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Abstract

The development of competency led, school-based initial teacher education in the UK and elsewhere has increasingly raised questions about the future role of higher education in initial teacher education. These developments have particularly raised questions about the continued role of those forms of knowledge traditionally associated with higher education - research, theory and scholarship. There is, as a result, a growing crisis of confidence amongst British teacher educators as to what their contribution to teacher education can and should be. This is a question echoed both by policy makers and by those in senior managerial roles in higher education institutions.

This paper will begin by illustrating the crisis by presenting findings from an on-going research project which examines the changing role of higher education in initial teacher education. The paper will then go on to explore what the rationale for the continued involvement of Higher education might be. It will be suggested that it is inappropriate to seek such a rationale in the 'ownership' of particular forms of educational knowledge (research, theory and scholarship) or in particular professional principles (the commitment to reflective practice). Rather, it will be suggested that that rationale is to be sought in the principles underlying higher education itself. It will be argued that it is only by the involvement of teacher education with institutions committed to certain fundamental values - to open mindedness, to enquiry, to the commitment to question the assumptions underlying current knowledge and practice - that the nature of teaching as a complex and moral activity, rather than a technical process can be maintained.

Introduction

The passing of the 1994 Education Act was a vitally important milestone in the history of the teaching profession in England, in that it marked the formal separation of initial teacher education from the higher education system. In future, funding for all forms of initial teacher education in England (but not in Wales) will be the responsibility of the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) rather than the
Higher Education Funding Council which funds all other higher education. Moreover, the TTA has a formal remit to promote the development of School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT) schemes where consortia of schools rather than higher educational institutions (HEIs) become the 'lead bodies' in the provision of initial teacher education.

The new Act is therefore extremely important, marking as it does the end of nearly a hundred year old link between the systems of higher education and initial teacher education in England. However, the challenge to the role of higher education in this field is not itself a new one. As early as 1972, the James Report (James 1972) argued against an over academic approach to teacher education, recommending instead that it should be 'unashamedly specialised and functional' (p23). More recently, a number of 'neo-conservative' commentators (O'Hear, 1988; Lawlor, 1990) have directly challenged the value of the contribution of higher education and have argued vociferously for its suppression. It is partly as a result of such petitioning that in the last 10 years we have witnessed a whole series of Government interventions (DES 1984; 1989; DFE 1992; 1993a) which, with their growing emphasis on school-based training, have themselves further served to raise questions about the role of higher education in this field. Moreover, the development of 'partnership schemes' in initial teacher education is encouraging those in higher education themselves to ask questions about their role too. If, as is true in partnership schemes, schools now have responsibility for much of the practical preparation of student teachers, what then is left for those in higher education - what can and should their distinctive contribution actually be?

The debate about the continued contribution of higher education to initial teacher education is therefore now a public one. The 1994 Education Act may have been the last in a long line of challenges to universities and colleges, but with the creation of the TTA, it is clear that initial teacher education and, indeed, the teaching profession as a whole in England is now entering a new phase of its development.

The time is therefore right for a serious exploration of what the contribution of higher education can and should be to the training of the next generation of teachers. While some of those outside the system have argued with increasing ferocity against a continuing role for universities and colleges, neither teachers, nor those within higher education themselves have been forthcoming in setting out a clear and principled rationale for their continued existence. The purpose of this paper is therefore to contribute to what I hope will, in the coming months and years, become a more elaborate discussion of the issue. Now, more than at any time since the war, the teaching
profession needs a clear rationale for its relationship with higher education. If that rationale is not forthcoming and if it is not convincing, there is indeed a chance that before long, the contribution of higher education to the training of teachers in England will be a thing of the past.

In this paper I want to begin by briefly summarising some findings from the Modes of Teacher Education (MOTE) project (Furlong et al 1994) to describe the current role of higher education in initial teacher education. I draw on data from a survey conducted in 1992 - just before the latest round of Government led school-based initiatives began to take effect. That data, I argue, suggests that, as the result of universities' and colleges' response to legislation of the 1980s, the distinctive contribution of higher education was at that significant juncture hard to define. It is my contention that many institutions had, by 1992, lost their way in establishing a clear role for themselves. In the second half of the paper I go on to make a preliminary exploration of what the rationale for the continued contribution of higher education to school-based teacher education might be.

The position in 1992

As I have already indicated, the relationship between HEIs and schools has been a central focus of Government policy in initial teacher education for the last ten years (DES 1984; DES 1989; DFE 1992; DFE 1993a; DFE 1993b; Wilkin 1991; 1992). Circulars 3/84 and 24/89 (DES 1984, 1989) both attempted to reconstruct that relationship by emphasising the importance of practical teaching competence and insisting on a formal role for teachers in the training process. The central motif of both of these earlier circulars was 'integration'; all teacher education courses had to achieve a close integration between the HEI and school-based elements of their programmes, though the ways in which that integration was to be achieved remained unspecified. What is distinctive about the British Government's initiatives since 1992 (DFE 1992;1993a) is that they specify one particular means of establishing integration; integration is to be achieved through the development of partnerships with schools, with schools exercising 'a joint responsibility for the planning and management of courses and the selection training and assessment of students.' (DFE 1992: para 14). Given the significance of these policies and their implications for the work of higher education institutions as well as that of schools, they necessarily became an issue of central interest in the Modes of Teacher Education (MOTE) study which is monitoring national changes in initial teacher education over a five year period (1991-1995).
Phase one of the MOTE study, conducted in 1991 and 1992, included questionnaire surveys of all initial teacher education provision and the Licensed Teacher scheme in England and Wales and case studies of 45 individual higher education-based courses and 5 Licensed Teacher schemes. Phase two, which is currently on-going, focuses on the response to more recent changes; it includes further case studies and a second national survey to be conducted in 1996. The results of the initial national survey, which have been reported elsewhere (Barrett et al 1992; Whitty et al 1992; Miles et al 1993; Barrett and Galvin 1993) demonstrated that in the academic year 1990/91, there was considerable variation in how far existing higher education-led courses had moved towards a partnership model of integration of the type now being required by the Government (DFE 1992; 1993). While on 87% of courses, teachers were described as taking joint or primary responsibility for the supervision and assessment of students on school experience, their involvement in other dimensions of training (subject studies, curriculum courses, and educational and professional studies) was significantly less. When it came to involvement in the planning of training, even in the field of school experience, it was reported that less than half of all courses gave teachers a significant role.

In 1992 the first round of case studies of 45 carefully selected courses was undertaken to explore in more detail the various ways in which courses, at that time, did attempt to integrate the work of higher education and school. What we discovered was that in the large majority of courses visited, the growing emphasis on practical training initiated by the Government during the 1980s had resulted in far more changes being introduced to the higher education aspects of training programmes than their school based parts. As a result, we argued (Furlong et al 1994) that many courses, by 1992, lost sight of what the distinctive contribution of higher education could and should be.

Following earlier work on school-based teacher education (Furlong et al 1988) we focused on five key elements in our case studies - course structure, course content, pedagogy, assessment and the roles of key personnel. In looking at 'course structure', we documented the wide variety of different patterns of serial and block practice that had been established. It was through the practice of students moving backwards and forwards between schools and HEIs that many courses hoped to achieve integration. Such structures were markedly different from those documented in teacher education programmes ten years earlier (Patrick et al 1992).

'Course content' also appeared to have changed markedly. Curriculum courses were perhaps unsurprisingly all highly practically focused. Less predictable was the fact that we discovered many examples of
attempts to integrate subject studies within undergraduate programmes to the world of school. In some institutions, subject studies programmes were being adapted to mirror the national curriculum while in a number of others, institution wide school-focused themes had been established. These themes then allowed tutors to link main subject study to work in school. But the most significant changes had come about in relation to educational and professional studies. Where as ten years previously much of this work was taught through the 'educational disciplines' of sociology, psychology, philosophy and history, we came across no example of systematic teaching in these areas. Instead nearly all courses seemed to have developed a professionally oriented programme with topics - such as classroom control and assessment - taken directly from the Government criteria. Such residues of the old 'disciplines' as were still visible, were largely fed through such topics in an ad hoc manner.

One of the most significant findings of our case study work was the extent to which tutors tried to integrate their work to that of the school through their chosen pedagogy. Almost every lecturer we interviewed claimed to choose their teaching strategies carefully in order to mirror the full range of teaching strategies students might be expected to employ in school. Pedagogy was for lecturers a key strategy in the practical training they tried to offer students.

All of these strategies for integrating the work of the HEI and the school therefore involved changes to HEI based programmes. As I have indicated, evidence from a decade earlier would suggest that practice had changed significantly in this regard presumably as a result of courses responding to the increasingly practical emphasis of Government legislation. Interestingly, when we came to examine school based work, we were aware that the range of new strategies that had been developed to integrate school and HEIs was more limited. For example when we came to examine assessment it was apparent that, in the vast majority of courses, written assignments were largely seen as the province of the HEI. It was HEI staff who set the assignments and in most instances it was they who marked them even when they involved significant degrees of school-based work. In relation to the assessment of students' practical teaching competence there was a greater degree of involvement of teachers though only in a very small minority of courses were they given the major role. The practice in 1992 was still very much of the schools having less power than HEIs in this aspect of the training programme.

The final area of work to be investigated concerned the role of key personnel in the schemes and particularly that of the mentor. Perhaps unsurprisingly in 1992, that role was still largely undeveloped and in the majority of courses, teachers did not take on a systematic and structured approach to the training of students while they were in school. In most cases it was appropriate to consider class teachers as traditional 'supervisors' - supervising students who had been trained
elsewhere - rather than as mentors with a formal responsibility for training itself.

This then was the picture that we found in 1992 before the introduction of the latest round of initiatives. While a small number of well publicised courses (Benton 1990; Furlong et al 1988) had developed a partnership model of training, the vast majority had, during the 1980s, chosen to respond to the Government's increasing insistence on a practically oriented course by transforming the HEI based part of their work. Rather than sharing power and responsibility with schools and together finding ways of responding to Government criteria, HEIs for the most part had taken it on themselves to deliver a practical training. It could therefore be argued that by 1992, those in HEIs still controlled provision of ITE but had maintained that control at considerable cost. In moving to highly practically oriented courses, many of them had started to lose sight of what their distinctive contribution actually was.

As I have already indicated, Circulars 9/92 and 16/93 now insist on the development of a more equal partnership between schools and HEIs with schools taking the leading role in many aspects of students' practical preparation. Schools are now being paid for their work by HEIs and much concern has been expressed about the de-stabilising effect that will have on Universities and Colleges. Equally, if not more significant, is the challenge to the role of higher education itself. If, as the MOTE survey indicates, many HEIs had, by 1992, developed a highly practically oriented approach to their work, the formal passing of responsibility for practical training to schools represents a significant challenge to higher education.

Over the next two years the MOTE project will be monitoring how HEIs are responding to these challenges. One approach may be for HEIs to take a minimalist view of their role: taking responsibility for course organisation and quality control but leaving the vast majority of the work to schools. After all it can be argued that if initial teacher education is a practical task (and the increasing emphasis by the Government on competences lends weight to that interpretation) then the role of higher education should indeed be minimal. The pressures of maintaining a high research profile and the need to generate other forms of income could encourage those with managerial responsibility in HEIs to take such an interpretation.

For many others though, with a long term professional commitment to initial teacher education, the challenge will be of a different sort - it will be to define what their distinctive contribution should actually be now that the schools have major responsibility for much of the practical training. In the second half of this paper I want to begin to explore what this rationale might be.
Higher education and practical professional training

So what then is the contribution of higher education to initial teacher education? Firstly we should recognise that those in higher education do have an important role in supporting the development of students' practical professional competence - this is a responsibility that universities and colleges share with schools. In my view, the assumption that higher education institutions can, and should, take total responsibility for this central aspect of professional preparation could never really hold water. One of the strengths of the Government reforms of the last few years is that they have forced those in higher education to recognise the importance of systematically involving practising teachers in their work. And in many courses, I would suggest that the quality of professional training offered is already significantly better for that involvement. Nevertheless, higher education currently has a vital role to play in this aspect of training in at least four key ways.

The first way is that students benefit from being introduced to a great deal of the practical business of teaching away from the complexities of the classroom itself. For example, they need a chance to look at the national curriculum in detail, they need to work on the preparation of lesson plans and to examine different strategies for assessing pupils' work. All of this work is highly practical in nature, but particularly in the early stages of their professional preparation, there are clear advantages to students if they engage in this work away from the complexities of actually performing as teachers. Classrooms are highly complex places with a great many different things happening at the same time. Students have to learn to cope with that complexity, but there are clear advantages if parts of their practical professional preparation take place outside of the classroom.

A second contribution that those in higher education can make is through the vitally important process of modelling good practice. It is no coincidence that all of the tutors we spoke to in the MOTE project, regarded their own pedagogy in their higher education based sessions as one of their key strategies in professional preparation. Pedagogy was always chosen with care. Through it, tutors were able to model a wide variety of teaching strategies for their students, and as our interviews with students confirmed, that modelling was a rich source of ideas for them. Many tutors would also deploy the strategy of putting a group of students back into the role of a learner themselves. Through this process, tutors could raise complex issues about teaching, learning, and the nature of knowledge in an extremely effective manner. These sorts of learning opportunities for students do demand that they are taught and that they work together as a group.

A third important way in which higher education can contribute to
practical professional preparation is by broadening the students' experience. Through their teaching, through the use of a well stocked professional resources centre, by arranging visits and visiting speakers, higher education tutors can broaden students' practical knowledge and skills. Again, this form of practical training is no substitute for direct experience in the classroom; it is nevertheless a vitally important complement to it. One of the greatest stimuli to developing a deeper understanding of the principles behind professional practice is to have a broad range of practical experience oneself - what John (1994) calls 'peripatetic knowledge'. Within the confines of an initial training course, the number of opportunities to teach in different contexts is strictly limited. Nevertheless, because of their knowledge of practice in a wide range of schools, those in higher education are particularly well placed to provide students with 'indirect' practical experience of this sort.

The fourth and final contribution of those in higher education to practical professional training is of a different sort in that it concerns quality control - monitoring school-based work and making sure that schools are able effectively to perform their role. At the end of the day it is essential to recognise that any one school or any one teacher only has responsibility for initial teacher education on a year by year basis. Schools have no statutory responsibilities for initial teacher education while those in HEIs clearly do. It is HEIs after all that are validated and accredited. This means that however much schools are partners in the development of students' practical professional preparation, the ultimate responsibility for the quality of that training must remain with the HEI. It is the responsibility of those in higher education to make sure that students are appropriately placed in school; to make sure they are well supported in school; to make sure that mentors give them the time that they should, and that their mentors have the right skills for working with them. Given that some schools are clearly much better than others in supporting students; given that mentors change - currently about 25% per year nationally - there is a long term role for higher education here. To say that higher education carries the can and therefore has a responsibility to be involved in the detail of students' school-based work is not being arrogant - it is to recognise that in an HEI based course those are lecturers' responsibilities.

So higher education clearly has a continuing role in the development of students' practical professional preparation. HEI staff have built up a great deal of expertise in supporting students' practical learning in the ways I have outlined, and for the present at least, Government legislation places the responsibility for quality control on those in higher education. Those in higher education should not apologise for or minimise the importance of these contributions to practical professional training, for they are essential if the quality of initial
teacher education is to be maintained in England. However, it should also be recognised that none of these functions, essential though they are, necessarily have to be undertaken by those in higher education. Universities and colleges may be well placed to take on these tasks; there may be important economies of scale in allowing them to do so; and they may have staff who have appropriate forms of expertise, but the tasks I have identified above could, I would suggest, equally well be undertaken by an local education authority or even perhaps by a consortium of schools. They are not tasks that are in principle something that only HEIs can do nor are they part of what higher education traditionally and distinctively is about. In the last section of this paper, I therefore want to turn to the question of what, if anything, is distinctive about the contribution of higher education to students' professional development.

Higher education, reflection, theory and research

What then is the distinctive contribution of higher education to the professional development of trainee teachers? One of the most common responses to this question is to point to the role of higher education in developing students as 'reflective practitioners' (Calderhead 1989). The first MOTE national survey (Barrett et al 1992) reported that over 70% of all training courses that claimed to be based on an explicit model of training, characterised that model as the development of the reflective practitioner. However, as I and others have have argued (Calderhead 1989; Furlong and Maynard 1995), the concept of the reflective practitioner is itself highly problematic. Most teacher educators use the term extremely vaguely while those who use it with more precision often mean very different things by it. Unless it is handled with care, the idea of the reflective practitioner as a rationale for the contribution of higher education creates more problems that it solves.

A second, and interrelated rationale, is that those in higher education typically have access to different 'forms' of professional knowledge from teachers in schools (Furlong et al 1988; McIntyre 1991). While it is argued that teachers have access to 'practical professional knowledge', those in higher education are seen as having access to more 'detached' forms of professional knowledge based on 'theory', 'research' and 'scholarship'. Effective training, so the argument runs, depends on students being exposed to both sources of professional knowledge. This rationale is put most explicitly by McIntyre (1991) when he suggests that students must take what they have learned in college and use that as a basis for raising questions about what they are learning in school. They must also use what they have learned in school to raise questions about what they have learned in college. It is through this dialectical process, McIntyre suggests,
that student teachers come to develop professional principles of their own.

While there is clearly something in both of these views of the role of higher education, a central weakness is that they each imply a deficit model of teachers. They imply that teachers themselves are not capable of reflection or that they do not have access to other more 'theoretical' forms of knowledge. In reality, many teachers are extremely thoughtful about their practice and equal to, or in advance of, those in higher education in knowledge and understandings in some areas of professional practice. (This is particularly so in those areas of professional practice that have been subject to radical change in recent years such as the national curriculum or the local management of schools.) True, most teachers do not personally engage in forms of research unless they are currently registered for a higher degree. But of course even those in universities and colleges who are currently engaged in research actively research only one tiny aspect of their work; the vast majority of higher education teaching is not informed by personal research.

If, therefore, in searching for the distinctive contribution of higher education, one is posing the question in terms of what higher education can contribute to the education of teachers that only those in higher education can contribute, then, I would suggest, the answer is precious little. There is very little that students can only get from higher education that they could never get somewhere in the school system. Indeed such an assumption would be a logical nonsense in that most of those in education departments in universities and colleges have themselves all been teachers - many of them recently so.

My own view therefore is that we should not seek the distinctive contribution of higher education in particular forms of knowledge, skills or professional commitments. Rather we should seek it in the distinctive purposes and aims of higher education as opposed to the distinctive purposes and aims schools.

Higher Education - its distinctive role

Schools, particularly primary schools, but also secondary schools to a lesser degree, are currently saying to those in higher education that however much they may be interested in initial teacher education, their primary role is to teach their children. As a result, many heads are insisting that they will only take on responsibility for initial teacher education to the extent that it does not interrupt their work with children. But of course it is this commitment to the teaching of children that provides the essential rationale for their involvement in teacher education in the first place. It is from this day to day responsibility that their distinctive contribution grows.
Once we have recognised that the contribution of schools to professional education flows from their essential purposes - the education of children - we are then in a stronger position to raise a similar question about the contribution of higher education. If higher education has a distinctive contribution to the process, it is to be sought not in something that cannot happen elsewhere in the system - rather it is to sought in the essential aims of higher education itself.

What then are the essential aims of higher education? Unsurprisingly there are many different views (Barnett 1990) including the idea that its purpose is to provide vocational education. But beyond the idea of vocationalism, two views stand out as having long lasting and widespread support. The first is the traditional 'liberal education' perspective (Newman 1976) which suggests that the essential purpose of higher education is to facilitate the personal development of adult learners as rationally autonomous individuals. The second perspective could be characterised as 'social reconstructionist'; from this point of view, the aim of higher education is seen as providing adult learners with a critical perspective on knowledge and society (Scott 1984). 'Rational autonomy', for the liberal educationist, comes out of educated choices; 'critical education', for the social reconstructionist, comes out of asking whose interest is served by the current arrangement of the world. In either case, the fundamental purpose of higher education is seen as being to explore the complexity as well as the values underlying surface appearances in whatever discipline one is studying.

What both of these views hold in common, therefore, is a commitment to looking behind the surface appearance of things. They are committed to the interrogation of common sense and involve a willingness to explore the principles on which knowledge and action are based. In the words of John Dewey, such a commitment involves:

'the active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it' (Dewey 1910:6).

Such an approach to education is dependent on the development of certain skills such as keen observation, reasoning, analysis and thinking. Again, as Dewey comments:

Thinking involves the suggestion of a conclusion for acceptance and also search or enquiry to test the value of the suggestion before finally accepting it. This implies (a) a certain fund or store of experiences or facts from which suggestions proceed; (b) promptness, flexibility and fertility of suggestions; and (c) orderliness, consecutiveness and appropriateness in what is suggested. . (Dewey
Thinking, reasoning and rational debate are also dependent on learners developing certain personal characteristics or 'orientations' as well. They must, for example, be committed to 'open-mindedness' 'responsibility' and 'wholeheartedness' (Dewey 1933).

The promise of involving higher education in initial teacher education is therefore that it will reveal to students, (and importantly reassert to teachers and to society at large), that teaching is indeed a profession rather than merely a technical process. This is because it is the job of higher educators involved in teacher education, as it is the job of higher education in many other aspects of its work, to help students realise the complexity of the field in which they are involved. In short, the essential contribution of higher education is to make teaching more difficult!

Such an approach to teaching stands in marked contrast to that offered by the school. The school is not a seminar - far from it. For the practising teacher responsible for teaching this curriculum, to these children, now, the imperative is to act. As a result, the essential contribution of teachers to professional development is essentially different from that of higher education - for it stems first and foremost from the skills, knowledge and understandings that derive from that imperative.

But to recognise that the contribution of the two institutions - schools and higher education - is essentially different is not to provide a rationale for why higher education is a necessary element in professional education. Revealing the complexities of teaching and learning may be of value to the profession at large in reasserting its own sense of professionalism, but why should students, in the very first stages of professional development need to engage with such complexities themselves? Given that the central purpose of initial teacher education is to provide a form of practical preparation that is directly vocational, the value of 'making teaching more difficult' is not self evident.

In addressing this question one is forced to return to a consideration of the limitation of 'technicist' approaches to professional training (Furlong 1991). Can teaching, one must ask, be learned and carried out entirely as a 'technical' process? This is the argument put forward by Hargreaves and his colleagues (Beardon et al, 1992) and many others in the competency movement. They argue that basic teaching can indeed be undertaken at an entirely technical level; basic teaching is no more than 'competence'. It is because this is the case that initial teacher education can indeed take place entirely in school. For Beardon et al, the more complex dimensions of teaching, which they recognise are
important, do not need to be, and are indeed best not addressed until later in a teacher's career. Higher education, they argue, should therefore focus on further professional development and leave initial teacher education largely to schools.

Research into how students learn to teach which I and Trisha Maynard (Furlong and Maynard 1995) have recently carried out at Swansea University, would lead us to a different conclusion. Our research made us aware that teachers' practical professional knowledge is held at many different levels of sophistication and that this observation is vitally important for understanding how students learn to teach. Thus a 'bright idea', say, for teaching about life in Elizabethan Britain to Year 5 pupils, may be understood at the level of a concrete recipe or routine - a strategy which students are capable of copying and implementing without fully appreciating why it takes the form that it does. Alternatively, the same lesson plan may be understood in rich and complex ways, drawing on a sophisticated appreciation of how children learn and a flexible understanding of the substantive and syntactic structure of historical knowledge incorporated within it. Recipes for teaching include and subsume within them these more complex educational, moral and other issues in ways that novice teachers seldom recognise.

Our research on the stages of learning to teach indicated that while it is possible to 'act like a teacher' simply by following routines and recipes established by others, becoming an effective teacher demands a deeper understanding of the processes involved in teaching and learning. The experienced teachers we worked with were, even when they were unable to articulate the process to us or their students, able to 'frame' (Schön 1983, 1987) or interpret teaching situations by drawing on richer and more complex understandings. When confronted by new or difficult situations, they had a deeper understanding than their students of the assumptions they were making in their framing. As a result, they were able to bring that teaching more directly under their own control.

Experienced teachers in our study therefore demonstrated that competent teaching involves much more than behavioural skills; in learning to be effective, teachers have to develop a deeper and richer understanding of their teaching than is captured in the notion of 'competence'. They have what Elliott (1990) calls 'intelligent skill knowledge'; knowledge that is still essentially practical but which nevertheless involves an implicit appreciation of the complexities on which it is based. Students, if they are to begin to control their own teaching, therefore do need to look beneath the surface of their own and other peoples' practice. Effective practice, even at an introductory level, demands a deeper understanding than the idea of 'competence' normally implies; it is through developing these deeper understandings that...
students progressively learn to bring their teaching under their own control.

The rationale for the contribution of higher education to initial teacher education is therefore that its essential purposes – which I have identified in terms of questioning the surface meaning of knowledge and action – do have a vital contribution to make to vocational training. For those within higher education, the justification may be in terms of their contribution to their students' liberal or even critical education. However, in meeting the very real political challenges of today, it is vital to recognise that higher education has a central role in practical training too.
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