of science and higher learning. This general provision was made more specific by the constitutional amendments of May 1969 (Article 91a and 91b of the Basic Law) which altered the manner, extent and balance of the co-operation between the Federal Government and the Länder. In Article 91a, participation of the Federal Government in the ‘expansion and new construction of academic universities’ (and thus indirectly in provision of teacher education) was provided for. In the opinion of the new Federal Government the Pedagogischen Hochschulen should be included (25). By two further regulations (26), the Federal Government undertook to participate in the financing of these institutions.

The Statute covering the all-union USSR Ministry of Education is comprehensive (27). It is charged with determining the country’s requirements for teacher training and organising institutions in which such training shall be carried out. Further, the Ministry is charged with providing research personnel, issuing curricula, approving the issue of textbooks for specialised disciplines for teacher training institutions, developing courses for teachers after graduation and providing equipment and teaching and visual materials for teacher education institutions. Costing for buildings, and approval of building designs for teacher education institutions are also tasks accorded to the all-union Ministry.

Thus the legal base for teacher education is, as indicated, extensive. Legal responsibility for the establishment of institutions, the provision of capital and running costs, curricula, teaching texts and the further education of teachers are all specified. Implementation is through the Union Ministries.

In contrast, because of the 10th Amendment to the Constitution, financial and administrative responsibility for teacher education in the United States rests legally with the various States. The Federal Government may impinge on the various States ‘rights’ in education if the Federal Supreme Court rules that the actions of a State (in, say, education) are unconstitutional. Subject to this proviso, States are—legally—financially and administratively free to make what educational provisions they see fit within their own borders. Federal subsidies or grants, available for certain areas of education are legally a matter for State choice. Conditions which the Federal Government attaches to these subsidies may, or may not, be acceptable to the various States.

Thus in three of the countries, France, England and the USSR, legally, the central government can influence teacher education directly through the exercise of executive action using regulations, decrees or direct financial influence. In the United States and the Federal Republic, however, no such national legal facility exists; such legal rights as the governments have is limited by the broad constitutional provision outlined by the original or amended national constitutional document. Legal powers over teacher education are thus placed at regional or local levels.

Further distinctions may be drawn in two main areas. Where a binary system of teacher education exists, administrative and financial influence of the national or local government may be less pronounced in the case of the universities which are to some extent privileged institutions as compared with teacher training institutions of non-university status. And, secondly, differences between national systems of teacher training are discernible in terms of what is, legally, seen as suitable areas for administrative and financial action by national governments. Where the national government has defined legal powers they seem usually to include influence over such administrative items as opening and closing of institutions, and provision of capital and running costs. In the case of some national governments, however, administrative action is also taken in such areas as definition of curricula and specification of staff qualifications.
(ii) Regional and Local Governments

As indicated, the statutory power of regional and local governments is heavily correlated with the statutory powers accorded the national government.

In England and Wales, legally, the local authorities oversee the running of the teachers' colleges and are responsible for submitting financial estimates to the D.E.S. for approval. The local education authority colleges receive all their finance through the local education authority concerned. Financially, in the case of the public colleges, the costs of running the colleges are shared between national and local governments. In the case of the voluntary colleges, as indicated, the costs are borne largely by the national government. The proportion of finance carried by the local education authorities for the public colleges is determined by a formula based on the number of pupils in the authority's schools. All LEAs, regardless of whether colleges are located in their district, pay into this pool, using local taxes (rates) as the source of this finance. In addition, each authority is given a general grant in aid towards its educational expenditure by the central government. As indicated, universities are relatively free of local government finance and administrative influence.

In France, local administration of teacher training is carried out through the Académie which is composed of the services of most of the relevant teaching establishments in a defined group of départements. The administrative and academic head of the Académie is the Rector. Within the Académie the Rectorat comprises a general secretariat which is involved with the overall direction of the budget and financial and administrative control of higher education. The département is in the charge of the inspector of the Académie who has administrative control of establishments of the 1st and 2nd degree. He assures the carrying out of directives from Paris and also has responsibilities, delegated by the Rector, in general administration and finance. There are no voluntary colleges financially supported by the State.

Thus, in France, the local or regional administration is, legally, the vehicle through which the national policies of finance and administration in teacher education are put into effect, i.e. implemented. How far there is local variation is questionable, but as far as the legal framework is concerned all Academies are subject to the same regulations.

In West Germany, the responsibility for policy and the administration of higher education, including teacher education, lies at present with the Länder. The Land's responsibility for higher education is legally defined, which ensures that the Land's administrative directives, especially those concerning the civil service regulations and the budget are followed.

The regional Ministries of Education located in the union and autonomous republics of the USSR exercise considerable influence over both the pedagogical and university sectors of teacher training. They are the legal agencies through which administrative decisions are carried out, including the provision of finance. In the case, for instance, of Moscow State University (28) budgets are compiled for each department, totalled into a university budget, which then travels via the RSFSR Ministry of Higher and Specialised Secondary Education to the central ministry. Budgets are then reviewed with the USSR Ministry of Finance, and Gosplan, and return to the relevant academic institution.

In the United States, at state level, both the Legislature and the State Board of Education are legally involved in financial and administrative matters concerning teacher education. The Legislature establishes the broad general organisation for education and modes of financial support, and charters public institutions of higher education.

More directly, the public institutions which include teacher training programmes are the responsibility of the State Board of Education, which works directly through the
trustees of the public universities. In public institutions, not only will the President be appointed by the State Legislature, ratifying the action of the State Governor in many cases, but there will be state representation on the Board of Trustees.

However, in spite of the colleges and universities presenting their budget estimates and building plans, etc., to the Board for financial appropriations, they are not entirely dependent on the State. This is because of the income derived from fees, which is large (in comparison with the fee income available to institutions in England and Wales, for example) (29).

(iii) *The Churches and Private Institutions*

In England and Wales, voluntary colleges, mostly Church of England, Roman Catholic or Methodist colleges, are subject to the same provision relating to the reasonable exercise of functions and the making of reports and returns as local education authority colleges. But at the same time, as indicated, they are not discriminated against in financial terms in any specific way.

There are a small number of private institutions of higher education in France. In them the same state syllabuses and the same state examinations must be adhered to, and the students obtain the same state benefits as do their fellows in state universities. But there is no direct aid from the government ministry to Catholic higher educational institutions.

There is no Church control, legally, of institutions of higher education in the Federal Republic. However, in five Länder (Baden-Wurtemberg, Bavaria, North Rhine- Palatinate and Saarland) the training establishments for teachers in the Volksschule are closely associated with the religious denominations; in one Land (Lower Saxony) denominational influence is restricted to the emphasis given to certain aspects of the curriculum; while in the remaining Länder (Bremen, Hamburg, Hessen, Schleswig-Holstein, West Berlin) there are no denominational connections (30).

In the USSR there are no church controlled institutions of education.

In the USA private institutions, including the universities operated by the Catholic Church, are almost entirely independent of the State as far as financing is concerned. They have not received financial support from the state or federal governments until the last decade when certain specific matching grants have made it possible for non-public institutions to receive public money. The consequence of being almost entirely self-supporting has been a lack of administrative control exercised from state boards of education. Presidents, for example, will be appointed according to the institution's Charter, being answerable to the governing body. Thus, church and other private institutions, apart from certain minimum state requirements, are, legally in a rather independent position.

(iv) *Universities*

In England, so far as the university departments are concerned, financial and administrative control is of the university and is similar to that exercised by any university over its departments. The situation is similar in the United States. In France the university and the écoles normales are both under the administrative control of the Rector of the Academy, so again little control seems possible by the universities *qua* universities. The same situation, with the universities under the direction and regulations of the central Ministry, obtains in the USSR.

In general, universities are much less involved, at the legal level, in the finance and administrative control of the system of teacher education than they are, say, in control of or an influence on academic affairs such as course contents or advanced qualifications.
(b) De Facto control over specific policies regarding finance

(i) Academics and (ii) professional educators

Such evidence as there is in this area seems to indicate that de facto control by academics or professional educators over financial policy is minimal. They are likely to influence financial policies within an institution, debating the allocation of funds between departments. Or they may of course, at the level of an individual institution, attempt to persuade representatives of a national agency such as the University Grants Committee in England. Or they may attempt through a professional organisation, such as the Société des Agrégés, to persuade. Alternatively, indirect influence may be exerted on finance through the standards imposed by an accrediting agency. But the influence at the level of policy formulation and adoption is indirect; and at the level of implementation, rather limited.

(iii) Laymen in Government or as Members of Identifiable Pressure Groups

Laymen, both in the sense of professional administrators and paid appointees from the general public, seem to be significant in terms of de facto control of financial policy.

In England, for example, the local education authority colleges receive their money from the LEAs—and thus laymen on education committees of LEAs can broadly influence the financial resources available to colleges. The local authority may also appoint a substantial number of the members of the college governing body. It is ultimately this governing body which submits “estimates of income and expenditure required for the conduct of the college …” (31). Further, “draft estimates of income and expenditure shall be prepared by the senior administrative officer, under the direction of the principal, and in consultation with the education officer; and shall be submitted to the governors for approval” (32). Thus, here too, laymen are located on a significant body which mediates between the colleges and the LEAs.

Lay influence in the United States is not only prominent in State legislatures, but also prominent through Boards of Regents or Trustees, the governing bodies of colleges and universities. These boards are responsible for allocating money, drawing up a budget and thereby—in de facto terms through control of financial policy—influence the general direction of educational development.

The position of lay influence in the USSR at the de facto level of financial control is unclear.

In Germany, there is some de facto dependence on the Land government. In some cases, the Land exercises its control through civil service ‘curator’ who is mainly responsible for the financial administration of the institution; in others, the representatives of the universities and the Government set up a joint administrative board which nominates a curator who is responsible to the board (33). In institutions such as the pedagogischen Hochschulen where no rectoral constitution has been set up it seems likely that the role of the Land civil servants is significant.

(c) Fiscal Management and (d) Personnel Management

In the USSR the financing of teacher education together with other types of specialised education is centrally planned. But once the Gosplan has allocated certain funds for teacher education to a Union Republic, the annual budgeting becomes the responsibility of the Union Republic which is also responsible for personnel management. The salary schedules of teachers in all grades are fixed by the central government, which is also the final authority for appointments, transfers and promotions.

In the USA, as indicated, state supported institutions are dependent on appropriations by state legislatures and privately controlled institutions look towards tuition fees and endowments. Accountability is to their respective controlling bodies. Appointment of
personnel may be done by faculty and confirmed by Dean, President or Chairman, often on the basis of a curriculum vitae and references. Promotions are often linked with movement between institutions, and again are controlled by faculty. Salary scales vary between institutions, and gross salary is usually supplemented by summer school teaching. Pensions tend to be based on a percentage of the average salary in the final years of employment.

In Germany, institutions of higher education are public institutions and have no private funds of any importance. The Länder governments have the responsibility of meeting their needs both in material and personnel (34). In personnel matters, institutions of university status have the right to elect their own teaching staff and the right to confer ‘Habilitation’ (35); however, legally, the Land is responsible for accepting the recommendation of the academic institution concerning a staff appointment (36) and regulates the legal status of members of the public service (37). The remuneration of teachers is governed by the general regulations for civil servants or by special regulations for university teachers passed by the Länder. Civil servants usually retire at the age of 65 and receive a maximum of 75% of their remuneration as a pension.

In England and Wales, as indicated, fiscal management is largely in the hands of the LEAs for the local authority colleges. Estimates prepared by the LEAs will, as far as possible, be in accordance with the recommendations of the National Pooling Committee. On this Committee are members representing the controlling bodies of the colleges, the DES and the LEAs.

Since the Weaver Report, much of the detail of personnel management and appointment has moved, depending on the grade of appointment, from the governing body to faculty members. Faculty is increasingly involved in promotions, with the governing body, however, exercising control over senior appointments. Salary scales are fixed nationally by the Pelham Committee. Pensions and pension rights are run by the central government and are based on a proportion of the salary earned in the final years of employment. Faculty in university departments are paid on university scales and belong to a university pension scheme.

III. Certification in Teacher Education

This section concentrates on agencies involved in the formulation and adoption and implementation of national academic policy, with regard to certification. It is perhaps clear that this is dependent on what has happened in terms of admissions, curricula, examinations and tests. These other processes necessarily precede and are logically and practically linked to the processes of certification. Where necessary they will be mentioned.

Certificate granting institutions are officially at the national governmental level in England and Wales, the USSR, and France. In England and Wales, the Department of Education and Science issues ‘qualified teacher’ status. In France, teachers are civil servants and are registered by the Ministry. In Germany, also they are civil servants, but the registration is with the Land. However, all the Länder recognise this registration through a decision of the Permanent School Committee of the Permanent Conference of Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs in the States of Federal Germany. In the United States, the State Board of Education officially registers the teacher as proficient to teach in that State.

In all countries diplomas or degrees are issued either by colleges or universities. National or state registration then follows.

In the formulation of certification policy qualitative differences exist between countries according to the reasons accepted for changes in certification patterns, and, secondly, according to the degree of influence that the government education ministry (national or state) can exert on the universities or colleges. Thus in France and the USSR close ties exist between the national ministries of education and the economic and manpower planning agencies.
Thus it may be that arguments concerning certification may more easily be phrased in terms of these considerations. Similarly, the powers of the central ministries to implement decisions are—presumably—great in the USSR and use of the competitive examination helps implementation in France.

In England and Wales the DES has close links with other ministries and is concerned to meet predicted demands for teachers. The legal and administrative control which it is able to exert over colleges helps it to attain its goals, but the links are less obvious than in France and the USSR.

In the USA federal money can be used to influence changes in certification patterns by providing money for certain kinds of courses, but there is less directness about these financial arrangements than in England and Wales.

Thus it seems that, with the exception of West Germany and perhaps the USA, national ministerial agencies, set within the whole picture of political decisions, establish broad frameworks, on admissions for example, from which follow the certification of teachers. It is at this level largely that policy formulation and adoption takes place; and at the State and Land levels in the USA and Germany.

At the level of implementation of these policies some power lies with personnel in the teacher education institutions themselves. In terms, for instance, of the admission procedures which precede any certification procedure: in the USA, use of selection tests by prestigious universities, in the USSR the giving of its own examination by a university or pedagogic institute, and in England and Wales the holding of interviews, all indicate a certain amount of influence on the implementation of certification policy by academics or professional educators.

Similarly the administering of certification examinations lies with the colleges and universities in all countries, though, as with the admissions situation, it should not be assumed that teacher educators feel themselves free of pressure. That is to say, this ‘control’ over the qualitative aspects of certification by the personnel in the institutions of teacher education is subject to financial sanctions if it impinges too considerably on national or regional teacher targets.

Thus, in terms of the areas of admissions, curriculum, examinations and certification a number of distinctions may be drawn. Processes of admission may vary between university and non-university institutions. The possibility exists as in France, Germany and some States of the US that the final school leaving examination certificate grants admission to the teacher training course of some institution. In general even in this situation, admission is, with varying degrees of explicitness, competitive, and the degree of competition may vary as between a university and a non-university institution. Thus even here, academics or professional educators will be able to exert some influence.

Generally, in the area of the curriculum, what is taught is the responsibility of academics or professional educators. But the degree of detailed control by academics or professional educators over the curriculum will vary. For example, curriculum contents may be prescribed by the Ministry, or influenced by State certification requirements as in the USA, or within non-university institutions heavily influenced by university suggestions as in England and Wales.

Thus, whilst the granting of a formal certificate to teach may lie with a national or regional government agency, it is the sequence of requirements in the areas of admissions, curriculum, examinations and certification which indicates—at the level of implementation—whether influence lies with the Ministry, university academics, or professional educators.

IV. The Politics of Teacher Education

The list of agencies external to educational institutions which could arguably be seen as exerting some influence on academic or administrative policies would be lengthy. It would range from the relatively measurable