11. The cliche refers to the three relative most geographically dispersed campuses in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales.
12. In the week prior to the academic 'day of action' over 100 arrests and 70 injuries were reported on the picket line at Grunwick Processing Laboratories, North London.
13. **T. Lane and K. Roberts,** *Strike at Pilkingtons*, Fontana, p. 167.
14. The position held by the Secretary of State was the same as that expressed in a letter from her to the AUT dated 29 September, stating, *inter alia:*
    It has been and remains our declared intention to see the anomaly rectified as soon as the Government's pay policy permits.
    See *AUT Bulletin*, November 1977, p. 4.
15. See **J. Shister,** "Logic of Union Growth", *Journal of Political Economy*, October 1953, pp. 413–433 for discussion of this concept.
16. In 1973 a proposal to affiliate with the TUC was rejected by a 2:1 majority (approx.) in a ballot of membership. The campaign for affiliation restarted almost immediately. For example, Mr. L. Murray, General Secretary of the TUC, accepted an invitation to address the Executive in December 1974. Correspondence and debate on the issue was recommended in the *AUT Bulletin.* In 1976 a 2:1 majority (approx.) voted in favour of affiliation.

UNIVERSITIES AND TEACHER TRAINING

Alan Barcan
Department of Education
University of Newcastle

In Australia, as in Britain, America and other "western" countries, some sectors of tertiary education face reduced enrolments resulting from a falling demand for teachers. In addition, the adverse economic climate which has prevailed since 1974 has encouraged moves to economise by consolidating the number of institutions undertaking teacher training. Rationalisation, redundancy and retrenchment have become the 3 R's of tertiary education.

University involvement in teacher training is a recent development in Australia. True, in the 19th century a few students at training schools attended universities part-time. The training colleges were saved the expense of providing academic courses, the thinly-populated universities obtained a few more students. But the universities took no part in the actual training of these student-teachers. In the first half of the 20th century a few universities conferred diplomas in education. But these training courses were actually provided by neighbouring state teachers' colleges. Although some of these colleges were located in university grounds, this arrangement was simply to give the college administration closer contact with undergraduate students on teacher training scholarships. It also made it easier for college lecturers to offer Education as an undergraduate Arts subject. But these Education subjects were academic or general ones, not professional, teacher training subjects. In many cases the Principal of the Teachers' College was also part-time Professor of Education.

It was the growth of post-graduate research work (B.Ed., M.Ed., and even Ph.D courses) which forced the separation of universities and colleges. Full-time Professors of Education were appointed at Melbourne in 1939, at Sydney in 1947. University Faculties or Departments of Education started to expand.

The growth of secondary education in the 1950's and 1960's increased the demand for graduate teachers and provided an opportunity for other universities to move into teacher training. In 1948 the University of Tasmania took over all teacher training in Tasmania. This arrangement proved unsatisfactory and the Department of Education soon re-established teachers' colleges, though the university continued its teacher training programme. After about 1954 most other universities entered directly into the job of training future secondary and even primary teachers. This great incursion of universities into teacher training raised little discussion at the time, partly because of the great shortage of teachers and the willingness of state Departments of Education to let universities meet some of the cost of teacher training. The articles and other writings which did discuss the new trend were mainly by proponents of university participation in teacher training.

Today the falling demand for teachers makes university participation in teacher training programmes a matter for debate. It has also raised the question of the role of colleges of advanced education in teacher training. Once again, however, the danger is that decisions will be taken and a new pattern emerge without much serious discussion.[1]

The Falling Demand for Teachers

In 1976, for the first time since 1940, the supply of teachers started to exceed the demand. "Our present production of teachers means we will soon be in over-supply" the Federal Education Minister, Senator Carrick, warned in July, 1976. He remarked that many students were now being trained in areas in which they could not expect employment.

The current surplus of teachers applies equally to primary and secondary schools. In 1971 enrolments in N.S.W. state primary schools reached a peak of 504,110. By 1975 they were down to 490,769, a fall of 2.6%. This fall will continue with the declining birthrate. However there is a slight bulge in enrolments within the primary school and this should reach secondary schools in 1982.

In N.S.W. state secondary schools, however, enrolments have been consistently rising:

1971	257,600	1975	298,400
1972	277,800	1976	303,400
1973	282,000	1977	307,400
1974	286,900		

Enrolments should continue to increase until 1980.

The annual increase has fluctuated — 20,200 in 1972; 4,200 in 1973; 4,900 in 1974; 11,500 in 1975; 5000 in 1976; and 4000 in 1977. This fluctuation reflects variation in the number staying on at school in Years 11 and 12, i.e. beyond the minimum school leaving age. The "persistence rate" responds to economic conditions, particularly the condition of the labour market. In 1971 29.2% of the 1966 Year 7 intake had reached Year 12. In 1972 the proportion which had persisted to year

12 rose to 31.2%. It dropped to 31.1% in 1973 and 29.8% in 1974. Then it recovered to 30.2% in 1975 and in 1976 passed the previous 1971 peak by reaching 31.3%.

On the other hand, in 1977 the number entering universities, colleges of advanced education and technical colleges seems to have stablilized if not fallen. In the past, periods of high unemployment produced increased enrolments in universities and technical colleges. Today unemployment allowances are higher than student allowances, and this fact, coupled with the realization that a university degree no longer guarantees employment, has produced a new pattern of response.

The fluctuating demand for teachers is illustrated by the annual increase in the state service of N.S.W. in recent years:

	Primary	Secondary
1972	528	1251
1973	−148	804
1974	529	865
1975	1019	1625

Numbers entering the secondary service are consistently higher than those entering the primary.

The resignation rate is highly relevant to the demand for teachers. At the end of 1974 the loss rate of teachers suddenly dropped. The tightening employment situation discouraged teachers resigning to take other jobs or go abroad for a few years on recreation. In 1974/75 losses of primary teachers totalled 2,133 or 11.2% of teachers. In the previous three years the loss rate had been 12.4% (1971/2), 12.4% (1972/3) and 12.3% (1973/4). Losses of secondary teachers in 1974/75 totalled 2,206 or 12.5%. In the previous three years the loss had been 15.1%, 14.5% and 14.9%. In other words the loss rate has become much the same for primary and secondary services, and the fall in resignations and retirements is likely to be about the same for other services.[2]

Another factor influencing the demand for teachers is class size. Demand can be stimulated by a reduction in class size. But this, in turn, must await on availability of classrooms. In any case, if the birthrate continues to fall smaller classes will be the result, even without an increased intake of teachers.

Some Consequences of this Falling Demand

The falling demand for teachers carries implications for teacher training. In New South Wales and some other states many Colleges of Advanced Education rely heavily on teacher training for their existence. In Victoria C.A.E.'s tend to be specialized; many are heavily committed to technical education, others to teacher training. Many universities throughout Australia are highly dependent on trainee teachers for their students, especially in day enrolments in Arts faculties. An awkward situation arises.

On the other hand, the fall in the demand for teachers and in the resignation rate amongst teachers is a good thing for the schools. Stability in the teaching service has been desperately needed. The Education Departments now have a breathing space to solve their problems — though I am not optimistic that they will use it. The falling demand provides an opportunity to improve the quality of teacher training. It also provides an opportunity to improve the system of training. This is because the incessant pressure of large numbers has been one reason for poor training. Phillip Hughes, Head of the School of Teacher Education, Canberra College of Advanced Education, commented in 1972: "It is the need to recruit so heavily to teacher education programmes which cause recruitment practices which enlist so many students who are uncommitted to teaching, and who frequently prove personally unsuitable."[3] These unsuitable teachers often resigned in their first year or so, and the high resignation rate intensified the need to recruit. Hughes might also have added that the large numbers of trainee teachers undermined the training system, particularly where mass lectures became necessary, where students attending lectures were not very interested in teaching, and where pressure of numbers undermined the quality of practice teaching in the schools.

One way in which large enrolments undermined the quality of university teacher training was by encouraging universities to hand over practice teaching supervision to "master teachers" in the school, who received payment for their services. Theory and practice often moved apart. The university retained nominal responsibility but abandoned real responsibility for practice teaching. The contact of the method lecturer with the schools and with his trainee teachers was weakened.

Large enrolments can reduce the quality of teaching training in other ways. Large numbers and the cost of practice teaching has encouraged reduction in the length of practice teaching. In N.S.W. many training institutions only require six weeks practice per year, sometimes augmented by weekly "school experience" on a half-day or daily basis. Other states, however, often require a longer period of practice teaching.

Another example of retreat in teacher training is a reduction in the number of teaching method courses to be taken by trainees preparing for the secondary school. In 1946 Sydney Teachers' College, which then provided a Diploma in Education course on behalf of the University of Sydney, required student teachers to take two major methods (e.g. History Method and English Method) and one minor method (e.g. Latin Method). Today in some institutions the requirement has shrunk to two methods and in others to one method. Yet it is well-known that most teachers will teach at least two different subjects.

A third relaxation introduced in some universities was to reduce the length of method courses. Once three hours per week was normal. As enrolments rose so did the temptation to reduce the number of hours per week in order to keep lecturers' teaching loads at a reasonable level.

A certain embarrassment has developed in universities and even in colleges of advanced education over teaching as a practical training course. This is reflected in vaguer, more "academic" terminology which has come into favour. Instead of Method, the terms Curriculum and Method has been adopted; in places of practice teaching the more pretentious but vaguer "practicum" has come into vogue. "Teacher training" is in disfavour; "teacher education" or "teacher preparation" is preferred. The phrase "teaching methods" is replaced by the more elegant "reading strategies".

The academization of teacher training is an unhealthy outcome of the university entry into this field. But does this mean that universities should vacate the field completely?

Should Universities Train Teachers?

Dr. Martin Haberman, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Wisconsin has presented "Twenty-three Reasons Universities Can't Educate Teachers".[4] Not all of these reasons are relevant to the Australian system of education. But among other things Dr. Haberman challenges the assumption that universities are able to co-operate with schools; that academics are able to relate their education theories to school practice; and that the leadership within the university schools of education are concerned and involved with problems of the lower schools. In his opening remarks Dr. Haberman says: "After a century of struggle to become respectable, teacher educators need critically to re-examine what we gave up in return for membership in the university club." He then suggests that such a re-examination could have three results:

> *We might try to change a few of the University conditions that mitigate against teacher education; we might try to support rather than crush organisations outside the university that seek to prepare teaching personnel; we might revel in our irrelevance and seek to become change agents who educate teachers for the best of all non-existent worlds.*

The academic freedom which is granted to university lecturers — and properly so — makes it hard to develop a coherent "philosophy of teacher training" in university Diploma in Education courses. Each lecturer is his own authority. Moreover, the criteria adopted by the universities in recruiting staff are not necessarily best suited for the recruitment of teacher trainees. University appointment committees tend to look for higher degree and research ability when interviewing applicants. What is needed for lecturers in teacher training courses is a minimum of successful practical experience in schools (say three years), together with some ability to teach at the tertiary level.

The autonomy of academics also brings its disadvantages in other areas of professional training. The Dean of Medicine at Adelaide University recently complained that methods of making university staff pull their proper weight in university and hospitals are non-existent, "even when it is manifest they are not carrying out their tasks responsibly."[5]

Advantages of the Old System

The system of teacher training operating before the universities entered the field and before training colleges became transmogrified into C.A.E.'s had quite a few advantages. One strength of the old teachers' colleges was that the lecturing staff usually (though not invariably) had a minimum of three years' successful experience in teaching. They had usually taught in the state schools of their state, and hence knew the schools for which they were training teachers. For this reason, and because the colleges were usually small and unpretentious, relationships with the schools were reasonably close and reasonably cordial. Because of the centralised control within colleges they often had a clear educational policy. However, the same central control meant that where a college principal was inadequate this weakness could be transmitted within the college. College lecturers were usually hard-working. They were close to the students, they had heavy teaching loads, and they had little concern with research.

Certainly the teachers' college system carried its disadvantages — a narrow spirit often prevailed, the paternalistic control over students reflected the similar control of the principal over his staff. Staffroom talk was of schools and teachers. A "school" atmosphere prevailed — something which was at times criticised by outsiders but which had some advantages for the training of practical, hardworking teachers.

One of the advantages of the small teacher training institutions was that the lecturers learnt from each other; young, newly-recruited lecturers learnt from their older, more experienced colleagues. In the large university-type institution it is often assumed that the lecturers involved in teacher training already have full wisdom when they join the staff. In any case, they are granted full "academic" autonomy, and hence a system of induction-training is not easy.

Mergers in England

In England mergers between universities and teachers colleges and between polytechnics and teachers colleges were arranged in 1974 and after as a means of "rationalisation" — economic rationalisation was what was primarily sought. The great majority of redundant colleges were merged with polytechnics, not universities. Polytechnics were controlled by local authorities; universities were independent.

For some months the reorganisation raised not the slightest protest. Then, in an article in June 1974[6] John Vaizey remarked, in passing, that "teacher-training colleges are being turned into general colleges without any specific aims" and warned against "mere bureaucratic amalgamation without any consistent philosophy". This brief comment gave others courage. M. Brearley, a retired principal, attributed the lack of concerted protest to "the Machiavellian system of the Department of Education and Science of picking off colleges one by one . . . The smokescreen of 'consolidation'" . . . The absence of philosophy to attack and the apparent vesting of power in the hands of bureaucrats "and the indifference of the general public and parliament arising from the incidence of greater crises than ours".[7] Max Morris of the National Union of Teachers drew attention to the lack of serious fight by staffs of colleges.[8]

Cyril Bibby, principal of Hull College of Education, referred to American experience[9]

> *In the United States, where the teachers' colleges were compulsorily merged with large multi-purpose institutions, the results have already proved so unsatisfactory that some states are now struggling to re-establish what they so unwisely destroyed . . . Do we really have to go through the same sad experience ourselves in order to learn the same lessons?*

Sir Alec Clegg, a former Director of Education in the West Riding of Yorkshire, argued that the teachers' colleges had produced a teaching service widely admired; that having realised the error of having schools which are too large, England was now repeating this error with colleges; and bitterly predicted that the new institutions would use the amalgamation to indicate that teachers in primary schools were not true professionals. "No amount of B.Ed.-ery will stop them doing so."[10]

In Australia, by contrast with England, teachers colleges started to undergo a transmogrification somewhat earlier. The Martin Committee, after prolonged gestation, had produced a new academic infant — colleges of advanced education. From 1969 onwards these entered into teacher training, as part of their multi-purpose character. From the early 1970's, too, some teachers colleges, encouraged by the prospect of Commonwealth funding, developed into multi-purpose C.A.E.'s. Thus in Australia pressure for amalgamation or rationalisation involves rather different institutions. Another difference with England is that technical colleges are not involved in merger proposals though some C.A.E.'s do sustain technical-style courses.

Mergers in Australia

In Australia the development of some teachers' colleges into multi-purpose institutions, particularly in New South Wales, stirred the universities in 1971 to propose mergers in order to forestall possible competitors. This early effort proved unsuccessful. Then, in 1975, the merger of the higher education commissions in the states and commonwealth and the emergence of tertiary commissions suggested the possibility of a merger of educational institutions. Indeed, the Universities Commission, in its Sixth Report, urged such a step at Townsville, Armidale and Wollongong. In the three regions there has been considerable resistance to the proposal for mergers. The condition of Armidale C.A.E. provides an example of what can happen when mergers, or semi-mergers are bungled — just as Wagga provided a case study of the disasters which can happen to teacher training when the translation of a teachers' college into a C.A.E. is bungled.[11]

Armidale Teachers' College, established in 1928, quickly built up a reputation as an efficient teacher training institution. From 1955 to 1962 the college provided the post-graduate Diploma in Education training course on behalf of the university. In 1962 the posts of principal of the college and professor of education became separated and the Department of Education at the university started to exert a more independent role. From 1962 until 1970 the Diploma in Education was jointly administered by the Department and the Teachers' College. Then, in 1969, a separate Faculty of Education was established in the university, and took over full responsibility for the Diploma, providing its own academic staff.

When a merger proposal was put to Armidale Teachers' College in 1971 the secretary of the Staff Association remarked that the staff could see no advantage for teacher education, and that what was integration as far as the university was concerned was disintegration as far as the college was concerned. But tertiary education in Armidale rested on two foundations, primary industry and teacher training, and both were declining industries. Hence the crisis was sufficiently severe to force some rationalisation. The university Faculty of Education took over responsibility for the training of all secondary teachers from the beginning of 1976, leaving Armidale C.A.E. with the training of all primary teachers. The university took over the academically respectable courses and lecturers, leaving primary courses and lecturers as a rump. Some members of the C.A.E. staff obtained university posts in open competition. Others have been employed by the university on tutor's rates as part-time teachers. The question of amalgamation is still under debate; how this would save money is not at all obvious.

What is needed is not further academization of teacher training, but more practical and smaller institutions engaged in teacher training. If mergers are required, the best solution would be to separate Diploma in Education courses from the universities and the teacher training courses from the C.A.E.'s and set up quite independent Institutes of Education. Such an institution could offer concurrent training, rather than "end on" training. Concurrent training is not easily accommodated in academic universities. If the objective is to save money, then two-year training courses might be sufficient for primary and infant teachers and a one-year course for university graduates. A three year course is not, in itself, necessarily better than a two year one. Mergers of disparate institutions are unlikely in the long run to produce financial saving.

Should all Teachers be four year trained graduates?

Those who support complete university control of teacher training sometimes argue that all teachers should be graduates, and that the period of training should be four years. I do not agree with either suggestion. The Martin Committee said

> *The Committee does not believe that provision can be made for all teachers to become graduates even in the reasonably near future. Nor, indeed, does it believe that all teachers should be graduates of the type traditionally recognised by universities.*[12]

After remarking on some of the characteristics helping to make a good teacher the Martin Committee commented: "These qualifications are not gained by a mere addition of courses, nor necessarily improved by his seeking "credits" from another institution. They are best acquired in an integrated fashion, and under conditions in which as much is gained from the prevailing spirit and atmosphere of his college as from official courses duly completed".

The N.S.W. Committee of Enquiry into Teacher Education in 1971[13] was dubious of the universities' role in teacher training. It pointed out that student-teachers in universities were vocationally isolated; they needed more contact with their future profession. The wastage rate of trainee teachers in college courses was about 10%; in universities the loss was about 50%, though 20% were recovered by transferring to colleges after university failure. In N.S.W. universities about 50% of total enrolments in arts, science and economics were holders of teacher education scholarships. In some universities the proportion approached 67%. "In spite of this situation, the status of teacher preparation in universities does not seem to be high and the universities themselves must bear some of the burden for the unfortunate image of teaching held by many students."[14]

This approach is now, in some senses, antediluvian. The inflation of teachers' colleges into colleges of advanced education, the translation of such colleges into multi-purpose institutions, and the expansion of university participation in teacher training helped change the situation. The 1972 *Report of the Senate Standing Committee on Education, Science and the Arts*, on "The Commonwealth's Role in Teacher Education" recommended the establishment of integrated courses in education (i.e. concurrent as distinct from end-on courses) and the introduction of four year minimum teacher education courses (one wonders how long the maximum courses would be). Admittedly this was a committee of politicians, not educationists; but it is remarkable that the argument justifying four-year courses consisted of one sentence only. Such courses were desirable "for recognition of teacher training degree and diplomas as professional qualifications" and because of the complex nature of courses (p. 26). The argument is circular. Four year courses were necessary to validate degrees and diplomas and since these courses were so complex they needed to extend for four years. The need for degrees was assumed; the need for complexity of courses was also assumed.

The fact that four or even five year teacher training courses exist in some tertiary institutions in North America is indicative not of the production of a superior class of teachers but of the decline in the quality of academic secondary education. I am not sure that in Australia expansion in the duration of teacher training to compensate for defective secondary education has yet become necessary.

I would argue:

1. That granting all future teachers a degree would not necessarily raise the prestige of the profession nor necessarily the quality of teachers.

2. If a bachelor's degree in Education is to mean anything it must be of a fairly high standard. Quite a few teacher trainees are not capable of taking a degree, though they would nevertheless make quite good and conscientious teachers. After some years of further maturation they might develop sufficiently to take a degree at night.

3. Many primary and infant teacher trainees do not want a degree. In the 1950's and 1960's many teachers' college students in the infant sections had academic records which would have admitted them to universities, but they preferred teachers' colleges. These students had a commitment to teaching, they wanted to become infant teachers as quickly as possible. Many primary and infant trainees, I believe, would prefer a two year course to a three year one and a three year one to a four year one.

4. Already the formal educational system has been inordinately protracted. It is bad enough for the child to start at a pre-school aged 3½ years and then stay on till he reaches a minimum leaving age of 15 years. A further two years of secondary school, plus four years of tertiary education is too much. Enough is enough! For many people the real business of life is postponed until the mid-20's. But for all this protraction of formal education, the quality of the end product is not noticeably improved.

5. I believe the supply of able teacher trainers is limited, and that in recent decades we reached and exceeded the optimum. Instead of increasing still further the number of lecturers engaged in training teachers we should seek rather to reduce this number and permit some of the experts to make their contribution directly in the schools rather than indirectly through their disciples.

6. There is a limit to the benefit which previous training can give to intending teachers. Teaching is a practical matter, in many respects best learnt on the job. We should not delay entry into the classroom for too long.

7. If introduction of a four year degree course is desired the best approach would be to let the students take a two year college or university course; then teach for two years; and then let those so wishing return to college or university for a further two years and a degree.

8. One of the best methods of improving the quality of teachers is by in-service training courses, preferably residential, preferably for teachers between their 5th and 10th years of service (young enough to be enthusiastic, old enough to be committed) and preferably given by successful teachers, with recent experience in teaching the methods they recommend.

Conclusion

I believe that Australian universities should retain some role in the training of future teachers, if only because lecturers in Education need some contact with schools and school teaching. But this should be a reduced role. During practice teaching the maximum number of lessons most lecturers in a secondary method course can supervise adequately each week is about ten. This suggests a maximum enrolment of ten in each major method course, or an enrolment in the Diploma of Education course of about 70 students. If trainees took two method courses total enrolments could fall to 50. An enrolment of this size would reduce the cost of practice teaching, no insignificant matter. It would permit closer contact between lecturer and student — and in teacher training a master-apprentice relationship is valuable.

If the universities are serious about teacher training they will increase the amount of time students spend on practice teaching; they will increase the number of method courses taken to at least two; and they will ensure that lecturers engaged in the teacher training programme have themselves had experience as teachers in Australian schools.

I do not deny that some colleges of advanced education face problems in teacher training similar to those in the universities — unnecessary academization of courses, the danger of estrangement between college lecturers and classroom teachers, increasing diversity in the interests of lecturers as colleges become multi-purpose; impersonality in institutions which have become too large. Like the universities, the colleges of advanced education will have to solve these problems if teacher training is to regain its quality.

Current discussion about teacher training very easily loses sight of the central issue — the quality of the teachers being produced. Governments are concerned with economising in teacher training; lecturers are concerned with preserving their jobs or improving their conditions; university administrators are concerned with maximising enrolments and hence maximising the Commonwealth Government's grant. Too often the educational issue is lost sight of. In my view, teacher training is best conducted in small, specialized, autonomous institutions working in close harmony with the schools. In such institutions practical, concurrent teacher training courses (i.e. where students take academic subjects, professional studies and practical work simultaneously) are more likely to work successfully.

References

1. I have recently considered the role of C.A.E.'s in "Exciting Times C.A.E.'s" (*The Australian Quarterly*, March, 1978). For an earlier survey of universities and C.A.E.'s in teacher training see Barcan, "Problems of Teacher Training", (*Current Affairs Bulletin*, 1st June 1972).
2. Figures taken from *Report, N.S.W. Minister for Education*, 1976.
3. **G. Harman and C. Selby-Smith**, *Australian Higher Education*, p. 33.
4. **M. Haberman**, *Journal of Teacher Education*, Summer 1971.
5. **Canberra Times**, 16-3-73
6. **J. Vaizey**, *Times Educational Supplement*, June 1974.
7. **M. Brearley**, *Times Educational Supplement*, 17-7-74.
8. **M. Morris**, *Times Educational Supplement*, 20-9-74.
9. **C. Bibby**, *Times Educational Supplement*, 12-7-74.
10. **Sir Alec Clegg**, *Times Educational Supplement*, 13-9-74.
11. For the Wagga case cf. Barcan, "Exciting Times for C.A.E.'s", *op. cit.* Elucidation of the intricate manouvres at Wagga, Armidale, Wollongong and elsewhere is a difficult task for outsiders; while those directly involved are sometimes either loath to speak or else liable to present over-coloured versions.
12. *Tertiary Education in Australia* (The Martin Report), August 1974.
13. *Report of the Committee of Enquiry into Teacher Education*, N.S.W., September 1971.
14. *Ibid.* p. 51.