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This paper attempts to summarize the findings of the London Working Party concerning some of the major topics suggested in the Planning Document IV/70 supplied to it by the Society. In particular, it looks at the relationship between teacher education and higher education, the finance and administrative control of teacher education, modes of teacher education certification and, finally, some aspects of the politics of teacher education. As far as possible, the study has been carried out with reference to six countries—England and Wales, France, USSR, USA and West Germany.

I. The Relationship Between Higher Education and Teacher Education

(a) Legal and De Facto Definitions of “Tertiary” or “Higher” Education

Strictly legal definitions of higher and tertiary education are in short supply (1). In de facto terms there is a continuing trend in the countries under consideration for higher education to be defined as:

“... all types of education (academic, professional, artistic, teacher education, etc.) provided in institutions such as universities, liberal arts colleges, technological institutes and teacher colleges for which: (a) the basic entrance requirement is completion of secondary education (whether general secondary, technical secondary, vocational secondary or teacher training at secondary level); (b) the usual entrance age is 18 years; and (c) in which the courses lead to the giving of a named award (degree, diploma or certificate of higher studies)” (2).

Thus, at the de facto level, in the USSR and the USA all forms of post-secondary education are included in the term 'higher education'. In England, the White Paper of 1966 indicates that all education after long-secondary is considered as higher education:

“Within higher education there are two other sets of students no less important than those who have the time and ability to take full-time or sandwich courses of degree standard. The first are those who are seeking a qualification below degree standard; the second are the many thousands of students, who, being already in employment, can find time only for part-time day and/or evening courses, whether they lead to a degree or to a qualification below that standard” (3).

The White Paper then goes on to say that courses which are above G.C.E. Advanced Level in standard but which are not classified as ‘advanced’ will be considered in the White Paper as higher education.

There follow from the de facto definitions used for higher education a number of corollaries. Firstly, the relatively precise generic term ‘higher education’, used especially within Europe to indicate almost ex-

clusively non-vocational and traditional professional studies at the university, is losing its precision. Secondly, it may be suggested that, within higher education, distinctions may now be drawn between institutions termed universities, institutions which are not universities but are of university rank (e.g. institutes in the USSR, grandes écoles in France), and other institutions of higher education (e.g. technical colleges and colleges of education in England). Thirdly, it follows that one method of delineating higher education is by its entry requirements at the end of the long-secondary course or its equivalents: as with, for example, the baccalauréat or the Abitur conferring firm legal entry-status; with graduation from high school in the USA providing, in some states, firm entry status for public higher education institutions; and with 'A levels' in England and Wales setting entry-status minima. Fourthly, it follows that, for certain purposes, it may be equally or more meaningful to draw distinctions between courses (e.g. as between degree and diploma courses) rather than between institutions within higher education.

(b) Non-Professional and General Professional Institutions within the System of Tertiary Education

It is perhaps useful to draw an initial threefold distinction for this section: between non-professional institutions, general professional (i.e. academic) institutions and specifically professional institutions.

Non-professional institutions would include those which are concerned with vocational training at less than professional level. An example would be the training of higher technicians. Thus in the United States:

"the National Defense Act of 1958 provided for the establishment of area centres, conducted by high school or post-high school institutions of ‘less than college grade’. Emphasis was placed on the training of technicians in scientific areas vital to the national defense" (4).

In France, University Institutes of Techno-
medicine and law attached to the American university. In England the thirty polytechnics, through their linkages with the Council of National Academic Awards, provide degrees characterised by a strong professional bias towards the concerns of industry.

Thus specifically professional education may be provided mainly in universities, as in the USA or the Federal Republic, in some measure within the universities, as in the case of medicine in England, or in non-university institutions of university rank, as in France and the USSR.

Considering, then, the general theme of the kinds of institutions which offer the various forms of education, it may be suggested that continental Europe, including the USSR, is characterised by a binary system which separates out institutions providing specific professional education; that, in England, a binary system is increasingly apparent; and that the USA is characterised, in institutional terms, by a comprehensive system.

If, however, the category of courses, established earlier, is utilised, further distinctions may be drawn.

In the institutions within higher education but below university rank, such as the institutions training higher technicians or the English colleges of education, general education and specific vocational education tends to be concurrent. That is, they are offered together.

In universities, the continental European tradition seems to be to provide concurrent courses, as in the cases of training for law and education. In England, in the university, the tradition is rather that consecutive courses are common: that is, that general professional (academic) education precedes specific professional courses. But there are exceptions as with engineering. In the USA both concurrent and consecutive course patterns are apparent.

Thus three sets of distinctions have been drawn:

(i) whether the education provided is non-

professional, general professional or specifically professional;

(ii) whether the education is provided in non-university institutions of university rank, universities, or non-university institutions of less than university rank; and

(iii) whether the courses provided are concurrent or consecutive.

It is suggested that the distinctions have general utility for locating the configurations of higher education in the five countries.

In addition it may be noted that certain of the distinctions are frequently matters of debate for teacher education. Thus France, Germany and England, together with the USSR, have made or are debating decisions about the kind of institution in which the training of elementary and middle school teachers should be located. In the USA a variety of new course arrangements are being experimented with; and in England the issue of concurrent or consecutive courses in teacher education is, for the moment, still largely at the level of debate (6).

(c) Teacher Education Institutions within the Secondary System of Education

The disappearance of normal schools in the United States is paralleled in a variety of ways in the other countries. In West Germany, for example, though systems in the different Länder are not uniform and the Pedagogische Hochschulen are in various degrees of association with the universities, teacher training does not now take place below the level of higher education. In England, "the system of Higher Education . . . is based on twin traditions which have created the present higher education institutions . . . (i) the autonomous sector . . . and (ii) the public sector, represented by the leading technical colleges and the colleges of education" (7). In the colleges of education "students in teacher training work for teachers' certificates and are classified as in higher education" (8).
Exceptions are France and the USSR. In France the numbers entering the écoles normales without the baccalauréat are decreasing; and those who do enter without it are prepared for it. Similarly in the USSR the pedagogic schools are specialised secondary schools for the training of teachers, mainly for the first four years of the eight year school. Entrance may be gained after completion of the eight year school, in which case the course for primary school teachers lasts four years; or after graduation from the ten year school, which allows of a two year course.

Thus, in the Federal Republic and England no institutions for the training of teachers exist within the secondary sector. In Germany all students must have completed the long secondary course before admission to the Pedagogische Hochschulen; in England and Wales all students must have gained 5 'O' levels before admission to a college of education and many have passed or attempted a number of subjects at 'A' level. In contrast, in France and the USSR, teacher training institutions located in the secondary sector will have only some of their students who have completed the long secondary course.

(d) Teacher Education Institutions within the Tertiary System of Education

Although teacher education institutions are located, in general, within the tertiary system of education, there tend to be institutional differences in the training provided for elementary and 'academic' secondary school teachers. The extreme cases of France and the USSR—characterised by institutional separation extending into the secondary sector—have already been pointed out; but less extreme distinctions are also visible. In the Federal Republic, Gymnasium teachers study for at least eight semesters at a university or Technische Hochschule (9). In England, the newly-graduated university students may follow a one year consecutive course of teacher training in a university department of education. In France, the lycée teacher will train in a university or institution of university rank. In the USSR, the task of training secondary school teachers is shared by the universities and the pedagogic institutes (10). Only the USA is increasingly characterised by a virtually all graduate profession (11), in which both primary and secondary school teachers are trained in similar tertiary institutions.

There are, however, some indications that the general European tradition of a dual system of teacher training, with a very clear separation between provision for teachers for the elementary school and for the academic secondary school, may be in the process of becoming less distinct. Thus, for example, declared Soviet policy is for the secondary schools for teachers to be replaced by four-year courses in the pedagogic institutes. In England nearly one-quarter of the students in graduate certificate courses attend colleges of education and not university departments (12); and the introduction of the B.Ed. degree for those college students who gain the relevant grades in the teachers' certificate has meant that at least a small portion of their training is conducted on university premises. The intentions may, of course, fall short in implementation as they have done in the USSR (13) but it may be suggested that changing secondary school structures in Europe are likely to have effects on the patterns of the institutions of teacher training.

(e) Types of Institutions in Which Teacher Training Is Provided

(i) Single Purpose

If the phrase 'single purpose institutions' is accorded the meaning that these institutions exist with the sole, stated, institutional aim of training teachers, it remains currently true that in four of the five countries single purpose institutions exist for the initial training of primary school teachers. As indicated the écoles normales in France and the secondary schools for teachers in the
USSR are single purpose institutions (in the sense defined, though not in terms of course contents). In the Federal Republic, with the exception of Hamburg (14), the training of elementary school teachers takes place in the single purpose pedagogische hochschulen. In England most primary school teachers are trained in single purpose colleges of education.

Teachers for non-academic secondary schools or newly developed middle schools may, as in England and West Germany, be trained in these single purpose institutions.

(ii) Multi-Purpose

In general, where teacher training is associated with and takes place within the universities, it may be characterised as occurring within the kind of institution which may be called multipurpose. That is, the institution also serves a number of other professional groups. In France, Germany and the USSR teachers are produced by the universities, on a concurrent course basis. However, other institutions within higher education in the USSR and France also produce teachers. In the USSR the pedagogic institutes are single purpose institutions, in the sense defined, as are the centres pédagogiques régionaux in France. Similarly, the Institut de préparation à l'Enseignement seconnaire, established within each faculty of arts or science, may also be characterised as a single purpose institution. The university departments of education in England are, of course, located within multi-purpose institutions, but, as where courses for teachers have started in the multi-purpose polytechnics, the courses in practice are to some extent isolated. In the United States, the number of single purpose teacher colleges has diminished in the last decade (15); most teacher education now takes place in multipurpose institutions.

II. Finance and Administrative Control of the Teacher Education System

(a) Legal Basis of Finance and Administrative Control

The supply of teachers, given the increasing extent to which education is recognised as a social service or as an activity for which public provision must be increased, is a matter of concern to public, and in some countries, private agencies. This concern is initially implementable in all countries through a legal definition of the situation. This legal definition of the situation contains, with varying degrees of explicitness and extensiveness, regulations pertaining to administrative control of, and financial provision for, teacher education.

Within this general position, however, a number of variations may be identified. The legal basis of influence may lie at national or regional levels. It may be enshrined in a document which has constitutional status, or it may follow from a number of rather specific regulations. The legal base may be specific enough to detail methods of opening and closing institutions of teacher education, to lay down criteria for staff appointment, to outline curricula, to define salary levels for those teaching in such institutions and to specify in detail regulations for the allocation of finance and the relationships of the agencies through which this should be done. The legal base may cover all or most of these situations or may directly identify only some of them. It may, further, differentiate the general modes of financial provision for and administrative links between (a) university and non-university institutions and (b) private and public teacher education institutions. Or it may treat them similarly; or differentiate between them only in certain areas within the framework of a general mode of control.

(i) National Government

In England and Wales, Her Majesty's Government, through the Secretary of State for Education and Science, has considerable in-
fluence on all teacher training institutions. The general legal definition of the situation is contained in the 1944 Education Act which says the minister:

"shall make such arrangements as he considers expedient for securing that there shall be sufficient facilities for the training of teachers ... and ... may give to any local authority such directions as he thinks necessary requiring them to establish, maintain, or assist any training college or other institution, or to provide or assist the provision of any other facilities specified in that direction" (16).

Within this basic position specific legal restraints on a number of issues are indicated through various sections of the Training of Teachers' Regulations. Thus a local authority, a university or a voluntary organisation may not open up a training institution without consulting the Department of Education and Science (17); similarly, 'after consultation', such establishments may be closed.

Further, though university departments are much less subject to direct influence, within the colleges, 'articles of government' which specify relations between the maintaining authorities, governors and academic staff, are made 'under the approval of the Secretary of State' (18). Articles of government follow the conclusions of the 'Weaver Report' which were accepted by the government and put into practice by the Education (No. 2) Act 1968.

Financial linkages are complex. As with the case of internal regulations for government, the powers which the D.E.S. exercises over university departments are much less direct, being mediated through the University Grants Committee. In the case of the colleges the main sources of finance are the central government and the local authority, for the public colleges. Voluntary colleges may have some private sources of income but they receive all their running costs and three-quarters of their capital costs from the central government in the form of direct grants (19). In contrast, in the case of the public colleges, it has been suggested that in finance "over 60% is found by the central government ... and the remainder falls on the rates" (20).

Thus, in terms of financial influence by the national government on the teacher's colleges, there is some direct legal provision which covers such areas as capital expenditure, minor building works costing over £1,000 and equipment costing more than £1,000 (21).

Administrative control is further exercised, and legally so, by rather specific directives. For example in 1965 the Secretary of State asked colleges "to increase productivity by a 20% increase in intake" (22). Administrative influence also extends to the age range for which teachers are prepared. After 1960 the training of teachers in the colleges was biased towards the production of primary school teachers (23).

In France, the legal definition of the situation focuses power over both financial and administrative issues in the hands of the central government. Administratively, the General Secretariat of the Ministry of National Education, created by decree in October 1963, directs and co-ordinates under the direct authority of the Minister, all the actions and services of the Ministry and the General Inspectorate. One of the functions is to prepare and watch over the spending of the Ministry of Education. It also prepares and conducts financial studies in relation to the current Plan.

Legally the powers of the national government, as manifested by various decrees, range widely over a number of administrative issues in teacher education. For example, administrative action by the central government created, by Circular (of 12.6.56), the C.P.R., and the J.P.E.S. (of 27.2.57).

The role of the German Federal Government in education, including teacher education, was limited by the Basic Law (Grundgesetz, 1948) whereby the regulation of education was made the responsibility of the Länder (24).

However, there was general provision that, by means of legislation or through the allocation of federal funds, the Federal Government could assist in the promotion