Mastering Teaching?

Please note that this is a working paper, offered in the spirit of supporting engagement and discussion at our seminar on 24th Oct and is NOT for wider circulation at this stage. Thank you!

Introduction

My exact memories of the practical preparations we made to introduce Masters’ accreditation onto PGCE programmes from September 2007 are vague. However, I suspect in common with colleagues in other UK universities at the time, I do remember programme meetings in which we would console ourselves that the additional paperwork this transition had generated would, at last, offer the recognition that our talented students deserved for their written work. This was often completed (we whispered in uncharitable asides) to a higher standard than that we’d marked by those registered on existing Masters’ courses. In other conversations, I remember speculating that enhanced accreditation could motivate those students struggling to value the written component of their PGCE. Some felt that reading and writing essays about teaching detracted from what they really wanted from the course, that is to teach well in the classroom. Others regarded the structured investigation on developing practice required as a worthless, trivial empirical social science project.

In the (OFSTED outstanding) institution in which I worked, we were encouraged to keep things simple through the change process, to ‘tweak’ our existing assignments, ‘refresh’ what was already there recognising that, in effect, it was already at an appropriate level. One university found warrant for 120 credits by holding their PGCE up to the Masters’ criteria and tweaking, another 90 credits; most settled on 40-60 credits, a figure that has become established over the past decade as an average across the sector. At the same time, further arrangements were needed to ensure that where scholarly work was not so scholarly, it still contributed to QTS and a PGCE. As written work was deemed essential, whether it reached the academic heights of Level 7 or not, creative use was made of alternative renditions of the PGCE acronym, e.g. ‘Professional Graduate Certificate in Education’ rather than ‘Post-Graduate Certificate in Education’. These options had existed before but as exit awards for students who could read and write about education but who, frankly, weren’t any good at practical teaching. At the time, and in the circumstances, it all seemed very sensible.

But was it?

I raise question somewhat reluctantly; to some extent it is a provocation. I am heavily invested in the change to Masters’ accreditation in principle and was committed to it from the outset. Fifteen years a PGCE tutor, I have tutored and marked Masters’ assignments on more topics than I care to remember, from the decidedly ropey to work that was potentially publishable, on 3 different high status PGCE programmes in research-intensive universities. Were any English university offering high quality research-informed provision ITE, surely it would be sector-leading institutions like these? I remain committed to the view that theoretical and technical ways of knowing combine with teachers’ situational awareness in a ‘textured’ form of professional judgement when they are teaching well (Winch et al 2015); so that teachers should be encouraged to engage with theory and the findings of educational research, the best place for this being linked in some way to a university. I remain committed personally and professionally to teaching teachers.

So why have I come to question the value of Masters’ accreditation in ITE in England? What has caused me to become so disillusioned by formal initial teacher education, and pessimistic about the possibility of change within the current structures and systems, that I no longer teach on the PGCE, finding and creating other spaces in which to engage teachers in theoretical perspectives on
teaching, including research findings? Has Masters accreditation, at least in its current form, helped or hindered teachers to master, or mistress, teaching?

To explain the thinking that has led me to question the Masters’ component of PGCE so seriously, I begin by placing the ongoing debate about ITE in England into context briefly. I draw attention to the way in which attachment to learning in teach in school from experience, and in preference to university-based teacher education, has stuck more doggedly in England, unlike other parts of the UK and further afield. I acknowledge a variable, changing picture in teacher education internationally.

I soften my established position on the place of theory in teacher education in response to important challenges posed by fellow philosophers of education, whilst advancing two reservations with their alternative point of view. This dialogue between philosophers is one of interest and potential significance to teacher education and teacher educators, I note in passing, showing here how the debate helps to shed light on difficulties to have emerged from the development of Masters’ provision within the English system. I conclude by proposing new forms of critical reflection which encourage engagement with theory so as to re-humanise ITE, whether or not it is accredited.

1. **Peculiarities of teacher education in England**

Teacher education provision in higher education in England has a long history, linked to the development of opportunities for women to access higher education. However, learning to teach on the job and from experience has a longer history still, developed in a range of settings. These included monitorial schools, providing basic education for poor children where lead instructors modelled practice to older pupils; small local schools often run by priests, using their homes, education and personal initiative to teach reading and writing in order to supplement their church livings; dedicated school buildings with one or perhaps two teachers provided basic instruction, using teaching methods learned from example and paid for by local benefactors; and graduates, employed by independent boarding schools to pass on the fruits of their university education to boys of wealthier families without means to support a personal tutor.

Could it be for reasons of gender (teacher education in university having developed far more closely to women’s academic development in higher education, rather than that of men enjoying freer access to the full range of academic subjects); or social class (the wealthy, members of the establishment have done very well by academically well-qualified and untrained teachers); historical accident, or some other cause(s), that the value of learning to teach in this way has persisted in England more readily than in other parts of Europe? Elsewhere, during the second half of the nineteenth century, formal teacher education programmes developed, informed by more technical theories of pedagogy and didactics (Wei, in preparation). For much of the twentieth century in England, teachers have not needed to be qualified, particularly in the secondary and independent sectors.

Ongoing concerns about teacher quality led to the introduction of mandatory qualification accredited by universities from the 1970s onwards, making good sense of some lamentable teaching I experienced first-hand while at school myself in England during the 1970s and 80s at the hands of teachers who were not formally qualified. The introduction of Masters’ on the PGCE came about at the latter end of this trend during the first decade of this century, following the political commitment of successive Labour governments to ‘Education, Education, Education’. However, the current policy drive back towards a more school-based approach to teacher education since 2010 is captured in a series of significant policy documents: the Importance of Teaching (DfE, 2010); the
Implementation Plan published in November 2011 (DfE, 2011) and the Teachers Standards (DfE, 2012) in which no necessary relationship is assumed with a university-based period of initial preparation for teaching. This latter move anticipated the relaxation in July 2012 of rules regarding the employment of unqualified teachers in certain kinds of state-funded schools in England (Harrison, 2012 p. 8).

The Carter Review of ITE in 2015 indicated the start of a more reconciliatory tone towards university-based teacher education in policy making in England, finding current provision (with large elements still based in HEIs) to be reasonably good. Promoting engagement with research evidence, obvious territory for university-based provision, although not unproblematically so, is identified as a priority area by Carter and is currently being developed further by the DfE. The current recruitment crisis in teaching in England has forced further push-back on the part of government. However, these concessions to teacher education in universities have been half-hearted at best. Moreover, the policy terms being dictated are part of the problem when it comes to thinking about theory, practice and Masters’ work on PGCE programmes as I will go on to argue in the paper’s next section.

Relations between policy makers and the educational research community in Scotland are far less frosty, by contrast, and formal training and accreditation has long been mandatory for teachers. Career-long teacher education “striking the right balance and connections between university experience and school experience” was advocated by the influential Donaldson Review (2010, p. 7) and widely accepted by policy makers and practitioners. The notion of “extended professionalism” (p. 5) it argued for is linked implicitly, if not explicitly, to ongoing engagement with educational theory by teachers. In Northern Ireland, CPD for new teachers has been prioritised in ways that involve universities, so that the status of teachers as professionals in their field is elevated. A dual approach to CPD enabling new teachers to keep thinking about, and engaging with, theory ensures that educational research is not divorced from the classroom, and that teachers – as professionals – are encouraged to develop their practice constantly. In Wales an explicit drive to promote teachers’ engagement with educational research to improve standards in teaching was highlighted in ‘the General Teaching Council for Wales’s advisory paper, Raising the Bar in ITET and Early Career Development (GTCW, 2011)’. This document not only prioritised ‘higher quality of entrants to ITE’, but also ‘enhancing opportunities for engagement with research and scholarship during ITE’ (ibid).

Beyond the UK, patterns of teacher education vary considerably; in many places, teacher education is in a state of flux. Some countries do now favour employment-based learning of the kind being pursued by successive governments in England, and following the pattern of practice in many parts of the United States of America. I have in mind here changes being proposed to teacher education in France for example. In Hong Kong, a context I know increasingly well, pre-service teachers typically undertake 16-weeks of teaching practice during their Postgraduate Diploma in Education (PGDE), 8 weeks fewer than is typical in England. In other parts of the world, more positive opinions of the place of universities in teacher education may be evident, in Northern Europe, for example. In South Africa, the model of teacher education adopted is biased heavily towards theory, and university-based interaction with students (Davids and Orchard 2018). Typically, pre-service teachers in South Africa may only complete a six-week practicum i.e. 30 days, possibly in only one type of school, compared with a minimum of 120 days in two different schools in England. This results in beginning practitioners who are often highly reflective at the level of principle but unclear about how principles ought to play out within the practical expectations and demands of a classroom.
2. Theory and teacher education

Commitment to the value of theory in teaching and teacher education remains contested, unsurprisingly in England perhaps, given the ambivalence towards university-led teacher education just sketched. Over twenty years ago Donald MacIntyre observed (1995) that as teacher education was becoming increasingly school-based, the question of “whether and in what sense there is a useful place for ‘theory’ in initial teacher education remains a source of tension and confusion” (p.365). MacIntyre was responding to an earlier argument of Robin Alexander’s (1984) that ‘practical theorising’ as a notion of theory as intellectual process should replace the traditional emphasis on theory as knowledge, in turn responding to moves to strengthen the academic dimension of teacher education programmes in England triggered a decade earlier by the Robbins Review. Going forwards, the debate has continued unabated in England (e.g. Jean Murray, 2006; BERA/RSA Inquiry 2013-14) and internationally (see Flores 2017).

The debate is one which has been brought teacher educators’ attention back to philosophy of education and the work of philosophers. MacIntyre’s notion of ‘practical theorising’, which went on to influence both Oxford Internship and the Cambridge University PGCE, arose out of a debate with Paul Hirst. More recently, the PESGB sponsored Philosophical Perspectives on the future of Teacher Education (PPFTE) initiative brought teacher educators and philosophers together in a series of fruitful 48-hour dialogues, captured in three edited volumes of papers, two philosophical collections (Heilbronn and Foreman-Peck, 2015; Jackson, Orchard and Lin 2018) and one in teacher education (Ellis and Orchard 2014). Teacher educators’ interest in this area is demonstrated by the healthy attendance figures at the regular symposium sessions held at the Annual BERA Conference which are organised to include a teacher education dimension within the Philosophy of Education SIG (Special Interest Group). Given how few philosophers of education are involved actively in ITE in England, it is encouraging to see the discipline attract this degree of positive attention.

In my own work relating philosophy to teacher education, I remain convinced of the key place that theory should occupy in helping to inform teachers’ professional judgement. I am concerned that particular kinds of theory included on the PGCE, and that the (very limited) timing of the required academic component of the PGCE is inappropriately placed at the start of a teachers’ career, such that programme structures do not allow for a sufficiently sustained engagement with theory. I am mindful of arguments that Carrie Winstanley has advanced, from a primary and BA Education Studies perspective, that pre-service teachers do engage willingly and meaningfully with educational theory without much experience on which to reflect. However, my own Secondary PGCE experience is in tension with Carrie’s, both as a former PGCE tutor and pre-service teacher. I hated the theoretical elements of my own PGCE and couldn’t see the point of writing essays and reading about education when what I wanted to do was get on with the business of teaching.

Poacher turned gamekeeper.

Talking about teaching experience, on the other hand, has always struck me as a valuable process enabling me to learn from my mistakes, be reflective, change. Like others before me, it took more than five years of being a teacher to appreciate the value of engaging more systematically with educational theory for my own practice. Defining theory as ‘systematically organised knowledge, whether it is conceptual, empirical or normative, which can be used in teaching to inform professional judgment or action’ (Winch et al 2015) it was my PhD which enabled me to make sense of intuitive unease I experienced at the growing concern for measurement, effectiveness,
instrumentalism in schooling from the mid-1990s. Learning about education in a structured way at that point enabled me to draw inferences across the interplay of professional practices I observed and/or experienced, including the policies that were impacting on me. Structured knowledge and understanding of education helped me to make sense and articulate, not only of what I thought as a teacher and what I ought to do, I began to better understand why other people disagreed with me. Whether or not I needed a formal research training is another matter. If theory is to be engaged with, so as to develop as a teacher, rather than as an educational theorist or researcher, why isn’t simply talking about it good enough?

I continue to think that theory helps teachers to make better judgements, underscoring their thinking, framing the concepts teachers use, structures their thinking about education. I can see how educational values, aims, curricula, pedagogy all need to be interpreted by teachers, together with the ways in which these foundational elements of educational practice are connected; I can even see why reading about such matters might help teachers to reinforce and deepen their interpretations of these concepts and to understand how the connections they chose to make are likely to be contested. Without that understanding, and that of the ethical basis on which their chosen profession rests, how can they make independent moral judgments about the right thing to do in the complicated workplace environment in which they find themselves (Orchard and Winch, 2015)? But this is something they need to be able to do in practice and in the moment, judging appropriate action in various school and classroom contexts? They should explore and reflect on the values that underpin the practice of education and the school curriculum (Orchard and Winch, 2015, p. 29); but why the need to write academically about it?

Professional teachers, I maintain, connect educational theory and research and the classroom together, using ‘a well-thought-through and coherent conceptual framework, on knowledge of well-substantiated empirical research, and on considered ethical principles, to arrive at decisions in the classroom context’ (Orchard and Winch, 2015 p. 13). The content and processes used in teacher education should leave teachers with a firm grasp of key educational concepts and, where these are contested, engage them in relevant theoretical debates. In the light of the Carter Review they should know, understand and be able to apply the findings of high-quality educational research as these become available. Understand; but do they really need to engage in the social practices of learning how to do such research themselves?

3. Listening to critics

My views have been challenged by fellow philosophers of education, including David Aldridge (2015), Padraig Hogan (2014) and Paul Standish. When we have debated my work before publicly, Paul has been concerned to reclaim the notion of teacher as craft worker, thus the doing, making and intuitive aspects of teaching, from the limitations I have identified with it. I may, or may not, provoke a different response from him with this working paper if he is able to attend the session.

The co-authored paper I prepared for the BERA/RSA Inquiry (Winch et al 2015) on philosophical perspectives on the implications of educational research for teachers’ professional knowledge was described by Hogan as seeming “somewhat distant from the experience of being and becoming a teacher, in all its dimensions and in its lived fullness”. Yet this seems to me to be a matter of opinion and easily contested. Having been a teacher and latterly a teacher educator for a period of 30 years – thus a long time, although maybe not as long as for Padraig – the emphasis being placed on knowledge clearly isn’t as distant from my experience of being and becoming a teacher as it is from his, or I simply wouldn’t have signed up to it!
David Aldridge expresses concern that thinking like mine fails to engage with ontological concerns in teaching. He observes:

“There is a difficulty in reconciling phenomenological accounts of teaching and learning with analytical approaches to the value of educational research: philosophers in each domain have often seen themselves largely as doing different things”.

Potentially difficult I agree, and maybe neglected in my earlier writing, but not impossible. I want to resist and move beyond such binary ways of thinking about these complex matters.

Teaching well, Hogan maintains, is not primarily about possessing knowledge and skills but a way of being and relating rather than ‘having and performing’. Teaching as a practice, he argues:

“involves a certain ontological shift on the part of the practitioner and the would-be practitioner. It’s not the kind of shift that is accomplished once and for all; rather the kind which one hopefully makes in some meaningful degree in one’s experiences of becoming a teacher, and which one struggles to preserve, to regain, to enrich in one’s more mature experiences as a practitioner.”

Again, I want to resist easy binaries in thinking such issues through. However, I do have sympathy for the possible misinterpretation of our remarks flagged up by this concern, recognising in the mainstream pedagogical content and approach now operating in teacher education in England an obsession with possessing knowledge in particular, of a simplistic and instrumentally valuable kind, and at the expense of almost everything else. A colleague reported pre-service teachers on the programmes she runs being motivated only by those aspects that are accredited; she doubted there would be takers for a project I am planning to run (on the margins of the PGCE, given the current climate), whereby participants will be able to have interesting conversations with people training to teach in other parts of the world via video-conferencing in order to encounter cultural difference, unless there were something more ‘tangible’ in it for them!

In the face of this apparent closed-mindedness, I wonder how far the performative stance taken by pre-service teachers like these does promote mastery of teaching? The stakes have been raised, attention focussed on the quality of critical reflection assessed against criteria aligned to formal academic skills and learning rather than reflection for its own sake. Surely this shifts the purpose of that which is being undertaken away from heart-work, in Hogan’s terms, to head work of questionable worth?

While the introduction of Masters’ credits may have incentivised some potentially reluctant pre-service teachers to engage with educational theory for questionable reasons, my own perception over the decade is that this hasn’t been widespread. Some students like the written assignments, others simply do not. and remain unmoved by the prospect of the potential reward being offered them because they simply do not care. In a recent survey of pre-service teachers’ perceptions of theory in ITE (Orchard and Kelly in preparation), participants were asked whether they were likely to complete the Masters’ they had started on their PGCE and their answers were mixed.

Some would, they said, because they appreciated the attention paid in education to children/young people and their development; others said not, or that they would be interested in pursuing a Masters’ but in their subject, not education. More still showed some interest but not at their own time and expense, being keen to prioritise their time elsewhere, including improving their classroom practice, time and money for holidays and paying off student debts.
All this said, in work with teachers in which I have recently been involved, I have noted that well-crafted Masters’ assignments can provide both the structure and stimulus to acquire knowledge and skills while also stimulating personal and professional growth, and the very best assignments I have read demonstrate this, for example a stunning piece of work submitted recently on teachers’ perspectives on school violence in Barbados. Experienced PGCE tutors comment regularly that those who complete written assignments confidently often also distinguish themselves as classroom teachers.

Trying to capture in words the interconnected qualities of situated understanding, technical knowledge and critical reflection that informs the most appropriate decision making within teaching is challenging to achieve in writing. One way in which Chris Winch, Alis Oancea and I chose to describe those dispositions to act well in the moment in classrooms is ‘professional judgement’ (2015). We adopted Gramsci’s (1975) notion of ‘good sense’ as an alternative to ‘common sense’ which we felt was problematic in that it may not be ‘common’ to all; and that distilled assumptions rendered simplistically into maxims and homilies need not be ‘sensible’. I am keen to explore other influential accounts of professional judgement in the field, including those developed by Ruth Heilbronn and David Hanson, in order to develop this critical idea at the heart of what it means to teach well. I remain committed to the idea that theoretical knowledge will retain a place in my account but am less confident that the complex ways of knowing, understanding and judging that teachers need can be covered in existing provision and equated to 60 Masters credits.

4. Ways forward

In this final section of the paper I offer 4 examples of reflective work in teacher education I have developed for and with pre-service teachers in England, one generic and 3 subject-specific given my background on a secondary PGCE programme. Each example facilitates elements of structured theoretical learning while making allowances for the quality of space and place that might be promote opportunities to develop as a teacher in other, richer dimensions as Hogan argues. Some of these activities turned out to inspire Masters’ work leading to accreditation but this was not the main motivation for undertaking them. Inevitably at this exploratory stage, each example raises numerous questions as well as offering answers. Nowhere do I claim these present complete solutions to what are nuanced and complex practical and theoretical issues.

a. Philosophy for Teachers (P4T)

Drawing on the model of learning through dialogue in a “community of practice”, comprising new teachers, teacher educators and philosophers, P4T aims to support teachers in thinking ethically about dilemmas they face in their early experiences in classrooms. P4T methods are designed to accommodate teaching as a relational practice in which ethically complex situations arise to which teachers need to respond. Alongside the development of dialogical pedagogical skills from experience, members of the community support each other in thinking ethically about dilemmas faced, generating these from their own experiences of classroom practice. One key aim of the exercise is to give teachers the opportunity to develop personal qualities, knowledge and understanding that sensitize them to the ethical complexities of practice so that they address them more confidently and competently. Another is to recognise the personal and institutional benefits of addressing ethical complexities collectively.

3 pilot events have taken place in England between 2014-16 which have led the team developing this work to think that a number of benefits could accrue from the opportunity it affords for extended ‘critical reflection’ away from the ‘busy-ness’ of conventional teacher education. More
recently in 2017 the model was trialled in Cape Province, South Africa, bringing together student teachers and tutors from 3 universities and across religious, cultural and ethnic divisions who had not worked together before previously. These pilots suggest that a ‘community of enquiry’ style professional development model, including a characteristically philosophical dimension to the dialogical activity, might extend and develop established teacher education practices of ‘critical reflection’ in distinctive ways. We believe that there is an urgent need for space and time of this sort, to challenge the nature, scope and reach of conventional teacher education provision whether located in schools or universities.

P4T is not without its limitations as those who have been developing it (and P4C) readily acknowledge. The potential absence of expert or ‘powerful’ knowledge in a community of enquiry established on democratic principles can lead to discussions which wander down intellectual cul de sac, placing pressure on teacher educators and pre-service teachers alike, given how time is at a premium on a PGCE course. By the same token, some structured subject specific input from a community member is possible on the P4T model; and the process of wandering had value. Furthermore, dialogical pedagogical models other than P4C have been developed over time which might prove as good when translated and adapted to the teacher education context.

b. ‘Theology for teachers’: Corrymeela

My teaching subject is Religious Education. An exploratory project in June 2017 brought together a mixed group from a university in South West England. The inter-generational group (the age of participants ranged from 18 to 69) included: student teachers on a 36-week PGCE, in-service teachers, consultants/advisers and university-based teacher educators; religion and theology undergraduates from the university and one of their tutors; two multi-faith chaplains. The 36-hour visit to the Corrymeela community and Belfast arose when it became clear that the student RE teachers knew little or nothing of the politics or history of sectarian division in N Ireland and an opportunity arose to address this through a visit. The dialogical and experiential professional learning that ensued was loosely framed within the interfaith tradition familiar to the group leaders in England and N. Ireland and were consistent with the ethos of the university’s ‘multi-faith’ chaplaincy. Given the commitment of the group to teaching RE in England, and clarity around expectations prior to departure, the framing worked well with this particular group many, but not all, of whom were personally religious. Some adjustments might have been needed to be made to the explicit positioning of the trip had the group comprised a broader Humanities team of teachers; or perhaps the positioning of the experience would have shifted with a different group of participants. This remains a hypothesis at this stage that warrants further testing.

c. Shared Space project: teachers and researchers ‘in residence’

The Corrymeela initiative just described was part of a broader project concerned with the claim that RE promotes warmer community relations, looked at through the social psychological lens of ‘contact hypothesis’ (Williams et al. in preparation). Activities on this body explored the potential of the contact principles applied to RE teaching with both pre and in-service teachers: these include equal status, collaboration towards common goals within context of wider institutional support (Alport 1954). However, the main focus was on in-service teachers and offered through CPD and the notion of dialogue through being ‘in residence’ was key, along the lines of an ‘artist in residence’. Two teachers were welcomed to ‘residencies’ in the university for a period of one week each (along the lines of the Farmington Fellowship scheme for RE teachers in England.
d. Generation Global: difficult dialogues using video conferencing

A further strand of work at an earlier stage starts from a similar premise to ‘P4T’ i.e. that successful dialogical pedagogies developed initially with children might be adapted with success to work with adults, recognising the respective differences in their needs as learners. Modelling alternative pedagogical models was also identified as an instrumental incentive for including ethical reflection, creating a ‘leaky space’ (Orchard et al 2016) on an otherwise over-crowded ITE curriculum. Generation Global https://generation.global brings diverse groups together to share ‘difficult dialogues’ using video-conferencing, lending itself potentially to the task of discussing difficult and potentially controversial discussion about ethics in classrooms. A challenge for this and other projects aiming for international range and scope will be which or whose cultural pedagogical tradition should frame the discussion? Why import, impose even, one way of thinking, acting and being on pedagogical practices and assumptions drawing on alternative beliefs and values?

5. Provisional Conclusions

The introduction of Masters’ accreditation onto the PGCE in England since 2010, however well intended, has proved a mixed blessing. Introduction to theory has a place within pre-service teacher education, although there is deep-seated resistance to this in England particularly compared with other parts of the UK, for reasons that aren’t entirely certain. Given this ambivalence, linking engagement with educational theory and research to assignment criteria that may be in tension with the kinds of activities likely to promote excellent teaching, as opposed to excellent research is problematic. In particular, it isn’t clear why so much critical reflection on education during a PGCE needs to involve pre-service teachers in academic writing.

Instead, educational research and theory needs to be integrated more fully into the PGCE programme – four ideas for doing this have been sketched in the penultimate section of the paper. Activities like Philosophy for Teachers (P4T) offer teachers a space where they can reflect critically and deliberate on the wider ethical dimension of teaching in ways that also develop their ‘conceptual maps’ through opportunities to engage with educational theory. Activities like P4T might stimulate wider reading of academic articles although this need not be the case. At least one of these proposed activities has been targeted more at in-service as well as pre-service teachers.

One final issue with the PGCE particularly could be that the programme is simply too short and that a more meaningful approach to Masters might be taken were arrangements made to extend it over two years, for example on an apprenticeship model allowing more realistic amounts of time and intellectual space for the acquisition of the elements of knowledge and expertise that are necessary for the development of professional teachers. In other parts of the world where teaching is afforded a higher status this investment in teacher education is commonplace.