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INTRODUCTION

As in most countries the training of primary and secondary teachers in New Zealand has followed different paths. Originally, primary teachers came through the "pupil teacher" system in which school leavers became "teachers" after the summer vacation. This scheme persisted into the 1930's despite the fact that towards the end of the 19th Century, Training Colleges with attached Normal Schools had been set up in the four main centres (Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin). Although there was also a university in each of these towns, the colleges were quite separate and under the control of the state Education Department. These colleges (later renamed Teachers' Colleges and later still Colleges of Education) provided initially a two year course for primary teachers. After the Second World War, colleges were set up in Hamilton and Palmerston North and, for a short time, there were two Auckland "satellite" colleges, one on the North Shore and one to the south at Ardmore. In the 1960's the course was lengthened nationally to three years but the tradition of colleges separate from the universities continued until the 1990's and, even today, remains the dominant model.

Secondary teachers, on the other hand, completed a degree in a university and began teaching without any special preparation. A one year training course was set up in 1911 but "the meagre rates of student allowances meant most intending secondary teachers had to seek school posts immediately after graduation." (Shuker, 1987,156). This remained the situation until well into the 1930's. Increasingly, however, a one year course for a Teaching Diploma, at a Teachers' College, following graduation from a university, became the norm and was in due course made compulsory.

A student who completed a primary course of training received a Teaching Certificate, later called a Teaching Diploma. At times, depending on the prevailing ethos, students with University Entrance were permitted or even encouraged to enrol part time at the local university and by this means some ultimately gained their degree (usually a B.A.).

Although the colleges remained separate from the universities and there was no degree expressly for teaching, there were developments within the universities. In the early years of this century, the highly influential Director of Education, George Hogben, tried to bring the two institutions closer together . His proposal required that each university recognise the principal of the college as an honorary lecturer in Education. Relationships between university and college were more cordial in Dunedin than elsewhere and, as a result of further negotiations by Hogben, the College principal, D.R.White was appointed as a Professor of Education. Although the position carried no salary it was regarded as a symbol of a new direction. But, for many reasons, nothing came of it: "The arrangements introduced in 1904, intended as a first step towards closer integration between university colleges and training colleges, remained the only step." (Carter,1993, 78).
In 1920 James Shelley was appointed Professor of Education at the University of Canterbury. He arrived from England expecting to become also principal of the college and to head a national university-based School of Education. It was to concentrate initially on secondary teaching but to broaden to primary teaching later. To this end, The BA in Education would be revised and a Diploma in Education and a Masters' degree in Education would be set up. Shelley's plans, like those of Hogben and White in Dunedin, were doomed to disappointment: for reasons not easy to discern, the government at the last minute withdrew its approval for the new School. (Carter, 1993,90-92). Shelley, his successors at Canterbury, and his counterparts at the other universities became Professors of Education with no responsibility for the training of either primary or secondary teachers. They built up Departments of Education (sometimes quite large: in the 1980's, Massey's department contained two professors and some 40 full time lecturing staff) which offered a major in the BA degree, an MA in Education and a post-graduate Diploma in Education. Unlike its counterpart elsewhere the New Zealand Diploma in Education was an academic qualification not a professional one and it did not provide certification for teaching. It was taken largely by secondary teachers after they had completed their degree in a teaching subject and their college diploma.

This remained the basic situation in all universities until recently. University Education departments have been departments in the Arts or Social Science faculties and have become known for research (often recognised internationally) in the various branches of Education. They have contributed to the general education of teachers and others through the B.A. and M.A. degrees. Since the 1970's they have also provided post graduate study in specialties such as Counselling, School Psychology, Special Education and Educational Administration. Autonomous colleges, often quite close physically to the university, have continued to provide the basic training for both primary and secondary teaching.

But teacher education has not been as static as this may suggest. In the 1960's the two post-war universities (The University of Waikato in Hamilton and Massey University in Palmerston North) and their local colleges (Hamilton Teachers' College and Palmerston North Teachers' College) created joint Bachelor of Education Degrees, and as the years went by the older universities and their local colleges followed suit. Each centre developed its own relationship but the basic model was that roughly half the degree was taught by university staff (in Education and in 'teaching subjects') and the other half by college staff. The B.Ed degree took four years to complete though students could (and often did) enter teaching after three years. (The three year college diploma, not the university degree, remained the qualification to teach.). While some centres had a number of jointly taught courses, the two institutions remained intellectually and physically isolated from each other and the staff of each viewed the other with suspicion and resentment, often verging on contempt. In the 1990's Hamilton Teachers' College amalgamated with Waikato University and the staff of the College and the University's Education Department formed a School of Education within the University. In 1996, a similar merger took place in Palmerston North and the Massey University College of Education was formed. These two (interestingly the newer two) remain the only integrated institutions. Because of extensive changes in the wider educational system, the current situation in the other centres is diverse and complex.

In the late 1980's the whole educational system was subject to massive restructuring. Among the many changes two have dramatically affected teacher education: (1) Teacher education became 'contestable' and any institution may now be accredited to train teachers. As a result Polytechnics and private "providers" train teachers. (2) Any non-university institution can apply to the National Qualifications Authority to set up a degree and to date more than 150 new degrees have been set up outside the universities (mainly, but not solely, in Polytechnics.)
Consequently, the colleges which did not amalgamate with a university have instituted their own degrees, usually called the Bachelor of Education (Teaching). These are, like the Diplomas they replace, three year qualifications, professionally focused, and as I shall argue later, academically narrow. (The degree at Auckland College of Education may be an exception.) In response to the loss of students from the joint B.Eds, universities have made various adjustments. Auckland University offers its own teacher education programme; Otago University is setting up its own School of Education; the staff at Canterbury University have been contracted to contribute towards the college degree, and Victoria University (Wellington) has withdrawn from pre-service teacher education. In an interesting variation, Auckland College of Education is to merge with Massey University, more than 500 kilometres distant.

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS AND ISSUES

Roger Openshaw, a leading historian of education, has argued that the tradition of teacher education in New Zealand has been marked by a narrow curriculum, and by 'a culture of constraints and controls.' (Openshaw, 1998, 1). I want to argue that, far from improving the situation, recent policies have made it worse.

There are, I believe, two basic models of teaching:

1. The first sees teaching as a practical craft centred on classrooms and the meeting of children's needs. The good teacher, on this model, understands children, has sound teaching methods, a general familiarity with all aspects of the curriculum and the ability to control children. I believe that this model stresses some important aspects of the teaching role and these need to be preserved but the model is limited and quite inappropriate to the challenges ahead.

2. The second sees teaching as a learned profession. Its practitioners have a broad grasp of schooling in its social, historical and political context. They are able to provide expert advice on the theory of education and on educational policy. Their approach to teaching is informed and critical. Their methods are based on the best research available though they know very well the limitations of this research. They are highly educated in the content they teach. They understand the nature of the various disciplines and their limitations. I believe that the model of a learned profession needs to become the basis for teacher education.

It is clear to me that teacher education in New Zealand has been deficient in two main ways: (1) It has not been sufficiently rigorous in handing on content knowledge. Subject studies, by and large, have lacked depth and students have not learned enough about the disciplines to enable them to appreciate their strength and their weakness. (2) It has been even more remiss in providing sound interpretive studies beyond those related to the individual child and the learning process. What has been missing is a sound understanding of the social, political and historical context in which schools operate. In the first phase of her study of colleges in the 1990's Margery Renwick (1991, 131) found that during the most turbulent years of our educational history students preparing to take their place in the new system had not been given any insight into the 'reforms', any understanding of the political rationale for them and any methods for critically examining them. The school system (old or new) was taken as a given and students expected to work uncritically within it.

Sadly, rather than improving under the 'reforms' the situation has got worse in recent years. There are, I think, three main reasons for this:

1. Powerful interest groups have insinuated a particular model of teaching into the national consciousness in some countries including Britain, Australia and New Zealand. Instead of
the teacher being an autonomous professional, she is to be seen as a functionary with a narrow technical task to be accomplished and measured. She will carry out the duties ascribed to her by these groups and critical thought about them will be proscribed. In its extreme version this position has led to school-based approaches to teacher education, especially in Britain. While teacher educators tend to be opposed to such initiatives, much of their own practice is consistent with it and, in a way, the school-based model is the logical conclusion of a narrow technicist view of teaching.

2. There has been the move to break down distinctions between tertiary institutions. Led by the world of business and fostered by the Qualification Authority there has been a steady erosion of the traditional view that degrees should be taught by people engaged in research. Although this is prescribed in legislation, NZQA has adopted a minimalist and partisan view of what research is. A quick review of the research reports for non-university institutions, will reveal the paucity and flimsiness of much so-called research. For reasons to be discussed in a moment, universities have their own version of this 'trahison des clercs' the betrayal of educational standards by the very people who should be committed to their protection. Within all this, teacher education has, I believed suffered badly and the situation is likely to deteriorate further over the next few years.

3. The development of the competitive model. The influential Holmes Group in the United States points out that because of the competitive model and profit motive "some [Colleges] offer excellent preparation for those who teach. Others provide shoddy preparation that angers and embarrasses those who care deeply about the minds and welfare of America's young." (p 1) Unwilling to learn that lesson, our government has adopted the competitive model for teacher education. Institutions are competing not by producing a superior product but by offering courses which are shorter and cheaper. Four year Bachelor of Education degrees which had just really begun to make their mark on the profession (I believe largely for the better) are being speedily replaced by three year degrees at a time when, for example, Australia and many American states believe that a teacher cannot be educated for the modern world in less than five years. In some programmes in New Zealand the shortening is achieved by the removal of subject studies. Instead of studying the literary tradition, or actual science and mathematics, students study the dull bureaucratic curriculum documents- and content is made subservient to method. The ruling doctrine is that all students have to be aware of the seven areas of the school curriculum despite the obvious fact that this means that none of them will be studied in any depth. The philosophy seems to be that a primary school teacher does not have to know much about anything. I have always, with John Dewey, held the opposite view: that the integrating approach to learning typified in good New Zealand primary schools requires teachers who are more knowledgeable of content than would be required in a rigid subject centred system.

Recent evidence from the USA backs up this view. A review of sixty studies showed that the single best predictor of student achievement in schools was the length of the time of teacher education. A number of studies have shown that graduates of the new five year programmes are rated by principals and colleagues as much more effective than graduates of four year programmes. (Darling-Hammond, 1998) . According to Darling-Hammond many recent studies show that graduates of the longer programmes are more satisfied with their training, are viewed by colleagues and principals as better prepared, are as effective as more experienced teachers and are more likely to enter and remain in teaching than graduates from four year programmes. (Darling-Hammond, 1997, 321) The National Commission was so impressed by the weight of evidence that it has demanded an upgrading of teacher education so that each graduate has a bachelor's degree in a subject and a masters degree in Education. In opposition to that, the New Zealand Green Paper on Teacher Education...
(1997) advocates more competition. (It also advocates better grounding in subject knowledge but as we now see, this is often one of the first casualties of competition.)

Another way in which programmes are being shortened is by the removal of educational study not directly related to classrooms: particularly educational philosophy, educational history, educational sociology, comparative education. These subjects have never been strong in colleges of education but the Bachelor of Education degrees encouraged some study of them.

Contrary to the traditional belief that the involvement of the university would ensure depth and breadth of study, the evidence is not consoling. The Department of Education at Otago University is to be dis-established and replaced with a School of Education. (This is to be in competition with the College of Education). The rationale for the staffing of the School is narrow: "Academic staff who wish to transfer to the School of Teacher Education should have as the focus of their research and teaching, schools, classroom and educational centres with research publications in that area." And, "In making appointments to the field of Education, the University give priority to seeking applicants with a strong background in teacher education and with a focus in their research and teaching on the work of schools and other teaching and learning centres." Here a calculated censorship is advocated to ensure that educationists who specialise in the contextual aspects (sociology of education, educational philosophy, history of education, comparative education, economics of education) are systematically excluded from injecting a critical perspective into teacher education. Notwithstanding the deluge of criticism which this proposal drew from educationists, it is proceeding.

In opposition to this myopic view, I would argue that teachers need and increasingly will need, much more than an understanding of "schools, classrooms and educational settings." They need, and increasingly will need, an understanding of the social background of students (studies show that this accounts for up to 90% of achievement), a grasp of the history of education, especially in New Zealand, where we constantly try to 'reinvent the wheel,' the economics of education, and education in other countries (it is now impossible for example to understand what is happening in pupil assessment except in relation to similar policies in other countries.) Teachers, if they are to be true professionals, must understand the theoretical rationale for policies and be able to explain these to parents.

This new aversion to contextual studies is not limited to New Zealand. According to Seddon (1991, 36) the Australian Green paper on teacher education provided for "no study of the social and historical context and limited opportunity for free inquiry." This absence he argues, "reflects international trends in all sections of the education system" on the grounds that these studies are removed from the 'real world' of teaching and promote 'subversiveness'. (Ibid., p 99). While I acknowledge that there have been, of course, some weak courses in these subjects, as in all the others, I believe that what is feared is not "subversiveness" but "critical appraisal." This fear is mirrored in the curriculum documents for New Zealand schools where there is a notable absence of critical thinking. The technology curriculum in particular, is a travesty of sound education. (Snook, 1997.)

In similar vein, Beyer argues that the narrow stress on teacher 'competencies' (and the neglect of the wider sphere) has come about because the foundational studies have provided a perspective which "integrates schooling and the wider social contexts while challenging the educational status quo." (Beyer 1997, 248)

Dr Geofffrey Partington investigated teacher education in New Zealand on behalf of the Education Forum, an organisation set up by Business Roundtable (which has been to the fore in encouraging competition and discouraging critical appraisal.) In his report he noted
that a sound body of educational theory should consist of the consideration of both means and ends. He goes on "Learning theory of various sorts...deals with means. By and large, although significant improvements are possible, these aspects are at an acceptable level in New Zealand teacher education. "It is when we come to more fundamental issues concerning educational ends that the general situation is very unsatisfactory and worse than a generation ago." (Partington, 1997,102) He elaborates:

"Without a proper introduction into basic issues in the philosophy of education, it is all too easy for students and teachers to embrace policy conclusions without considering what might be their justification....Even the sociology of education of the 1970's and 1980's has been largely replaced by courses about sexism and racism, while there is rarely any significant history of education or comparative education in initial teacher education." (Ibid. p 103.). One of Partington's recommendations is that "Teachers should have sound knowledge of the main educational disciplines, namely the philosophy of education, the history of education, the sociology of education, educational psychology and learning theory, and comparative education." (Ibid. p 113)

It is interesting that both Partington and the Green Paper advocate in-depth studies and yet also advocate a radical 'free market' in teacher education. On the basis of existing evidence, competition almost inevitably leads to the exclusion of such studies. This constitutes an inbuilt contradiction in these policies.

CONTEXTUAL STUDIES

I am convinced that the contextual studies (sociology, history, philosophy and comparative education) are needed for four main reasons:

1. The problems faced by teachers are multi-faceted. They are seldom simple problems of methodology, psychology or human growth. They are often social, political and ethical in nature. School principals I have talked to have agreed with me that most complaints they receive about teachers have to do not with their technical competence but with the insensitive or unprofessional ways the teacher has (allegedly) dealt with a child.

2. The reflective teacher, to whom almost universal lip service is paid, is more than one who simply "thinks about what she has done and is doing." She needs to have learned ways of thinking about her work. Research on children and classrooms can provide some basis for reflection but the teacher must also ask such questions as: whose interests are being served by this? What political role am I playing here? Why are these forms of assessment being currently promoted? What are the ethical norms that are relevant in this situation?" and so on. Without these objective and broadly based means of examination, bland talk of "the reflective teacher" will, argues Seddon, be "nothing more than a slogan which comfortably justifies whatever we do." (1991, 101) John Barrie argues that what is needed for reflective teachers is "A view of practice as that which is shared in a wider professional context than the world of 'my' classroom, so that practice is informed by the best available professional knowledge and by defensible general principles." (1992, p 14). And LaBoskey says that "Reflective teachers need to consider the moral and ethical implications of what they do. They are obliged to do so because education is an intervention in the lives of children for the purpose of giving each of them the chance to dwell in an equitable and just society." (1997, p 161).

3. It is needed in order to minimise the dangers of bias in teacher education. All disciplines rest on models of human functioning and on assumptions which are metaphysical in nature. While this is as true of sociology, history and philosophy, as of psychology and human development, the models and assumptions tend to be in tension with each other and hence,
in principle, the student sees that there are different, and often conflicting, ways to view her task. This seem to account for the belief that contextual studies are subversive: they stop teacher educators (and political and business masters) from getting away too easily with "right answers" to highly complex questions. A thorough grounding in all the basic disciplines of education is vital for reflective professionals. Otherwise students will be at the mercy of ideologists and faddists.

4. If teachers are to be truly professional they must see themselves as more than simply classroom performers. They must be knowledgeable about schools and education and be able to educate parents, analyse policy proposals and make informed submissions to the government. The fact that at present New Zealand is gripped by an ideology which downgrades the professional teacher under the rubric of "provider capture" should not prevent teachers recognising the ideal. When sanity is restored teachers will need to be ready to take their proper place in helping to plan a better educational future. If they are not prepared, their own defective education, not some political dogma, will have disqualified them from contributing to policy development.

Of course, it can be argued that pre-service teacher education cannot cope with all that professionals require; there is, after all, post graduate and 'lifelong' learning. This point is undoubtedly correct but, I suggest, it supports rather than undermines my position. A narrow technicist first degree prepares students for the first year of teaching. (and that is how it is often defended—"these kids have to face the classroom next year"!). A broad, general, problem centred and contextual first degree provides (a) the motivation (there is much more to be known) and (b) the skills (this is how to advance one's knowledge) for a student to seek further education in relevant areas. The old saw distinguished between "ten years of teaching experience" and "one year of teaching experience carried out ten times." Broad critical work prepares for the former. A narrow technicist training encourages the latter.

These claims, conceptual as they are, are not without empirical support (although there is a surprising lack of data on teachers' evaluations of their training). Birkel (1983) examined the views of a 367 secondary teacher students in an American University on their experience of foundation studies. They valued them quite highly with some 70% saying that there was much value in the discussion of social classes, school integration and equality of opportunity. Philosophy, however, did not rank well. (398) When I noted that the philosophy course consisted of the outmoded discussion of various philosophical "Schools" (Realism, Pragmatism etc) and their so called 'implications for practice", I was not surprised. As I have said before, much depends on the content and style of the courses not on their titles. Sound courses in educational philosophy have to be centred on problems of practice.

Dawson, Mazurek, and De Young (1984) studied 615 education students in two large American universities. Approximately two thirds agreed that foundation courses (sociology, history, philosophy) were very helpful and "valuable for all teachers." Borman having cited these studies adds that there is further evidence from AESA meetings where consistently "these courses are highly rated by students especially when their content highlights current social issues and sociological concepts." (1990, 395)

This reflects my own experience over many years. In the Massey B.Ed there used to be a compulsory 300 level course which was historical, philosophical and sociological in nature. Survey of former students showed that it completely polarised students: students embraced it, often lamenting that it was not compulsory and that they had not been exposed to this style of thought earlier. On the other hand a sizeable minority rejected it saying, in effect, "How dare you do this to us.?” I believe that the strong rejection of some was as much a sign of the success of the course as the strong approval of others: each indicated that the
course was challenging simple minded beliefs: this to my mind is almost a definition of education.

H-G Rolf defends history in much the same way: "Only in the context of historical knowledge is it possible to recognise the basic trends and to judge contemporary events in an informed way....[History] permits the recognition of interests and conventions as such and the demystification of technical and economic forces." (1993, 166-167)

For many years now a colleague and I have taught a course in philosophy of education as one option for the B. Ed. Despite competing with what are thought to be more relevant options, such as human development and educational psychology, there have been between 50 and 60 teacher education students each year. Year in an year out, students have in formal evaluations rated this course highly for interest and for relevance to teaching. How could it fail to be relevant when the topics covered are, for example, parents’ rights, children’s rights, teachers’ rights, privacy in school, punishment, accountability, performance pay, evaluation of teachers, discipline, school rules, freedom, authority, managerialism, pupil assessment, the nature of intelligence, education, indoctrination, the philosophical bases of the curriculum and philosophical critiques of IQ testing. I believe that hundreds of teachers have entered classrooms more aware of the conceptual and ethical issues they face and with a more critical attitude to their work. These are attributes of a true profession. This option will of course vanish in the new shorter and "practical" degree which is to replace the B.Ed. It is ironic that this emasculation of the degree is one of the first fruits of the merger of college and university which was promoted on the grounds that it would enable more research based and critical studies of Education.

The much vaunted methods courses, skill training, and classroom observation are themselves problematic. Reviewing all the extant research on teacher education in 1986 Lanier and Little lamented: "The obsession with technique and management continues even though its shortcomings have long been recognised." (1986, 553). More recently, Needels carried out a small piece of research on first year teachers and as a consequence points out that ‘observation’ may be of little use. What is needed, she argues, is that the teacher educator ‘concentrate on helping novice teachers to understand the complexity of teaching and the relationship between the elements of it...This approach would move away from an approach to teacher education that emphasises specific skills or performance objectives." (278)

Auckland College of Education three years ago set up a new degree in which the social and the political elements were intergrated in all the Education and Professional Inquiry courses. Student evaluations have been most encouraging. The data will be summarised in a forthcoming paper by myself, Helen Dixon and Ruth Williams. The following is provided by way of example.

The fourth and final (compulsory) education course that students must complete is a course entitled "Education Policy Studies in Aotearoa". Students complete this in the second to last semester of their programme. The focus of this course is on the social, economic and political forces that had shaped historical and contemporary educational policy within New Zealand. Divided into three themes the course examines the interaction between global economic forces and New Zealand educational policy, the ideological nature of discourse and its relationship to policy development and finally, specific policy implementation and its effects on teachers’ practice. At the end of this course students completed the second evaluation. Of interest to the course developers was students perceptions of the relevancy of such a course to their understanding of teaching. Did students consider a course that had as its focus the macro issues surrounding education important, as opposed to courses centred on the classroom and meeting children’s needs?
Overwhelming, students responded in the affirmative with 90.5% of the students indicating that the course content had increased their understanding of teaching.

Both students and teachers believed that these increased knowledge bases had provided them with the tools of analysis whereby they could better articulate, defend or challenge what was happening within the education system. Comments from teachers illustrate how knowledge of the wider political and economic contexts has helped them to understand the significant changes which have occurred in New Zealand in recent years.

Striking support for this position on teacher education is contained in the very recent and important book on teacher licensing in the United States. This book, by leading American researcher Linda Darling-Hammond and associates,(1999), takes off from the innovative work of the Minnesota Board of Teaching (MBOT). They say "Where others seek expedience, the MBOT…has set a deliberate course to produce a licensing system which will encourage the development of professional teachers." (ix) The book, however, extends that work and puts it in a wider context which the authors believe "will be crucial for ensuring that teachers have the knowledge they need to as a foundation for twenty first century schools" (ix)

Having compared and discussed various state mandated areas of necessary knowledge as well as those produced by professional education bodies, the authors conclude that "a common core of teaching knowledge exists that is widely recognised as important. These, they summarise as follows:

1. 1. Knowledge about learners and learning, including knowledge about human growth and development, motivation and behaviour, learning theory, learning differences, and cognitive psychology.
2. 2. Knowledge about curriculum and teaching, including general and context-specific pedagogical knowledge, curriculum theory, assessment and evaluation, as well as knowledge of scientific inquiry, epistemology, communication and language as they relate to pedagogy.
3. 3. Knowledge about contexts and foundations of education, including knowledge about schools and society, cultures, educational history and philosophy, principles from sociology and anthropology, legal responsibilities of teacher and ethics. (35-37)

They conclude the book with these words: "Investing in knowledgeable and skilful teachers who are able and willing to do what is right for children is the only sure way to create successful education for all." (167)

..The New Zealand Green Paper which endorsed a narrow competency based model of teacher education, pointed out that "the trend in Europe is towards greater integration of teacher education into the university sector, to maintain the tradition of academically rigorous subject expertise and to ensure that teachers have adequate conceptual skills as well as practical competencies." (1997,29). And, it noted, the Ontario reforms require a Bachelor's degree for admittance to teacher education programmes. (Predictably, the Green Paper did not even attempt to tell readers why Europe and Canada are wrong and New Zealand right.)
CONCLUSION

Employers and others often say that they want schools to turn out talented, thoughtful, creative, and independent workers and citizens. They then advocate methods of teaching and assessment which encourage quite the opposite. Teachers cannot encourage creativity, innovation, critical thought, autonomy, enthusiasm and commitment unless they themselves are creative, innovative, critical, autonomous, enthusiastic and committed. Similarly teachers cannot be prepared for this except by teacher educators who possess these qualities.

Teaching is the only profession which intrinsically requires educated people. Women and men can be proficient doctors, lawyers, accountants, engineers without being educated; but they cannot be good teachers without being educated: their job intrinsically involves the initiation of the young into the acquired knowledge of human beings. It is the function of teacher education to produce educated teachers not just technicians. Despite the restrictions imposed by government policies and pressure groups, a good deal of power still lies with teacher educators; all that is needed is the will.
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