

## PARTNERSHIP IN ITE IN SCOTLAND AND ENGLAND: CAN WE LEARN AGAIN FROM RESEARCH AND FROM EXPERIENCE?

DONALD MCINTYRE

---

### ABSTRACT

This paper looks at the part that schools have played, and could play, in initial teacher education (ITE) in Scotland and England. It reviews the common problems of which these two countries (and indeed many others) gradually became aware in relation to their twentieth century systems of ITE, controlled by, and largely located in, higher education institutions (HEIs). It looks next at the efforts made by teacher educators and the teaching profession, again in both countries, to reform ITE through strengthening the part in it played by schools and by practising teachers and through developing more balanced and integrated partnerships for ITE between schools and HEIs. The general failure of these efforts is recognised and the different consequences in the two countries of this failure, through government efforts to impose reform, are examined. The brief final section of the paper suggests that present circumstances in both countries may present opportunities for renewed efforts for reform.

### 1960–1978: LEARNING FROM RESEARCH AND EXPERIENCE

In striking contrast to the internationally dominant school-based model of ITE in the nineteenth century, throughout most of the twentieth century in most English-speaking countries ITE was very largely controlled by universities or by colleges of education. Schools played very little part in ITE except as places where students spent substantial amounts of time on ‘teaching practice’. The universities and colleges, at least in Scotland and England, had for most of the century quite a remarkable degree of autonomy, even in Scotland where the Scottish Education Department (SED) exercised some control and ensured some degree of commonality across the colleges.

The first of the above two dates is rather arbitrary. It is chosen because, while there seems to have been a good deal of complacency about the system until around 1960, the sixties and seventies were years in which questions were asked and authorities challenged, in ITE as in other spheres, and in which the scale and scope of educational research expanded enormously. During these two decades, some of those involved in ITE, or affected by it, began to ask questions about how it worked and about how well it worked, and came up with some uncomfortable answers. The second date, 1978, much less arbitrary, is the date of the Sneddon Report, *Learning to Teach* (SED, 1978), a joint report of the SED and the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) which marked an end to the uncontested dominance of HEIs and the need from then on at least for justification of their relations with schools and perhaps for change.

What were the problems that emerged from research and from experience relating to the place of schools in ITE during these two decades? Perhaps the most fundamental problem was that the most important part of ITE, from the perspective of student-teachers, was in schools, while those who had responsibility, resources and time for ITE, and the opportunity to develop professional expertise in ITE, were based elsewhere. That student teachers gave more importance to school practice than to other parts of their courses was repeatedly demonstrated by research in both countries. Williams (1963), for example, in a study of twenty-four English colleges, found that among both current student teachers and practising teachers, teaching practice was attributed much the greatest value of all elements of the ITE

curriculum; and Clark and Nisbet (1963) found the same attitude among the student teachers of a Scottish college. However, as Morrison and McIntyre (1969) noted, having found similar results in another Scottish college, 'students were as critical of arrangements for teaching practice... as of other aspects of their instruction in the college' (p.65).

The problem was that these arrangements were generally made unilaterally by HEI-based teacher educators who had neither any authority in, nor any detailed knowledge of, the school contexts. Those in the schools, who had the necessary authority and knowledge there, had no obligation and no resources or time to attend to ITE concerns. Various studies demonstrated the consequences that could arise, and those by Griffiths and Moore (1967) and Cope (1971) reflect quite well the general findings. Griffiths and Moore (1967) found, in a study of twenty teaching practice schools, that 'the majority of schools regard teacher training as peripheral to their main tasks, they are not structured in such a way as to contribute systematically to the process, nor are teachers (including heads) trained in the specialist role of supervisor'. There was evidence too both of lack of respect for, and ignorance about, the college courses: twelve of the head teachers thought that there was evidence that college courses produced unrealistic teaching, but nineteen of the twenty heads appeared to have no detailed knowledge of the courses.

Cope's (1971) study of student teachers and their supervisors from two colleges and the teachers in thirty-five teaching practice schools was especially thorough and well conducted. Cope found that while the three groups espoused very similar teaching practice objectives, they had widely differing expectations and perceptions of each other's roles. The college supervisors were considerably more inclined than the other two groups to see their own role in the practice situation 'as positive, practical and constructive' and to see student teachers 'as willing to subject (supervisors') suggestions to critical challenge, ready to seek help from supervisors and motivated by concern for the pupils'; and they were less inclined to 'attribute a great deal of student behaviour and motivation to assessment and supervisory pressure' (p.105). The student teachers also differed from both the other groups in seeing the teachers as 'somewhat less sympathetic, co-operative and welcoming than teachers saw themselves' (ibid). Cope (1971) also, like other researchers, reported wide and subjectively very important 'discrepancies' in the professional courtesy with which student teachers saw themselves as being treated in different schools, in their relationships with teachers, and in the guidance they were given by teachers, as well as in the helpfulness of their visiting supervisors.

Some of the problems revealed by such studies seem to have been due to the inevitable misunderstandings that arise between groups of busy people who have quite different jobs to do and little time to communicate; but there were also more fundamental problems. HEIs in both Scotland and England have consistently (and quite rightly in my view) emphasised in their ITE courses ideals of good teaching that are as much moral as theoretical: child-centredness, social justice and the rejection of inert ideas have been among these ideals. Schools, in contrast, have emphasised (quite rightly in my view) the crucial importance of student teachers developing ideas and practices that are *practical*. Without much closer collaboration than seemed possible within the organizational framework of HEI-based ITE, there was bound to be considerable tension between these two priorities. This is reflected in the research evidence from this period of the substantial effects that teacher education courses had on the attitudes of student teachers. Butcher (1965) in England and Morrison and McIntyre (1967) in Scotland, for example, showed that student teachers tended to become more radical and more progressive in their attitudes during their teacher education courses, but that these changes were generally reversed after a significant period of full-time teaching. Schools and colleges were pulling in different directions.

Changing this state of affairs within the existing organizational framework would not have been easy. However experienced as schoolteachers the HEI lecturers were, and however concerned they might be with the practicalities of teaching, the context in which they were working obliged them to focus on issues of principle, on teaching and learning in general, on what could sensibly be abstracted from their own or others' experience, and on theoretical ideas and research findings. They could not easily focus student teachers' attention on the particular issues with which teachers have to deal in planning and teaching lessons on particular themes to particular classes in particular contexts. At best, they could offer generalised guidance. And when the student teachers went into schools, and had to confront all the particularities of teaching, they themselves were the only people who knew about all the generalised advice they had been given. It therefore had to be their task to translate the general into the particular, as best they could. Many of us would argue now that such a task is in principle impossible; and many student teachers certainly found that it was beyond them. And so, with the variable help of class teachers who were generally at least concerned that their classes should not suffer, the student teachers would start on the largely new task of learning how to teach particular classes in particular contexts.

In the nineteen-seventies, researchers slowly began to learn to ask new kinds of questions and to use more sophisticated methods to answer them. In particular, we began to take seriously the fact that student teachers themselves were individual actors, each with their own conceptions of teaching, their own ideas about how to learn to teach and their own agendas for learning and for looking after their own interests. Lacey's (1977) research was exemplary in the way it teased out student teachers' ways of making sense of their situations and the strategies they adopted for coping with these situations. He describes, for example, the contrasting strategies of 'collectivisation', used usually in the university context, where articulating and sharing one's problems was generally well received, and 'privatisation', used usually in the school context, where student teachers generally found it wiser to keep quiet about their problems and their ways of dealing with them. Like Shipman (1967), who had earlier suggested that student teachers found it both necessary and possible to offer systematically different impressions of their views and practices to supervising teachers and to college tutors, Lacey paints a picture of student teachers using their intelligence to find a successful path for themselves through the differing, and only in some cases internalised, ideas of teaching and teachers offered by schools and HEIs. The problem for HEIs, of course, was that it was for life in schools that student teachers were preparing themselves, and the ideas of lecturers were likely to be valued only if they seemed useful in that practical world of schools.

By the late seventies, teacher education researchers like myself were reluctantly being persuaded by the accumulated weight of evidence that our attempts to improve ITE through HEI-based initiatives like microteaching (e.g. McIntyre, *et al.*, 1977) were quite inadequate, and that the only effective way forward had to be through HEIs working in much closer partnership with schools and asking schools to take on much more responsibility. Others, like the Sneddon Committee, were coming to similar conclusions largely through learning from experience.

The Sneddon Committee's (SED/GTCS, 1978) most important conclusion was that

'We are convinced... that teacher training has failed so far to marry theory and practice satisfactorily; and it is unfortunately true that many students still regard their initial training as consisting of two separate and alternating experiences – their college course and their teaching practice.' (p.17)

The Committee's remit was limited: 'to make recommendations... on ways in which arrangements for student teaching practice and the induction of probationers might be improved.' (p.2), but it saw clearly that schools and teachers had to play a

much more active part in ITE if matters were to improve. They believed that ‘...the teaching profession, if invited to assume a more active part in teacher training, will accept this responsibility’ (p.18) and they put their hope in such school and teacher involvement and in much fuller collaboration and communication between school and college staff. For example,

‘...students require the sympathetic guidance and assistance of practising teachers in the classroom. To render this assistance school staff have to know what knowledge and skills students have acquired from their college course and what experience the college staff wish them to have in the school. We firmly believe that college staff must take the initiative in discussing with school staff the aims and objectives of teaching practice and responsibilities of teachers and tutors.’ (p.19)

There was a need for

‘regular meetings between school and college staff... school staff should be represented on the planning team... the improvements we hope for will not be achieved if the teachers consider themselves to be helpers rather than partners in a co-operative venture’ (p.19)

The Committee’s hope was that

‘If improvements take place in communication between colleges and schools, we hope not only that the college course will become more practically oriented but that teaching practice and induction will become more clearly and soundly based on theory. What we hope for then would be a course in which theory and practice are simultaneously and continuously developed in college and in school.’ (p.19)

The Committee saw it as crucial that education authorities should ‘make it possible for head teachers to adjust the class contact time of promoted members of staff with responsibility for students and probationers to allow them to contribute to training’ (p.24), and recognised that this had implications for school staffing. ‘We have been told that these (changes) cannot be achieved forthwith. We are convinced, however, that there can be no significant improvement in teacher training and induction unless they are given the highest priority.’ (p.27)

The sixties and seventies were decades of learning from research and experience, in Scotland as in England, about how necessary it was that schools and practising teachers should play a much larger part in ITE, in partnership with HEIs. The rest of this paper is focussed on the adequacy of the actions taken since then on the basis of this learning. Have the partnerships between schools and HEIs developed since 1978 been such as to deliver the ‘significant improvement in teacher training’ that the Sneddon Committee sought?

#### 1978–1992: YEARS OF OPPORTUNITY FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

If research and experience from the previous decades had shown the clear need for schools’ and teachers’ active involvement in ITE, the eighties was a decade in which teacher educators, schools and education authorities had the opportunity to introduce the necessary reforms on their own terms. In this section, I shall assert three main propositions about this period:

- (a) that the professional case for radical reform, as outlined in the previous section, was overtaken by a different political agenda only towards the end of this period;
- (b) that teacher educators therefore had the opportunity to shape the nature of the reforms to be made; but, with relatively few exceptions, they failed to take this opportunity and introduced reforms only minimally and reluctantly;

- (c) that, as in the previous two decades, there were only minor differences between Scotland and England in the need, the pressure and the enthusiasm for reform.

It is worth noting at the start, however, that one of the significant differences between the two countries was Scotland's General Teaching Council. The Sneddon Committee was a joint committee of the SED and the GTC; the setting up of the Committee stemmed from the report of an earlier GTC working party; and the GTC's involvement ensured that the Committee's agenda was concerned with professional issues and was not significantly influenced by ulterior political motives. The professional case for partnership in ITE between schools and HEIs got off to a flying start in Scotland because of the Sneddon Report and its GTC origins. The Report received general government approval in 1980.

Wilkin (1990) summarises the situation in the UK at the beginning of this period rather well:

'Until the beginning of the 1980s, the incidence of *active* committed partnership in the teacher training system as a whole appears to have been limited, despite the long-term and widely articulated commitment to it; though in the public sector institutions collaborative links were more advanced than in the university departments of education (UDEs).' (p.12)

There were no doubt various factors in the history of 'public sector' institutions that made them a little more ready than the universities to seek partnership with the schools, but by this stage that tendency had been incorporated into the culture of the CNAA. As a member of the Council's Undergraduate Initial Training Board from 1978 until 1984, I was in the visiting parties for the validation or review of the B.Ed. courses of some twenty institutions in England and Scotland, and 'partnership' was a significant item on the agenda of nearly all these visits. All institutions presented themselves as taking partnership seriously, although their efforts were generally quite superficial; and almost always the visiting party asked them to take partnership rather more seriously. There were no obvious differences between Scottish and English institutions in this respect.

Until the mid-eighties and beyond, HEIs in both countries were generally able to pursue their own modest professional agendas in relation to partnership. It was certainly the case that national government in both countries was signalling its interest, but it was doing so very gently. This is reflected very well in the mandatory guidelines for teacher education issued in the two countries in 1983 and 1984. That such guidelines should be issued at all was of course a cause for some concern, given the autonomy that HEIs had come to expect. Wilkin (1990) suggests that 'When Circular 3/84 (DES, 1984) advocated partnership, it was not... suggesting any innovative break with current practice... it affirmed what were by then well-established goals in many institutions... By selecting for enforcement the unobjectionable minimum of existing collaborative activities and structures it captured the drift to partnership as it already existed.' (p.3)

Circular 3/84 established the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, but it too, over the next five years, made demands on HEIs that only the most laggard can have found threatening.

The 1983 national mandatory guidelines introduced by the Secretary of State for Scotland were for the new 'professional' B.Ed., introduced to make teaching in Scotland an all-graduate profession. Kirk (1984), emphasising that these guidelines were developed by a widely representative working party, implies that they had general support. In relation to school-college partnership, he notes that the working party agreed 'that it be made a condition of approval that the Sneddon guidelines are adopted by course planners and fully implemented' (p.24). Again, the government was taking a position, but only one of supporting a consensus of enlightened professional opinion.

From the beginning of this period, modestly ambitious attempts to rethink ITE, or at least the teaching practice element of it, were undertaken in Scotland within the climate generated by the Sneddon Report. Two projects may for example be mentioned that were financially supported from the SED's research budget after the Report received general government approval. Both projects were in fact conceived primarily on the basis of research evidence such as that reviewed in the previous section; but both found the post-Sneddon climate propitious, at least from the funding perspective.

The first of these was the Collaborative Project on Teacher Education initiated in 1978 between the University of Stirling and the Central Region Education Authority. Evaluation of the project was funded by SED from 1980–83. 'The concern was with teaching practice in particular but also with the teacher education course as a whole' (Butts, 1983, p.5). It was a somewhat open-ended project in which a joint co-ordinating committee and five joint subject working parties were asked to:

- devise acceptable and effective procedures for teacher/tutor collaboration
- develop curricula based on coherent theoretical frameworks for directing enquiry into teaching and in terms of which students' teaching may be analysed and evaluated
- agree upon a rational division of labour between school and university staff.

David Butts, the evaluator, makes clear that insufficient attention was given at the early stages to clarifying how this rather large task was to be undertaken and especially to the timescale envisaged for the task. However, there were more fundamental problems.

'University reaction was divided between those who felt that the expertise and insights of tutors and teachers were different but complementary and that partnership was in that sense a teaming of equals; and those who, from a genuine sense of their own superiority, could not accept a concept of partnership on equal terms' (Butts, 1983:25).

In relation to barriers to collaboration, 'the only consensus of opinion was among teachers, as identifying lack of time as the main practical barrier' (p.26). More generally, lack of funding for the development and for school-based work was crucial. So too, was the lack of strong sustained leadership, informed by a clear vision. Finally, teachers and tutors wanted direct communication between themselves, but the Education Authority insisted on communication through proper bureaucratic channels. A great deal was learned from this project, but severe financial cutbacks combined with lack of enthusiasm among university staff meant that it had little long-term practical impact.

The second project funded by the SED as a direct follow-up to the Sneddon Report was The Primary Teaching Practice Project at Moray House College in Edinburgh, from 1980 to 1982 (Cameron-Jones, 1982). Within the constraints of having to fit in with the existing Teaching Practice arrangements, 'the project set out in 1980 to develop as far as possible a Sneddon-style model of Teaching Practice... the intention... was that there should be clear understandings and positive co-operation among all the parties involved in Teaching Practice, whether school staff, student or tutor.' (p.2) Among the developments were a collaboratively developed Teaching Practice Manual for all involved, various measures to support a more conscious and reflective teaching practice, and new kinds of three-way meetings among students, tutors and class teachers. An important emphasis was on enhancing the class teacher's engagement in partnership as well as that of senior school staff. Such proposals 'turned out to be controversial in the college and there was some strong opinion against them.' (p.3)

In the final evaluation of the project (Cameron-Jones, 1982), it was found that 'the project students reported a Teaching Practice which felt a more demanding, more valuable and more happy experience to them than did the Teaching Practice reported by their non-project colleagues in the same period' (p.5). While 'many aspects of the project were evaluated positively by all three groups of project members', there was a general tendency for the teachers and the students to be positive about the project's ideas and practices, but for the tutors to be much less positive. 'The doubts of the tutors about the project seemed to appear most strongly in the area of co-operation, partnership, and relationships.' (p. 6) In conclusion, Cameron-Jones justifiably claimed that the project 'broke new ground for Scottish teacher training in very many ways...and yet, for all its R and D strength, or perhaps even because of it, the project did not really thrive in the host college, except in the pioneering work of a minority of tutors.' (p.6)

Throughout the 1980s, Margot Cameron-Jones continued to explore new possibilities for collaboration between college tutors and school teachers, and especially to develop new ways in which student teachers could learn more fully, effectively and reflectively from the expertise of experienced teachers and from their school experience more generally. The impact of her work on the thinking and practice of some of her college colleagues and of some schoolteachers was apparent (for example to external examiners like myself). It is reflected too in her important book, *Training Teachers: A Practical Guide*, (Cameron-Jones, 1991) addressed to both college tutors and school teachers. Nor was Margot alone in Scotland in pursuing such research and development work. There were others, notably Ron Elder of Northern College at Dundee, who were actively exploring partnership issues. Yet a developed kind of full institutional partnership, with schools and teachers having the responsibility, the time and the other resources needed to pursue such work fully as school-based initial teacher educators, did not happen in Scotland in the eighties any more than it generally did in England.

The fullest realisation of partnership in ITE in the eighties, in either Scotland or England, was — so far as I am aware — the Oxford Internship Scheme. It was, I think, only by chance that it happened in England rather than Scotland. Nor did it have much to do, as I think is often assumed, with Oxford's prestigious position in English education. It happened because two thoughtful men had the vision and the influence to make it possible. Harry Judge, Director of the Oxford University Department of Educational Studies, had previously been the head teacher of Banbury School, one of Oxfordshire's leading comprehensive schools, and was an influential person among Oxfordshire heads. He had also been a member of the James Committee (DES, 1972) and had formed clear views about the importance of ITE having a strong university involvement but being primarily school-based (Judge, 1980). Tim Brighouse, then Chief Education Officer for Oxfordshire and always passionately committed to quality in school teaching and learning, saw the importance of Harry's ideas and especially their potential for the professional development of Oxfordshire teachers and for benefits to the schools. Together, they planned the framework for the Internship scheme and persuaded both Oxfordshire secondary school head teachers and the university department staff of its merits. Crucially, Tim found the resources for twelve senior teachers to be seconded full-time during 1986-87 to join university staff in planning the programme; and subsequently, for several years, he used substantial resources from the LEA's in-service budget to give teachers the necessary time both to share in the planning of the ITE course and to be school-based teacher educators. It could have happened anywhere in the UK, but Oxford was fortunate to have these two men in the positions they were in.

The Internship Scheme was distinctive in several respects:

- (i) more of the student teachers' (or 'interns') time was spent in schools than in the university, and each stayed in the same school for most of the year;

- (ii) as noted, resources were made available for teacher ‘mentors’ to spend time both on planning and in working with interns in their schools;
- (iii) the course was planned from the beginning in the light of what had been learned from research over the previous decades;
- (iv) in particular, the discredited theory-into-practice rationale was abandoned in favour of a ‘practical theorising’ rationale, whereby good ideas from theory and research, and equally from teachers’ practical wisdom and craft knowledge, were to be critically considered in terms of a range of practical and theoretical criteria;
- (v) among the ideas to be seriously and critically considered, an important place was to be given to the interns’ own good and not-so-good ideas;
- (vi) the aim therefore was both for interns to learn to engage in well-conceived, practical good practice, and for them also to learn the skills and habits of practical theorising about their own teaching.

More detailed accounts of the rationale and development of the scheme are available elsewhere (Benton, 1990; McIntyre, 1991). Clearly there was much that we had to learn about what could be done and how it could best be done. As in the two Scottish projects described above, many of the established university staff were unenthusiastic or antagonistic towards the scheme, and the enthusiasm, the creative work and the necessary research came primarily from teachers — those initially seconded and others — and from lecturers who were at the time temporary or part-time. I was fortunate to be employed, because of what I had learned from research in ITE (McIntyre, 1980; 1988) and from involvement in the Stirling project, to work on the development of the scheme and to lead the research into it (McIntyre, 1997). It was a very rewarding experience, because of the research-based ideas being put to the test and the exciting new developments especially in the school-based work, but also because on the whole it seemed to work very well. The scheme has of course evolved but has stood the test of time and, in most of the years since Ofsted and TTA introduced their league tables, even by their crude criteria the scheme has been rated as providing the best secondary school ITE in England.

We of course had many interested visitors to Oxford in the early years of the Internship Scheme, including at least as many from Scotland as from England. Nowhere else, however, were comparably radical — either similar or different — new partnership schemes for ITE developed. Although, as noted, implementation of the Sneddon Report had been made a condition for approval of the new B.Ed. degrees, and although considerable efforts were made to improve communication and collaboration between schools and colleges, there did not seem to an outside observer to have been radical rethinking in practice in Scotland of how school and HEI contributions to ITE were operating. In both countries, there seemed to be plenty of concern about partnership. In Scotland, Kirk (1988), for example, discussed developments in collaboration in ITE in terms of a College/Regional Organisation of School Experience, a complex organisational framework for planning. McCall (1988), while noting the increased involvement of teachers in both national and local ITE decision-making, concluded that significant partnership would depend on a redefinition of roles for college and school staff and recognised the fundamental problem of time and resources that this raised. Elder and Kwiatkowski (1993) reported an empirical study conducted in 1990/91 which found, for example, wide divergence between the ‘apprenticeship model’ pursued in practice during school placements and the model to which they aspired in which teachers’ craft knowledge would be incorporated into a theorising and reflective agenda for school-based as for college-based work. Similarly in England, there was much debate and research, best exemplified perhaps by Furlong, *et al*’s (1988) evaluation of four school-based

PGCE courses and the book on *partnership in initial teacher training* edited by Booth, *et al.* (1990). This debate increasingly included much justified suspicion of the government's agenda (e.g. Crozier, *et al.*, 1990).

As teacher educators pondered, the government began towards the end of the eighties to get impatient; or at least they were able to represent themselves in that way. In England, there had been two HMI surveys in the 1980s (with a third in 1991) of the effectiveness of ITE in preparing beginning teachers, as judged by the beginning teachers themselves and by head teachers (HMI, 1982, 1988; Ofsted, 1992). The first, in 1981, had seemed to show that a large minority of student teachers were poorly prepared for their first teaching posts. For example, from one fifth to three fifths of the beginning teachers rated themselves as having been inadequately prepared on a range of key teaching skills. The 1987 survey seemed to show that things had improved somewhat, but HMI were still concerned and one third of the beginning teachers declared themselves not satisfied with their preparation. The government saw such evidence as giving grounds for them to intervene seriously.

Wilkin (1990) contrasts government thinking about partnership with professional thinking as exemplified by the Oxford Internship programme. She describes the major thrust of teacher education as moving away from a discredited theory-into-practice conception of ITE towards an integrated practical theorising approach, to which teachers and lecturers contributed as equals. In contrast, she shows that government documents instead maintained a traditional distinction between 'theory' and 'practice', but increasingly marginalized theory in favour of an emphasis on untheorised practical 'skills' and 'competences'. This had been gradually more apparent in the government's rhetoric, but it was near the end of the decade before they acted:

'Circular 24/89 (DES, 1989), *Initial Teacher Training: Approval of Courses*, replaced Circular 3/84 and differs from it in a fundamental respect. It is at this point, in the opinion of the writer, that the curriculum and content of training per se are transferred from the professional to the political domain.' (Wilkin, 1990:18).

The professionals had had their chance; now it was the politicians' turn.

#### 1992–2005: FRUSTRATION ON BOTH SIDES OF THE BORDER, BUT OF DIFFERENT KINDS

I have argued that up to this point there were no important differences between Scotland and England either in the need for a new partnership approach to ITE or in the factors facilitating and constraining such reform. In 1992, however, the UK government took different kinds of action north and south of the border. In England and Wales, it imposed new arrangements whereby 'schools should play a much larger part in ITT as full partners of higher education institutions' (DfE, 1992). In Scotland, conscious no doubt that the Conservative Party was attracting only some 15 per cent of Scottish votes, it initiated a pilot study to explore similar possible arrangements. It becomes necessary from this point on, therefore, to deal separately with Scotland's and England's different experiences.

Were these 1992 government initiatives to be welcomed? I argued at the time that the government was almost certainly taking these actions for the wrong reasons. They had, however, got some things right as well as some things wrong. The proportion of time to be spent in schools was broadly right, the avoidance of specialist 'training schools' was right, and

'Mr Patten is right, thirdly, in that he has specified very little about the structure of, and rationale for, PGCE courses: he has, as I interpret him, put the ball back in our court and left it to us to make the best we can of school-based initial teacher education. It is an opportunity we must grasp with both hands' (McIntyre, 1992/1995:40).

On the other hand, there were very good reasons for believing that,

‘without careful, informed and substantial measures to help schools to prepare themselves for the task’ (p.37),

the initiative would be counter-productive.

### *The English Experience*

In England, because the initiative was indeed being taken for the wrong reasons — the right-wing pamphleteers’ antagonism to colleges and departments of education and their belief that teaching could best be learned simply through ‘practice’ — the government provided neither the necessary resources nor the necessary encouragement and incentives ‘to help schools to prepare themselves for the task’. Furthermore, they provided very little opportunity in terms of time for the schools to prepare themselves; and, with a few exceptions, the HEIs did not grasp such opportunity as there was to work with schools to develop well-conceived, integrated partnership courses. In England, too, the absence of additional resources and the obligation for the schools’ costs to be met ‘through transfers of resources from HEIs’ (DfE, 1992) exacerbated the strong negative ideological reaction from HEIs (e.g. Gilroy, 1992).

The consequences of these reforms, and of the gradually elaborated requirements and accountability mechanisms that followed throughout the 1990s, have been clearly and effectively documented by Furlong, *et al.* (2000) on the basis of national surveys conducted in the middle and late 1990s. Three aspects of their findings may be highlighted. First, they sought the opinions of student teachers completing their courses, of newly qualified teachers after they had been teaching for a year, and of the head teachers of these NQTs, deliberately seeking to compare these views of training with those found by the HMI surveys of 1981, 1987 and 1991. The findings were unambiguous: ‘Both primary and secondary trainees were very confident in all of their basic teaching skills’ (p.125). ‘By the mid and late nineties, NQTs and their headteachers felt that there was a close match between the training that was provided and the levels of skill and understanding currently demanded by schools’ (p.127). ‘By and large the students we met and surveyed felt well prepared for teaching and their employing headteachers confirmed this view’ (p.139). From the customers’ perspectives, the move towards more school-based ITE has been a considerable success.

Secondly, Furlong, *et al.* (2000) found that most ITE partnership course teams espoused a ‘reflective practitioner’ model of teaching and that ‘many (though not all) students recognised the importance of reflection within their course...(and) considered themselves well prepared in this area’. As to what ‘reflection’ meant,

‘For some students... reflection... implied a critical process, reviewing personal experience in the light of other forms of professional knowledge (descriptions of practice; principles derived from practice; the findings of research; theoretical insights derived from the foundation disciplines, etc.). For the majority, however, it seemed that reflection was much more of a ‘lay’ activity where trainees struggled to come to terms with their own experiences by articulating them and sharing them with others... if reflection remains only this, rooted in particular practical experiences, then its implications for professionalism are significantly different from when trainees are systematically provided with opportunities to engage with other forms of professional knowledge...’ (p.138)

The evidence suggested then that although the new system was enabling student teachers to develop initial practical competence as teachers, it might not be giving them the skills and understandings necessary to be able to develop their expertise further.

A third area of Furlong, *et al.*'s (2000) findings concerned the nature of the partnerships that had been developed between schools and HEIs. In the most common type of partnership that they found, one they described as 'the HEI-led model', HEIs played primarily a managerial role:

The aim, as far as course leadership is concerned, is to utilize schools as a resource in setting up learning opportunities for students. Course leaders have a set of aims (often set out as a set of competences) that they want to achieve and this demands that schools act in similar ways and make available comparable opportunities for all students. Within this idealised model, quality control — making sure all students receive comparable training opportunities — is a high priority' (p.117)

They did, however, find a few partnerships that approximated to the 'collaborative partnership' model, exemplified by the Oxford Internship Scheme. It is important to reflect on why there were not more partnerships of this kind.

As always with centrally imposed innovations, HEIs have had a choice. They could simply accept the prescriptions from the centre and implement them in a straightforward way, for example through accepting the externally specified competences as their own course aims. Alternatively, they could accept the imposed prescriptions as constraints, but constraints that could generally be interpreted constructively to allow them to plan an excellent course in their own terms. To make the effort to take the latter option of course requires confidence, energy and commitment. Where these qualities have been apparent, collaborative partnerships have thrived. For example, the Oxford Internship programme, planned without reference to government requirements, has been changed only in relatively minor ways over the years, and many of these changes have been internally motivated improvements rather than modifications to meet external requirements. At Cambridge too, I have been conscious of constant creative collaborative planning by tutors and mentors (e.g. Counsell, *et al.*, 2000), and the gradual development of an excellent partnership programme.

However, although staff at universities such as Oxford and Cambridge have had to work very hard to develop and maintain collaborative partnerships, there is no doubt that they have been relatively privileged by the universities' circumstances and policies. As has recently become clearer as a result of an independent study by JM Consulting (2004), the cost of ITE in England is on average substantially higher than the funding received by the institutions for this work. Furlong, *et al.* (2000) make clear that they found wide differences among institutions in their reactions to the manifest underfunding. They noted widespread casualisation of ITE staffing, with increased reliance on part-time and temporary staff; and they estimated the average staff-student ratio to be 21.5. The exhaustion and demoralisation experienced as a result of such workloads and such undervaluing of teacher educators' efforts have surely combined with the widespread hostility to government prescriptions to encourage HEIs to adopt a mechanistic approach. In addition, there comes a point when the scale and the wrong-headedness of external requirements become so great that even the most energetic of teachers find themselves unable to find the space to generate curricula of real quality. That happened for many teacher educators, I believe, when a National Curriculum for ITE was imposed in 1996, specifying in detail the content to be covered by student teachers of the core subjects. Fortunately, for whatever reasons (cf. Furlong, 2005), the idea of a National Curriculum was eventually abandoned in 2002.

There have therefore been some seriously negative elements in the English experience. But it has been a mixed experience. It has brought impressive new levels of satisfaction for headteachers and NQTs. Furthermore, partnership has been a rich learning experience for thousands of mentors: through studying on courses, through joint

planning with lecturers and especially through reflectively doing the job, even within its restricted framework, they have developed expertise as teacher educators. I certainly would not suggest, however, that Scotland should model its ITE practice on what has generally been happening in England.

### *The Scottish Experience*

In Scotland in 1992, the government moved more cautiously, inviting Moray House to conduct a pilot study 'of a more school-based approach to training', the Teacher Mentor Scheme. In another paper in this Special Issue, Smith, *et al.* (2006) tell very well the story of that pilot study, of the careful and scholarly positive evaluations made of the scheme, of the rejection and abandonment nonetheless of plans for its national implementation, and of successive national reports, consultations and reviews relating to partnership over the subsequent ten years. They explain how ITE partnership has remained on the Scottish agenda, actively promoted by the GTCS and by such teacher educators as Kirk (2000), but how in practice little progress if any has been made. There is no need for me also to tell this story.

But now, here we are twelve years after the apparently successful pilot Teacher Mentor Scheme, and not apparently any further forward. Does it matter? It matters a great deal if it is still true that, as the Sneddon Report claimed, 'teacher training has failed so far to marry theory and practice satisfactorily'. I find little evidence of such a satisfactory marriage. Indeed, reports of research concerned with teacher education in Scotland during the last twelve years seem to show quite the opposite. Let me briefly mention four of these.

First, McNally, *et al.* (1994) paint a graphic picture of student teachers on their ten-week final school placement at the end of the Stirling University concurrent course. After three or four years of university-based teacher education,

'It is clear that most of the student teachers were learning haphazardly as the need arose – certainly their experience was not of a systematic programme of professional development, either from the school or from reference to any training at the University to sustain them on the teaching practice.' (p.226)

Learning to deal with the world of the school seemed to be an entirely separate task for these student teachers from the learning they had done at the university; and it was a task which they had to undertake in the schools with very limited and variable kinds of help. The picture was a familiar one in research reports internationally in the sixties and seventies, but this was Scotland in the 1990s.

Stark's (2000) excellent PhD thesis explored how school placement contributed to student teachers' learning in the Honours B.Ed. course at Strathclyde University. She was especially concerned with them learning to be reflective practitioners, but found that the school placements did not tend to combine well with the University courses to achieve this, and concludes:

'Within the existing system, a number of weaknesses were detected in the partnership arrangements of schools and TEIs, the origins of which lay primarily in the non-contractual, goodwill nature of the partnership, where roles and responsibilities tended to be tacit and taken for granted... A number of limiting factors have been identified (in relation to placements), the main ones being resources, variation in practice and the disposition of supervisors... The main resource in short supply was time: time to meet, to talk, to observe and to reflect... A persistent concern from students was the variation in practice, both in teaching observed and in supervision experienced... Dispositions: the view that the teacher is responsible for the children and the (university) tutor for the student was expressed by respondents in all groups concerned... teachers and students have highlighted the juxtaposition of practice and theory, of the 'reality' of the classroom and the 'airy-fairy' irrelevance of the faculty...' (pp.317–320)

Two further studies reflect the lack of real partnership between the universities and the schools in Scottish ITE. Conlon, *et al.* (2001) discuss how they are addressing 'the theory/practice problem' in the context of Edinburgh University's secondary PGCE course. Their very reasonable starting point is a concern that the 'lack of coherence' of an earlier course clearly 'hindered student learning' (p.1). But their solution to the problem is entirely and unilaterally driven by theory and by the university. For them, the main solution is in how the university-based part of the course is structured, with the schools expected to follow along behind: 'placement provides an excellent opportunity to deepen and broaden the student's learning of course theory and to refine and evaluate the theory in practice' (p.5). Similarly, Cope and Stephens (2001), recognising the problems stemming from 'the two worlds' of the university and the schools, also look for solutions within the university, in their case exploring the merits of bringing practising teachers into the university to work with student teachers there. They sensibly conclude that 'although the employment of practising teachers on the programme has many clear advantages, it will not, of itself, solve the two worlds conflict' (p.923). Scotland seemed in 1978 to have learned that serious partnership in ITE was necessary, but in 1994 failed to take the opportunity to develop such partnership and in 2005 does not seem to have remembered how necessary it is.

#### 2005 ONWARDS: NEW YEARS OF OPPORTUNITY?

To summarise, the argument of this paper has been that, equally in England and in Scotland and indeed elsewhere, it was evident by the late seventies that radical change was needed to the twentieth century HEI-dominated theory-into-practice approach to ITE. It was however Scotland that, especially through the Sneddon Report, took the lead in considering what might be done. Throughout the eighties, there were similar opportunities and exploratory initiatives in Scotland and England, but in general the opportunities were not taken in either country. Then, around 1990, the professional debate was overtaken by political agendas, with very different outcomes in Scotland and in England. There have been deep frustrations in both countries for those concerned with high-quality ITE, but in England there has been some limited progress whereas in Scotland even the exploratory developments of the eighties seem to have ground to a halt.

The external observer could indeed become very depressed about the lack of development of collaborative partnership in Scottish ITE, were it not that Scotland has been demonstrating its capacity for imaginative collaborative partnership in the CPD field, with such initiatives as the Chartered Teacher and the School Leadership programmes, much admired south of the border. This and the evident commitment and influence of the GTCS give grounds for real hope.

In both countries, too, space may be opening up for new initiatives. In England, Furlong (2005) suggests that New Labour has to some extent lost interest in ITE, not seeing it as a necessary or most effective route through which to pursue its new professionalism for teachers. He is certainly right in his judgement that DFES and TTA both seem to believe that they have got ITE 'sorted'. Partnerships are under less pressure from Ofsted than for many years and it feels like it may be more possible to take imaginative initiatives than it has been for a long time. In Scotland, while as Smith, *et al.* (2006) conclude, the Second Stage Review of ITE (SEED, 2005) certainly leaves fundamental issues about partnership unresolved, it does seem to suggest that there might be a considerable degree of autonomy for local partnerships. Could one hope that this might mean that thoughtful leaders of faculties of education and enterprising, committed leaders of local authorities (like Judge and Brighouse) could develop new kinds of collaborative partnerships?

What is it that is needed? The answer is the same for both countries. There are four crucial ingredients. First, there has to be genuine respect for the expertise of

practising teachers from academic teacher educators and recognition that, while each of them has important and rich but different expertise from which beginning teachers need to learn, it is the learning from teachers and in schools that is the more crucial. Second, to make that possible it is essential that substantial resources be specifically provided for this purpose. Third, there has to be a recognition on all sides that schools and teachers need to engage in new learning if they are to make more effective use of their expertise in teaching for helping beginning teachers to learn (and the expertise of university lecturers will be of only limited help in this). Finally, the centre of gravity of ITE curricula has to move from the universities into the schools. This will mean the planning of new kinds of school-based curricula (cf. Hagger and McIntyre, 2006); and it will also mean that faculties of education need to move into the kind of service role to support school-based learning that has already been pioneered in Scotland in for example the Chartered Teacher programme.

Where can the ideas for planning these new school-based ITE curricula be found? Much interesting work has been done in other countries, and the review by Brisard, *et al.* (2004) provides a very valuable guide to such work. Creative, research-based work from the past in England and Scotland has, I suspect, been sitting on the shelves unneeded within recent regimes but is still highly relevant to a more enlightened future (e.g. Cameron-Jones, 1991; Hagger, *et al.*, 1993). Mainly, however, it will be necessary for partnership teams to invent, to develop, to explore and to improve these curricula in the schools. What an exciting prospect!

#### REFERENCES

- Benton, P. (1990) (ed) *The Oxford Internship Scheme: Integration and Partnership in Initial Teacher Education*, London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.
- Booth, M., Furlong, J. and Wilkin, M. (1990) (editors) *Partnership in Initial Teacher Training*, London: Cassell.
- Brisard, E., Menter, I. and Smith, I. (2004) *Models of Partnership in Programmes of Initial Teacher Education: A Systematic Review*, commissioned by the General Teaching Council of Scotland, Edinburgh: GTCS.
- Butcher, H.J. (1965) 'The attitudes of student teachers to education', *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, Vol.4, pp.17–24.
- Butts, D.C. (1983) *A Concept of Partnership: An Evaluation of the Collaborative Project on Teacher Education (Summary Report)*, University of Stirling/Central Region Education Authority.
- Cameron-Jones, M. (1982) *The Primary Teaching Practice Project: Final Report (Short Version)*, Edinburgh: Moray House College of Education.
- Cameron-Jones, M. (1991) *Training Teachers: A Practical Guide*, Edinburgh: SCRE.
- Clark, R.P. and Nisbet, J.D. (1963) 'The first two years of teaching' mimeographed report, Aberdeen College of Education.
- Conlon, T., Gemmill, T. and Long, A. (2001) 'Integration by Design: Addressing the Theory/Practice Problem in Teacher Education', Faculty of Education, University of Edinburgh.
- Cope, E. (1971) *School Experience in Teacher Education*, University of Bristol.
- Cope, P. and Stephen, C. (2001) 'A role for practising teachers in initial teacher education', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 17, pp.913–924.
- Counsell, C., Evans, M., McIntyre, D. and Raffan, J. (2000) 'The Usefulness of Educational Research for Trainee Teachers' Learning', *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol.26, pp.467–482.
- Crozier, G., Menter, I. and Pollard, A. (1990) 'Changing Partnership' in Booth, M., Furlong, J. and Wilkin, M. (editors) *Partnership in Initial Teacher Training*, London: Cassell.
- DES: Department of Education and Science (1972) *Teacher Education and Training (The James Report)*, London: HMSO.
- DES: Department of Education and Science (1984) *Initial Teacher Training: Approval of Courses*, Circular 3/84, London: DES.
- DES: Department of Education and Science (1989) *Initial Teacher Training: Approval of Courses*, Circular 24/89, London: DES.
- DfE: Department for Education (1992) *Initial teacher Training (Secondary Phase)*, Circular 9/92, London: DfE.
- Elder, R. and Kwiatkowski, H. (1993) *Partnership in Initial Teacher Education*, Glasgow/Dundee: St. Andrew's College/Northern College.

- Furlong, J., Hirst, P., Pocklington, K. and Miles, S. (1988) *Initial Teacher Training and the Role of the School*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C. and Whitty, G. (2000) *Teacher Education in Transition*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Furlong, J. (2005) 'New Labour and teacher education: the end of an era', *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol.31, pp.119–134.
- Gilroy, D.P. (1992) 'The political rape of initial teacher education in England and Wales: a JET rebuttal', *Journal of Education for Teaching*, Vol.18, pp.5–22.
- Griffiths, A. and Moore, A.H. (1967) 'Schools and Teaching Practice', *Education for Teaching*, Vol. 74, pp.33–39.
- Hagger, H. and McIntyre, D. (2006) *Learning Teaching from Teachers: Realising the Potential of School-based Initial Teacher Education*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- HMI: Her Majesty's Inspectorate (1982) *The New Teacher in School*, London: HMSO.
- HMI: Her Majesty's Inspectorate (1988) *The New Teacher in School*, London: HMSO.
- JM Consulting (2004) *Review of the Unit of Resource for Initial Teacher Training: Study of Provider Costs*, Norwich: HMSO.
- Judge H (1980) 'Teaching and professionalization: an essay in ambiguity', in Hoyle, E. and Megarry, J. (eds) *World Yearbook of Education 1980: Professional Development of Teachers*, London: Kogan Page, pp.340–9.
- Kirk, G. (1984) 'The new B.Ed in Scotland: Towards a Professional Degree', *Scottish Educational Review*, Vol.16, pp.19–26.
- Kirk, G. (1988) *Teacher Education and Professional Development*, Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Kirk, G. (2000) *Enhancing Quality in Teacher Education*, Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.
- Lacey, C. (1977) *The Socialisation of Teachers*, London: Methuen.
- McCall, J. (1988) 'Improving Teacher Quality – the potential of enhanced partnership between college and schools', *European Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol.11, No.2/3.
- McIntyre, D., Macleod, G. and Griffiths, R. (1977) *Investigations of Microteaching*, London: Croom Helm.
- McIntyre, D. (1980) 'The contribution of research to quality in teacher education' in Hoyle, E. and Megarry, J. (eds) *World Yearbook of Education 1980: Professional Development of Teachers*, London: Kogan Page, pp.293–307.
- McIntyre, D. (1988) 'Designing a Teacher Education Curriculum from Research and Theory on Teacher Knowledge' in J. Calderhead (editor) *Teachers' Professional Learning*, Lewes: The Falmer Press, pp.97–114.
- McIntyre, D. (1991) 'The Oxford University Model of Teacher Education', *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 19, pp.117–129.
- McIntyre, D. (1992/1995) 'Initial Teacher Education and the Work of Teachers: the 1992 Lawrence Stenhouse Memorial Lecture' in J. Rudduck (ed) (1995) *An Education that Empowers: A Collection of Lectures in Memory of Lawrence Stenhouse*, BERA Dialogues, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- McIntyre, D. (1997) (ed) *Teacher Education Research in a New Context: The Oxford Internship Scheme* New BERA Dialogues, London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- McNally, J., Cope, P., Inglis, W. and Stronach, I. (1994) 'Current realities in the student teaching experience: a preliminary enquiry', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol.10, pp.219–230.
- Morrison, A. and McIntyre, D. (1967) 'Changes in opinions about education during the first year of teaching', *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, Vol.6, pp.161–3.
- Morrison, A. and McIntyre, D. (1969) *Teachers and Teaching*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Ofsted: Office for Standards in Education (1992) *The New Teacher in School: A Survey by HM Inspectors in England and Wales*, London: HMSO.
- SED/GTCS (1978) *Learning to Teach (The Sneddon Report)*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- SEED: Scottish Executive Education Department (2005) *Second Stage Review of Teacher Education: Report of the Review Group*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Shipman, M.D. (1967) 'Theory and practice in the education of teachers', *Educational Research*, Vol.9, pp.208–212.
- Stark, M.E.R. (2000) 'Learning from Experience: The Contribution of Placement to Becoming a Primary Teacher' Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Strathclyde.
- Wilkin, M. (1990) 'The development of partnership in the United Kingdom' in Booth, M., Furlong, J. and Wilkin, M. (eds), *Partnership in Initial Teacher Training*, London: Cassell.
- Williams, R.H. (1963) 'Professional studies in teacher training', *Education for Teaching*, Vol.61, pp.29–33.