have not had the impetus of the Black Papers although the cries of irrationality demanding from some sectors regarding "basics" education is reminiscent of the same hysteria.

The Old Paradigm of Teacher Training

In Australia prior to the 1960's expansion of the old Teachers Colleges into multi disciplinary colleges of Advanced Education, teacher trainers were recruited from the schools. They were experts in the practice of the craft of teaching and what they taught, based on experience, was a reflection of reality within the school system. They were familiar with the routines in schools and had had constant associations with pupils and school staffs that were trained within a similar mould to themselves. Within the schools, especially the high schools, there was a small cadre of elite university trained teachers who had degrees and an end-on diploma in education. These university trained teachers were required to undergo a one year probationary teaching period prior to being granted a certificate in teaching. Not so for the two and three year trained college students who were required to undergo three or two years probationary teaching prior to receiving a teachers certificate. Thus, for whatever reason the university trained graduate attracted higher salary, higher status, more rapid promotion, "better classes", and more responsibility than the college graduate who on top of his two or three year status had to undergo a further period of "training" to be given fully qualified status. In the case of the two year trained college graduate such training required a further 5 years part time study for a degree, the university giving little or no credit for the initial two years of full time training at the college. The State Education Department, in NSW at least, granted three year trained status only after 4/9 of a degree program was completed.

With the advent of the numbers game and political pressure from the unions and professional associations, and the restructuring of colleges into degree granting institutions, much of this has changed. At some institutions delayed admission to teaching as a career option through undergraduate non-education oriented type degrees was fostered. However, within the C.A.E.'s the greatest majority of the student intake were still teacher trainees and, as well, the staff mix retained the expert attracted from the class room. As Colleges became truly more diverse within their curricular offerings, students came in contact with others doing entirely different program formats. These meetings however were mainly cafeteria style rather than planned curricular offerings. A further development under this paradigm was concerned with the political decision to amalgamate some C.A.E. institutions with Universities. Often a further curricular restructuring in terms of joint offerings and the granting of credit from one part of the institution to the other followed. However as could be imagined, curricular changes via political fiat creates many problems. A classic case is concerned with the autonomy issue where one sector of the institution

is responsible for its own courses and the other must get outside approval from an external accrediting Board ... the old university/college graduate argument mentioned above. Yet both student programs lead to graduation from the same institution. This is not the place to take up the issues involved with other curricular problems associated with amalgamations; suffice it to say that the old paradigm of teacher training has been stretched to breaking point in terms of its capacity to deal with contemporary needs of teachers, schools and society.

Experience in the UK gleaned from case studies (Evans : 1978; Brew 1980) suggests that, not only is a new paradigm necessary but also that if needed changes in teacher education are to be understood and implemented, the various belief systems of the partners in the training program need curriculum articulation. The point is that if Australia follows the British lead, by introducing an induction year into the training program, as indeed is being contemplated in a modified form at some Colleges in NSW, some hard curricular decisions need to be thought through and implemented within a (rational) theory based paradigm.

The Research Orientation

It is useful to analyse the various curricular data gathering camps in order to identify the stances taken concerning the valued approaches to teacher training. Van Gigch (1974) suggests that data can be divided into hard and soft data collection, the one representing the science-agriculture approach, the other the social science approach. He provides the following summary statement pointing to the difference between the two. (Van Gigch, 1974: 148)

It is normal to expect that the physical sciences be more suitable to logicomathematical derivations and to more formalised reasoning processes than the social sciences. Although logic and mathematics have a role to play in the latter, these methods will never supercede informal reasoning processes, intuitive judgement, and other less structured processes which are more suitable to a less precise domain. It is misleading, on the other hand to completely characterise the realm of sciences as "exact" and that their counterpart, the social sciences as "inexact". Informal reasoning processes play an important role in all the sciences

It needs to be emphasised that, like the hard sciences, the social sciences cannot and do not survey the total environment in order to be able to understand it. Certain concessions are taken with the data to make it

manageable. Specifically the researcher is not analysing the total case, but the context in which the case appears, i.e., since total reality is infinite and the researcher's capability is finite he can only analyse a finite part of reality. That finite part of the total reality is characterised by contextual constraints operating within this finite state.

The identification of the context as an indication of reality is of paramount concern to the contextual researcher attempting to build a case for analysis. The analysis is concerned with the why of the context not the what. Thus in the initial stages of attempting to analyse curriculum within teacher education as it is, the identification of the context for analysis is the critical factor. However, the multitude of operational variables apparent within such a context precludes the analysis of all contingencies. A structure for sifting the details is obviously necessary. This structure is, of course, researcher dependent and as a consequence reflects the researcher's biases for filtering out information regarded as unimportant either personally or to the problem for analysis seen by the researcher.

Within this framework two questions highlight the approach to understanding the curriculum within teacher education and set the biases for data collection. The two questions; 1: *why* is this event occurring and, 2, *what* event is occurring, neatly separate the two approaches to data collection. Of necessity both these questions are inseparable in reality. But this is not the point at issue. The critical paradigmatic departure is in the priority afforded to the ranking of the questions. The contextual analysis is fixed by the collection of the data in response to the prioritisation of the questions above.

Under the pseudo scientific number crunching activity of the input/output paradigm the generalisability to the infinite universe was a paramount consideration for acceptability of the research output. This approach, so prevalent in the psychologically oriented approaches to research in education, has led for example, to the failure to give adequate account in educational psychology to the individuality of learners; a classic example of this being the mass training of teachers essentially within the one training paradigm. This approach to curricular planning focussed on the *what* question and, to a large extent, separated it almost completely from the *why*. Specifically, studies focussed on what was happening in the classroom almost to the exclusion of why it was happening, i.e., practice was examined as an end in itself without regard to theoretical considerations. What was happening became the order of the day for data collection.

Under a contextual approach no such restriction is necessary. The "why" of the context is taken cognisance of in the first instance within the finite

reality of the situation and the capability of the researcher. As V. Lynn Meek (1983,16) states: "it is generalisations from the concrete and specific that we are after, not scientific generalisations which assume the existence of "empirical universals" from the beginning:

The "empirical" universals in the case under consideration constitute administrative convenience, but more of this later.

Bullivant (1982, 11) perhaps sums up the case for the interpretative paradigm as a means of eliciting research information when he states:

"... research which takes its direction from this interpretive paradigm makes different assumptions about the social world from those related to the normative paradigm. They move the emphasis away from thinking that there is an established social world "out there" with set statuses and roles, which predetermine how people behave, to a more phenomenological and social interactionist perspective".

White (1983) reinforces this view in his comments regarding the suitability of the present research paradigms in answering critical questions concerning the complexities of the learning environments: "simple theories, paradigms and questions, studied in ponderous set piece experiment, cannot illuminate the complexities and so they provide teachers with little guidance". Nowhere is this malaise more apparent than in the field of curriculum planning for teacher education.

Kuhn's 1960's account of the history of science established the use of paradigm as a way of analysing and understanding the physical sciences. Perhaps the paradigm concept could be useful in examining the nature of curriculum decision making regarding the development of a teacher training program. Simply, Kuhn defines a paradigm as a set of assumptions which explain the world to us and help predict its behaviour. In my analysis above, his historical approach, used to describe the development of the sciences, was modified and used in a limited fashion to explain curricular incidences within N.S.W. The assertion was made that a different set of spectacles (the why question) was needed in order to view any "new" approach to the understanding of teacher training. What follows is an attempt to create a scenario within a new paradigm.

The Changed Paradigm : One Scenario

The new 1985 breed of teacher, trained under a different set of contextual constraints is of a different ilk than those teachers presently in the system in school and in training colleges. This "new" generation is trained under

a degree structure that may or may not have education as a base discipline. This is not unlike the university training model of deferred choice within the UK and some institutions within Australia where little or no formal study in education is undertaken during the degree part of preservice. As the most obvious public deficiency is seen within the classroom, perhaps an extension of the classroom practice into an induction year has distinct possibilities. Thus, if an induction year was undertaken within a new format of teacher training, the student would in all probability miss out on those much derided "teacher only" type courses. Much of this practice role in NSW at present is in the hands of the inservice phase of teacher renewal where practising teachers tell practising teachers about better ways. The only apparent difference as far as training goes is that probationary and other teachers undergo this as a voluntary exercise based on perceived need. However as witnessed in the UK experience, as budget cuts become more pronounced, this in-school time experience rapidly gives way to out of school time. The problem for NSW in accepting a full induction year as practice, however, appears to be not so much that induction is seen as necessary (the State Education actually runs "induction" courses in teacher training over short periods), but in accepting that such a year be an integral part of training. The fact that the State Education Department does offer these courses suggests there is institutional acceptance that they are necessary and, as a corollary, that something is wrong with the present training paradigm. However such a course (a day or so) could hardly be construed as an induction year concept.

Under a new paradigmatic consideration the induction year would be conceived as an integral part of training, rather than as a haphazard politico-administrative whim, especially if it was to be managed by the actual professional body of teachers. Whilst in parts of the UK and other regions this kind of thinking has received the official stamp of approval there appears to be within the present paradigm in NSW at least, a problem associated not so much with implementing an induction year but in accepting that there are theoretical justifications for other programs eg. a developmentally based model compared to say a competency-based one.

Administrative Considerations

It is much easier to administer a lock step program based on administrative criteria of sequence than one based on student needs. Students enter the program (typically) from school and enter a familiar time zone of four years duration tacked on to their high school program where they were totally familiar with people making decisions for them.

As a Curricular issue the grounds for change in teacher training are compelling. The administrative model of program development works on the premise that administration should give direction to the educational effort. Thus the appropriate curricular questions are never asked as a prelude to administrative decision making. Specifically when "educational" timetables are examined the questions asked appear to be :

How many classrooms are needed? how many students are available? how many lecturers are needed? etc. and the consequent questions which follow are concerned with the manipulation of these prime variables so that lecturers, classes and students meet at the administratively arranged times. The curricular question of what to teach? is then addressed. However as Elvin (1974) points out the administrator has to understand more than the compilation of numbers of teachers or the state of financial resources.

Under many present training programs it is difficult to argue with the logic of a smooth administrative program. However, under a paradigm that requires the curricular question to be addressed as the first priority, administrative convenience is relegated to a much lower order consideration, and as a consequence, a much more creative administrative role needs to be adopted. Thus, administration then becomes a supportive role to the curricular effort. What to teach and its derivative questions of how and when to teach within the instructional mode set the pattern of administrative question asking and decision making. If in response to the curricular question mentioned above, it is appropriate to deal with a particular educational experience only when the student in training is developmentally ready for it, in for example an induction year, such an induction year would need to be provided by the Administration. Admittedly administrators would not be able to use such fiat devoid of educational professional input. Rather, the curricular plan would be put to the administrator and then a consultation exercise would need to be undertaken in order to realise the necessary curricular dimensions of the possible.

Dinosaural considerations

The present paradigmatic view of teacher training suffers from the problem that, with the assumptional bases as givens, creative exercises in curriculum are contained within a fixed structure - the set piece exercise. This situation has been referred to as "curriculum tinkering". With the diversity of givens - some explicit, many implicit - sound curricular planning is hampered. In the history of the physical sciences, for example, the notion that the sun revolved around the earth led to a vast array of scientific tinkering that attempted to make sense out of the givens. Only when the givens were

questioned or when the system repeatedly could not answer the questions raised did the tinkering exercise give way to a new appraisal such that a new paradigm analysis was invented to lay the dinosaur to rest. Whereas the physical sciences could adopt new formulae to understand the results released from the new science, education as curricular implementation within N.S.W. has not been capable, as a collective effort, to go beyond administration as the key to curriculum efficiency. This situation still exists within the various training regimes despite both the research evidence on individualisation (Dewey, 1971) as a tenet of human existence, and as argued elsewhere (Fielding, 1983) the compelling evidence of individual development as a case for consideration within teacher training programs.

Some Aspects of The Changed Paradigm Considered

In this section, I propose six assumptions which are intended as a first attempt to set the stage for "new paradigmatic" thinking in the curriculum of teacher education.

1. Teachers consciously seek professional renewal as an integral part of their career development.
2. Teachers wish to control entry to the profession by a variety of means including the possession of appropriate knowledge, demonstration of teaching expertise, length and type of training, and other rites of passage determined by them.
3. Teachers wish to be controlled by a code of ethics including the adoption of professional sanctions.
4. Professional autonomy is the aspiration of all persons seeking a permanent career in teaching.
5. Curricular decision making is based on legitimate trust, mutual respect, reward and autonomy within an acceptable supportive administrative framework.
6. Extended practice in the skills of teaching make teaching better.

The James Report (1972) envisaged a continuity of partnership between initial preparation and training, an Induction Year and inservice training. The curricular question that follows is related to this partnership, viz. How can elements both new and old within the original training year(s) be organised to incorporate the concept of an Induction Year as part of the neophyte's training? Such a question immediately focusses on practice teaching as the most pressing problem to be solved. Under the old paradigm in NSW, practice teaching relegated the student to an inferior position

in the training partnership. They were bonded, and subservient to the State Government and the whims of a single purpose institution geared up to train teachers within the one training format.

With the advent of multi-purpose institutions, withdrawal of bond support and its controlling influence, the extension of school education and the lowering of the voting age, such a subservient role, although persisted with under the old paradigm, is no longer applicable to these students, especially under the new political directives which incorporate participation and equity and anti-discrimination legislation. Thus, both the education climate of change and the political impetus of funding make the time right to re-examine the "partnership" role. However, to do this implies a change in valuing priorities within the profession, namely the adoption of an alternative curricular procedure for making practice better eg. the induction year as a partnership learning year compared to a probationary controlling year. For the training colleges, however, the practice teaching component is a source of funding and staffing in addition to forming a part of an "integrated course" ie. an administrative priority is accepted as an implicit given. Under the new paradigm, and its assumptional base above, the curricular question becomes : how can the practice teaching component be reconceptualised as an integral part of the training year? Clearly I am looking at the concept expressed in assumption six. The practice of teaching over an extended period under supervision appears to make more sense that the present course arrangement of a few scattered months of pseudo practice in a contrived practical environment where supervision is carried out as an adjunct to other activities. In an extended apprenticeship period the student would need to be given all the rights, duties and privileges ascertained by the profession in order for the practice to be acknowledged as a critical part of the socialisation of the student into the profession. Thus the trainee would be a student teacher in practice not a practicing student. In order to adopt this concept certain reconceptualisations concerning the concept of practice teaching need to be undertaken.

Reconceptualisation of the Act

Practice teaching in general, as undertaken within the present training format, is akin to putting an observer, who has been a passenger within a motor car, in the driver's seat, and expecting that person to become the expert driver without having the benefit of an extended practice session. What is wrong with practice teaching as it is undertaken within the majority of institutions? Quite clearly an administrative decision to have practice teaching at a time convenient to the institution is devoid of any

consideration or analysis of the *in-situ* situation concerning the individual readiness of each student to perform practice in a classroom environment. Such decisions to place practice at institutional whim are contrary to even the most basic notions of professional growth and development. The following questions are never posed: are you ready for practice? are you confident in putting yourself up for critical scrutiny? do you wish to undertake practice? do you need any special support? etc. The classic justification given to hide a multitude of non curricular decisions, namely: the sooner you do it the sooner it will be over, hides a number of developmental issues but is accepted by the neophyte on face value... the parental prerogative is invoked, the child-adult derivative is extolled, the controller-controlled social status is accepted, the wisdom-ignorance dichotomy is asserted and all of these are accepted by administration as given in the decision debate concerning practice in teaching. As mentioned above, however, the socio-political milieu has changed and the trainee *adult* although institutionally naive has the right to make decisions concerning himself, based on and supported by his own intellectual, social, emotional and physical *development*. The institution can do better than it has on the first three "developments" by attending to curricular decisions based on development. The basic curriculum question that needs to be asked is: as a person who will be concerned with the total development of learners, do you feel "ready" to engage in the practice of teaching within the profession? The answer of course to this question cannot be given with any integrity devoid of professional input. Such procedures are typically left to politicians!

The Professional Input

Psychological evidence from personality theorists in teacher education (Fielding 1983) suggest that student teachers in training require institutions to take cognisance of the developmental aspects of the teachers when curricular decisions are to be taken. However, such paradigmatic shifts in thinking require trainers in institutions to undergo a values reorientation more in line with the socio-political realities concerning student status mentioned above. At this stage in the eighties, the values orientation is at a very low attendant level for curricular decisions.

Such a values orientation, to be successful in terms of curriculum thinking, requires the values to be recognised and then adopted as a valuing priority. The first step towards such an acceptance is to understand that traditional mores concerning the rights of students have changed. However, once acceptance is achieved, the new values need to be integrated into the

collective administrative personality within the training format for any progress in curriculum to be achieved. The old paradigm of administrative convenience thus needs to be relegated to a lower order priority within the curriculum process. In order for this to happen, of course, the practising profession would need to examine its curriculum priorities and expose its operational administrative bases. Thus, if the assumption that practice makes perfect is accepted the next curricular question becomes, when should it begin? If the administrative support function is adopted, then the answer to this curriculum question, based on the changed social conditions mentioned above, must move towards the recognition of the needs of the neophyte. To do otherwise is to relegate the neophyte to a different social context, one that existed in the past and as such is no longer applicable to the changed conditions that he/she will face in the schools. If we are to believe the reports concerning the inadequacies of the "trained teacher", then as their most public performance is in the classroom, this performance must be made better. But the concept of better is inextricably interwoven within the value dimension. To identify the context of the concept "better" would require a separate analysis. However, for the purposes of this paper, if the assumptional bases mentioned earlier are accepted, "better" involves professional autonomy and judgement of and within the practice arena. This can only happen if an extended practice is undertaken. The concept of an induction over an extended period, not as long as the surgeon (several years), since mechanical skills require a great deal of practice to perfect, but of sufficient length so that the intellectual, social, and emotional maturity needed to be an adult amongst children has a change to surface, appears to be necessary within the training format. Such a duration would at least enable the neophyte to realistically assess his/her situation within a professional arena and it would give time for the profession to assess whether such a person was developmentally ready to intervene in the intellectual, social and emotional lives of young people.

Unanswered Curricular Questions

If the assumptional bases of the paper are accepted then a number of questions need to be articulated. Those listed below are an indication of the level of difficulty apparent within curricular decision making compared to those taken based on administrative convenience.

What curricular experiences can be offered early in the training programme regarding practice teaching that are different in kind from those offered in an induction year?

What hierarchy of skills can be safely left to the induction year?

What can teachers in training do better when they are an integral part of a school than can be attained whilst they are still students with certain curricular disadvantages associated with their stage of professional development?

What training and retraining skills will be necessary for the in-school supervisor to enable him to give curricular support that is not now possible or seen as necessary under the old paradigm?

What selection procedures are to be used to guarantee that the supervisor (master teacher) will demonstrate his expertise and support the integrity of the induction year as a professional responsibility, thus enabling the neophyte to draw on his college experiences and to integrate them with practical experiences on the job?

Obviously I cannot take up all these issues in this paper; suffice it to say that within the training institutions i.e., the college, university, and school, marginal forays into the classroom context could still be available during the initial training years, similar to the situation as it is today, with the proviso that it was the student's responsibility to try out the situation when he/she is ready for it. This would be a matter of direct negotiation between the student and the profession. Adult students would approach the school of their choice when they felt developmentally ready for it. I am, of course, suggesting that if students never feel developmentally ready, they can still graduate from the training program but not be credentialled to teach. Their courses in training thus become theoretical ones and since they have never been put into practice, the classroom is no place for them. The practice hurdle is so important that if, with appropriate administrative curricular support, students cannot jump it, they are therefore excluded until such time they can feel comfortable within the teacher role. Administrative support, however, needs to be articulated within the total curricular package as a support to the curricular decision making to exclude such students from the profession. Again the value orientation needs changing to cope with this new dimension - away from a punitive failure concept towards a more positive learning response under a changed paradigm. Self-selected micro teaching clinics, counsellors, student camps, demonstrations and video models, peer support structures, allied teaching experiences, (eg. sporting or community involvements, etc.) would need to be identified for students to try out should the need arise. This, or a check-list of experiences on offer, could be displayed as electives to be undertaken by self choice to moderate the developmental traumas of being in-situ within a regular classroom. The point is, that if the student self-selects from a range of offerings that are monitored by the profession within a comprehensive support structure,

then students will have the opportunity to decide if they are developmentally ready for an extended practice, under supervision, before taking permanent control of classrooms.

The training profession is, however, riddled with a number of similar value problems associated with the changing nature of society and the protected pre-eighties environment of the school, - itself a product of a past curricular era. However, the role of inservice and the rapid dissemination of ideas via computer technology will in time close the gap between this insular environment of the profession and the value preferences of the society. These value preferences (as espoused through the various public reports and media releases from politicians as the mouth pieces for their electorates) concerning the results of schooling, coupled with the increased knowledge about practice in schools, will lead to an inescapable conclusion by the profession that administrative convenience is not the curriculum *raison d'être* of the teaching profession.

Conclusions

It has been pointed out that a change in the valuing priorities of the profession is an essential prerequisite for the emergence of curricular decision making in teacher training. The role of administration as a supportive function to curricular decisions thus needs to be clarified. Yates (1978: 34) in analysing the reactions of professional bodies of teachers and trainers as expressed in documents submitted to the various committees of inquiry into teaching in the UK suggested that it is important that "all those involved should give more attention to the question of the adequacy of their own and other groups' understandings (of a teaching practice)". Further she suggests (1978: 33) that the issues of what are the central needs in teacher education and what role teachers should play in this have "been seen as peripheral and not as an area for many positive responses".

That such is the case in NSW cannot be denied. However if teachers and teacher trainers do not accept the responsibility for the professional induction of teachers as an integral part of the training program they will undoubtedly lose the initiative to the administrators and politicians who have a penchant, as the Thatcher Government has shown recently, for reducing the autonomy of the profession to the level of superficial debate and political accreditation.

Bibliography

- Auchmuty, J.S. (Chairman) (1980) *Report of the National Inquiry into Teacher Education*. Canberra: Commonwealth Government Printer.
- Brew, C. (1980) "Teacher Education in England and NSW, a Comparative Study of Problems of Transition from Student to Teacher" *Unpublished M.A. Thesis*. The University of Wollongong. pp 1-325.
- Bullivant, Brian. M. (1982) "The Search for "Truth" Directions of Research in Australia", *Australian Educational Researcher*, Volume 9, Number 4, pp 5-20.
- Cavanagh, D.M. (1983) "Teacher Development: Curricular Problems and Paradigm Possibilities", *The Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, Volume 8, Number 2, October, pp 44-53.
- Correy, P.M. (Chairman). (1980) *Teachers for Tomorrow: Report of the Committee to Examine Teacher Education in New South Wales*. Sydney: New South Wales Government Printer.
- Dewey, John. (1971) *Experience and Education*. New York: Collier Books.
- Evans, N. (1978) *Beginning Teaching in Professional Partnership*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Fielding, A.J. (1983) "Personal Construct Theory as a Basis for a Non-Deterministic Model of Teacher Development", *The Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, Volume 8, Number 2, October, pp 2-16.
- Fielding, A.J., Cavanagh, D.M., and Widdowson, R.E. (Eds.). (1977) *Teacher Training: Anticlimax to Education*. Wollongong: The University of Wollongong. pp 1-304.
- Fielding, A.J., Cavanagh, D.M., and Widdowson, R.E. (1978) "Diploma in Education...? Rethinking the Curriculum", *The Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, Volume 3, Number 1, November, pp 2-26.
- Fielding, A.J., and Cavanagh D.M. (Eds) (1983) *Curriculum Priorities in Australian Higher Education* Canberra and London: Croom Helm.
- Fyfield, J.A., Taylor, S.M. and Tisher, R.P. (1978). *The Induction of Beginning Teachers in Australia*. Canberra: ERDC, 1978.
- Tidher, R.P., Fyfield, J.A., and Taylor, S.M. (1979). *Beginning To Teach* Vol. 2 Canberra: AGPS.
- Kuhn, Thomas. (1974) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago University of Chicago Press.
- Meek, Lynn, V. (1983) "The Wheel Re-Discovered: A Critique of the "New Paradigm of Organisational Evaluation in Education", *Australian Educational Researcher*, Volume 10, Number 4, November, pp 5-27.
- Van Gigh, John, P. (1974) *Applied General Systems Theory*. New York: Harper and Row.
- White, Richard, T. (1983) "Changes In Theories, Paradigms, Methods and Questions", *Australian Educational Researcher*, Volume 10, Number 1, March, pp 5 - 14.
- Woods, Peter. (1984) "Essay Review: Standards, Selection and Equality: a Test case for Educational Research", *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Volume 16, Number 3, pp.317-235.
- Yates, Lyn. (1978) "Teacher Representation and Some Problems for Changing Structures of Teacher Education", *The Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, Volume 3, Number 2, November, pp. 27-35.
- The Bell Report (1971) "The NSW Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Teacher Education".
- The James Report (1972). *Education: A Framework for Expansion*. London: HMSO.
- The Martin Report (1964). *The Report of the Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia to the Australian Universities Commission*.
- The Senate Report. (1972) *The Report on the Commonwealths Role in Teacher Education by the Senate Standing Committee on Education, Science and the Arts*.

Notes:

See *The Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 2, Oct. 1983. This total issue was given to an international collection of papers that explored the possibilities of a theoretical basis for the conceptualisation of teacher education which incorporated a developmental concept and an Induction Year.

PROFESSIONALISM AND PROFESSIONAL STATUS: CONTRASTING ASPECTS OF THE TEACHER ROLE

Ken Shaw

University of Exeter

When teachers talk about themselves as professionals two related, but at bottom different, ideas are involved. The first is that of a skilled performance, a practical competence within a sector of activity, underpinned by theory, but essentially the outcome of study, formation, and a lengthy period of immersion in a "technik": classroom teaching and all that goes with it, including all relevant aspects of belonging as a full practicing member to a school or college. The second idea is that of professional status. This is an aspiration or a claim, to some extent realised, to enjoy certain privileges, social esteem, a level of salary, a style of relating to other people who are seen as clients, not customers, together with a degree of autonomy in the workplace. At the level of public rhetoric about pay, conditions of service and comparabilities, discourse moves easily between these two ideas, slipping rather than arguing from one to the other. But in the real world social, economic and political conditions see to it that they are kept separate, save for the lucky few, those "free" professionals such as successful surgeons with large private practices or eminent barristers.

For example, when we talk about professional training for teachers we are usually referring to an arranged set of experiences by which people are prepared to embark on a career which will lead to a degree of maturity in the skilled performances and the sorts of self-presentations and commitments that go with them. These come only after a quite prolonged practical experience, a matter of years rather than weeks. Training, however, involves the conferring of credentials which give a licence to practice (not necessarily a certificate of competence) and entry to an occupational group. These entry gates have been steadily narrowed over the decades, and sharply so in the U.K. since teachers have been in surplus. Because professionalism as skill has been officially credentialised and entry requirements raised it is difficult to talk about it without overtones of professional status lurking about in the language.

That there is a certain tension between the two ideas has implications for Fielding's proposals (1983) and for this reason I want to bring it out more