ments have not been satisfied. They wish to gain more control over admissions to teacher education programmes. In Western Australia this is achieved by a system of sponsorship. Intending teachers are paid a salary during the course of study. Or again, in Canada, government regulations lay down for primary school teachers lower qualifications for entry to teacher education than for intending secondary school teachers. The stranglehold of the universities and their close links with the academic secondary school system are difficult to break. Once broken the re-distribution of candidates into socially desired courses remains a difficult problem.

(b) Length of Courses

The length of course also influences the supply of teachers. In England, under an emergency training scheme, the length of course for mature persons was reduced from two years to fifteen months for non-graduate teachers. Considerable professional pressure had to be brought to bear in the late fifties on the Government before it was prepared to sanction a three year training course for non-graduate teachers. In 1968 proposals from the Department of Education and Science included a suggestion that universities should offer shortened courses terminated by non-degree awards. This was rejected by the universities. It seems likely that the proposal will be included in recommendations made for the future of teacher education. Meanwhile Department regulations and finance controls are bound to influence the rate of growth of B.Ed. candidates as much as university policy. In London this is in the direction of a four year course.

In the U.S.A. while the majority of teachers have followed four year degree courses there are, in "shortage" areas, two-year post-high school training courses on the basis of which teachers can obtain a temporary certificate. Again in the U.S.S.R. debate in the sixties turned on whether the five year course in pedagogical institutes could be reduced to four years. The ministry pressed for this reduction, academics were opposed to it.

(c) Examinations and Certification

State agencies normally retain the right to accept or reject university and college examination results as a basis on which to issue to intending teachers a certificate to teach. Frequently the recommendations of the institution of higher education are accepted without question. Nevertheless government authorities have the last word in deciding who shall, or shall not, be admitted as a qualified teacher to the profession. Under conditions of shortage they may accept teachers without either a certificate to teach or a degree. This becomes more difficult and consequently public authorities seek to gain control of the examinations on which certification is based.

Formal examinations in teacher education institutions are for the most part conducted by teachers within these institutions—in the case of England, with the help of university educationists and academics. Failure rates depend on various factors. In England (and where a degree is a licence to teach) it is futile to fail a graduate who is in his fourth year of study and performs badly in his professional courses. In this system university academics virtually determine pass and failure rates. Drop-outs in British universities are at a low level. Formally, examinations for the teachers' certificate, and now the B.Ed., are controlled by university and Area Training Organisation committees. Subtle pressures are brought to bear by employers to regulate the overall supply of teachers through the examination system. Failure rates in college of education examinations are low. Differences exist between subjects so that while the overall number of students obtaining certificates may be influenced by government policies the distribution of subject specialists is less easy to control. In London the numbers of candidates specialising at the teachers' certificate in mathematics are extremely small.
In the U.S.A. the grade system for each course operates. Individual professors assess each student in the class so that a profile of grades is built up. Failure rates after the first year or two of undergraduate work are low. On the whole the pattern of required courses allows State Boards to exercise an influence on content rather than standards. There has, however, been a long commitment by educationists to meet the demand for teachers by increasing enrolments and so on.

Conant’s argument on the Education of American Teachers was, of course, that there was a conspiracy between professors of education, who determined course content and were responsible for grading students, and superintendents of school systems who influence State teacher certification in the U.S.A. in repetitious, sloppy and irrelevant teacher education programmes, lowered academic standards and technically ill-prepared teachers.

Certainly where educationists have gained control of examinations there is considerable pressure on them from public authorities to “pass” all the candidates. Professional educationists are less able, or willing, to resist these pressures particularly when the most widely accepted criterion of quality is the teacher-pupil ratio. Numbers are more important than quality.

Professional Control

The professional control of teacher education is questioned, therefore, on the one hand by academics and on the other hand by the public authorities. Slowly, control over admissions, course length and content, examination and certification procedures is being wrested from the universities. In the U.S.A. this has led to control by the profession or perhaps by the professors of education in alliance with State Boards of Education which require students to follow prescribed courses in education at the undergraduate level before they can obtain a certificate to teach and at the postgraduate level for the purposes of permanent certificates and salary increases. But even this alliance is now being questioned by public figures, for example, in California both inside and outside education.

In short the public authorities are not satisfied that the universities, with their traditional attitudes to knowledge and professional training, should continue to dominate the politics of teacher education. Nor are they prepared to grant to the teaching profession the kind of autonomy enjoyed by lawyers and doctors. The fact that there are perhaps ten times as many teachers as medical doctors in most societies helps to explain this. Another reason is that the aims of universal education are not very clear. Consequently the kind of skills and knowledge needed by teachers at various stages of education are not easily specified. Meanwhile public policy requires children to attend school and in most countries is raising the age of compulsory attendance. Somebody has to look after these children. At the moment, in spite of team teaching proposals and an increase in the number and range of ancillary helpers, this is still regarded as the teachers’ task. So many teachers are needed.

Will educationists be able to maintain control of their profession? If teacher education moves more completely into the university orbit it is unlikely that it will continue to enjoy the freedom traditionally accorded to the universities. The power of the universities in Europe is such that interference by the State to the extent demanded will be successfully resisted. The answer which is bound to be found is that teacher education will become a separate sector of higher education, much less autonomous than the universities and much more under the control of the government agencies.
La Politique de la Formation des Enseignants

par Brian Holmes (London)

Le développement rapide de l’enseignement à tous les niveaux a conduit à la création d’une importante masse enseignante. Le service que doit fournir cette masse est très discuté, tout particulièrement en ce qui concerne l’enseignement supérieur. Les rôles des enseignants à tous les niveaux changent en fonction des changements selon les institutions d’éducation dans lesquelles ils servent. Les tâches que l’on attend des enseignants et les moyens dont ils disposent changent. Cela conduit, pour leur formation, à un certain nombre d’implications, qui ne sont pas encore résolues.

Les décisions gouvernementales concernant la quantité et le type d’éducation à donner, et l’attribution des ressources économiques qui lui sont affectées, sont intimentement liées à la formation des enseignants car elles influent sur le nombre d’enseignants requis, le nombre de personnes devant être formées, la nature des facilités offertes pour la formation et le contenu des cours. Ayant à faire face à une demande sans cesse croissante d’enseignants, les universités et les gouvernements s’affrontent sur le problème du contenu de la formation des enseignants. Des pressions conduisant dans de nombreux pays à l’incorporation de la formation des enseignants à l’enseignement supérieur réduisent en partie le contrôle gouvernemental sur les personnes entrant dans la profession.

À l’intérieur d’une université en grande partie autonome dans un système binaire, un conflit se crée entre les « universitaires purs » et les « professeurs d’éducation » non seulement à propos du contenu de la formation des enseignants mais aussi à propos du contrôle de la discipline enseignée dans les écoles. Les « universitaires », tel Hutchins, Bestor et Conant aux États-Unis, demandent le retour à une formation des enseignants fondée sur les disciplines universitaires traditionnelles. Les étudiants quant à eux demandent une plus grande « actualisation » de leurs études ce qui est interprété en matière de formation des enseignants par un intérêt porté davantage aux aptitudes qu’au savoir.

Des débats, dont la solution est une question politique, ont pour sujet l’équilibre de l’enseignement à donner entre le sujet lui-même, l’enseignement général, les cours de formation professionnelle et la formation pratique ainsi que sur la façon dont ils doivent être organisés et la place qu’ils doivent prendre dans le temps — simultanés ou consécutifs. Dans la plupart des pays non-communistes il ne faut pas ignorer l’influence des Églises dans ces débats.

Dans un système où la formation des enseignants est en grande partie financée par les fonds publics, les groupements liés à la politique de formation des enseignants comprennent les organisations gouvernementales au niveau central, régional et local, les bureaucrates, les partis politiques, les universités et les associations de professeurs. Le contrôle du nombre des enseignants et du coût de la formation dépend des critères en matière d’admission, de durée des cours,
d’exams et de diplômes. En ce qui concerne l’admission le nombre d’élèves faisant des études secondaires et souhaitant un enseignement supérieur a conduit à une expansion de la formation des enseignants et a suscité la candidature de personnes ayant de faibles qualifications universitaires. Cependant la répartition des candidats dans des cours nécessaires socialement reste difficile. La variation de la longueur des cours et des processus d’obtention des diplômes affecte aussi le nombre des enseignants. Tandis que les universitaires repoussent les cours de courte durée, différents gouvernements les ont favorisés pour satisfaire les demandes. De même, tandis que le contrôle de l’obtention des diplômes dépend de l’état, les examens dont dépendent les diplômes sont habituellement organisés et contrôlés par les écoles de formation et les universités. Les autorités publiques ont fait pression pour diminuer le pourcentage d’échecs, cependant la répartition dans les différentes disciplines est moins facile à contrôler.

Le contrôle professionnel de la formation des enseignants est ainsi mis en question par les universitaires dont le pouvoir en matière de formation pédagogique est restreint et par les autorités publiques qui ne veulent pas accorder aux enseignants le genre d’autonomie dont bénéficient les autres professions. Dans de telles circonstances et là où les universités peuvent résister à l’ingérence de l’état, la formation des enseignants devient nécessairement un secteur séparé, et beaucoup moins autonome, de l’enseignement supérieur.