



## Teacher Education in Australia in Uncertain Times

Tom O'Donoghue<sup>†</sup>

*University of Western Australia*

Currently the Australian university sector almost has a monopoly in the provision of courses and programmes for the initial preparation of teachers across the nation. What the future holds for the field, however, is quite uncertain. This uncertainty, as this paper will demonstrate, is reflected in a number of trends. First, while a trend has manifested itself over the last number requiring that in order to gain accreditation as a teacher one must graduate with a professional masters' degree, it is not at all clear that this is being deemed attractive to potential student teachers. Secondly, national policies in all aspects of teacher education continues to be very difficult to implement since, constitutionally, States can, and do, insist on adding their own variations to them. Thirdly, the historical trend of regularly calling for an overhaul of approaches to teacher preparation in Australia had not died out and continues to be distract teacher educators from getting on with their work. Fourthly, further distraction is provided by a focus on the part of policy makers on emphasising the outcomes of programmes of teacher preparation rather than their content and on gathering evidence on the impact of the graduates of the various providers on student learning. Fifthly, the notion of 'the teaching continuum', receives very little emphasis in the current policy discourse on teacher preparation in Australia. Finally, the instructions for institutions applying for accreditation for their courses of teacher preparation and that the hours of work that have to be undertaken to provide the documentation required is so enormous that it is almost impossible to include approaches in courses of teacher preparation that cultivate creativity and innovation.

---

<sup>†</sup> Address for correspondence: Professor Tom O'Donoghue, Graduate School of Education, The University of Western Australia (M428), 35 Stirling Highway, 6009 Perth, Australia. Email: tom.odonoghue@uwa.edu.au.

## **Introduction**

Currently, in Australia, the State governments are responsible for some preschool education and for State-managed primary and secondary school education (Campbell & Proctor, 2014). Each State and Territory government has a Ministry of Education, Youth and Training to oversee the organisation of an associated government department. The department in each case oversees administration and financing, engages in the development of curriculum, and seeks to ensure that teachers are prepared according to what they deem to be appropriate standards.

Education throughout Australia is compulsory for children between the ages of six and 17, with preschool education being available for children aged between three and five years (Campbell & Proctor, 2014). Primary school education extends for seven years in New South Wales, with children starting in kindergarten and going through to year 6, while in some other States, primary school education extends for six years. Secondary school education throughout the nation is for five years or six years. This period is known as 'the years 7-12 schooling-level' in some States and as 'the years 8-12 schooling level' in others.

Most schooling in Australia takes place within the government sector. The Catholic Church also operates schools at all levels. Some, termed 'independent Catholic schools', are primarily run by religious orders and are financed directly through the fee structures and grants received from the Federal Government. Each Catholic diocese also has its 'Catholic diocesan school system' and its Catholic education office, which controls the employment of teachers, the management of schools, and curriculum development. The national Catholic Education Commission was established in 1974 (Dixon, 2005). Its major role is to distribute and administer funds provided for Catholic schooling by the State, Territory and Federal governments.

Australia also has school systems run by other religious denominations and by various education groups, along with having

what are known as independent schools, some of which have a religious affiliation (Anderson, 1990). All of these are also fee paying schools, although they receive the majority of their funding from the Federal Government. Finally, Australia has students who are home-schooled, who receive tuition through State-funded distance education institutions, who are in hospital schools, and who are in schools that follow recognised programmes in ‘alternative education’.

The Australian university sector almost has a monopoly in the provision of courses and programmes for the initial preparation of teachers across the nation (May et al., 2009). Furthermore, nearly all of the universities are involved in the enterprise, along with also being involved in offering professional development courses for practising teachers, and masters’ and doctorate-level courses in ‘education studies’. The main emphasis within the courses for the initial preparation of teachers is on creating professionals for the early childhood, primary and secondary school sectors in each of the nation’s States and Territories. Enrolled students can be prepared as ‘generalist’ teachers as well as have the opportunity to specialise in specific aspects of curriculum and pedagogy. This general pattern, however, is a relatively recent one when considered over the wider course of the history of education in Australia. Furthermore, one should not assume that the apparent homogeneity in the field means that various uncertainties do not exist. Indeed, not only do they, but some are troubling and need to be detailed. Accordingly, following an exposition on how the current situation in relation to teacher education in Australia has evolved, the remainder of this paper considers these uncertainties

## **Historical Background**

Unlike the situation in Britain, government involvement in schooling in Australia commenced at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Between 1872 and 1893, all colonies passed legislation leading to education acts which established government-controlled school systems and withdrew State aid to church schools. These State schools were characterised as being ‘free, compulsory and

secular' (Hogan, 1987). The Protestant churches largely accepted the development, while continuing to run their elite fee-paying grammar schools. The acts were, however, fiercely opposed by the Catholic Church, which ended up having to maintain and develop its own school sector without State aid until the 1960s (Austin & Selleck, 1975; Praetz, 1974).

While the various Christian churches had instituted secondary school education from the middle of the nineteenth century, it was not until the end of that century that public sector provision in the area was developed through the establishment of what were termed 'high schools'. These schools provided the foundation for the secondary school system that developed within each State. After Federation in 1901, the various States maintained their control of education and the contributions of the Federal government to education were minimal for many decades. (Barcan, 1980)

A major reason for the control of public schooling in Australia by State education authorities since their inception in the late nineteenth century arose out of a desire to provide education opportunities for all children no matter how remote their place of residence. Indeed, until very recently, the education department in each of the nation's States and two Territories was solely responsible within the public schools' sector for such matters as curriculum, school buildings and supplies, school-leaving examinations, teacher salary determinants and payments, staffing appointments, and transfers between schools (Kandell, 1938; Wilkinson et al., 2006). It was not until the early 1970s, that State education departments across the country were decentralised through a breaking down of bureaucracy to seek administrative and economic advantages and effectiveness (Connell, 1993). Significant change, on the other hand, had taken place with regard to involvement by the Federal government in school support. In particular, from 1956, Federal Government financial assistance to non-State schools increased greatly. Also, while the nation's technical and further education and training sector remained the sole responsibility of the States and Territories, Federal government financial assistance was forthcoming after World War II, and

increased greatly from 1974 (Martin, O'Donoghue & O'Neill, 2012).

The period between 1960 and 1975 is sometimes termed as having been 'the heyday of higher education' (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2014) in Australia. Developments during this period, which witnessed large growth in the university arena, were driven initially by economic goals and later by equity and access considerations. The Federal Government also established Colleges of Advanced Education (CEAs) separate from the universities (Gardiner, O'Donoghue & O'Neill, 2011). Many of these were in regional towns, often using existing State-run teachers colleges and technical colleges as foundations. Their brief was to concentrate on being teaching institutions only.

In 1989, the university and CAE sectors were combined through a process of institutional mergers. This reduced the number of separate institutions; between 1988 and 1994, 19 universities and 44 colleges became 36 universities. All teacher preparation programmes in the nation became consolidated within the new university sector through amalgamations of existing university education department providers, State teachers' college providers, independent providers which were mainly religious-owned, and State CAE providers (Gardiner, O'Donoghue & O'Neill, 2011).

Taking account of the general background outlined above, May *et al.* (1989) identified five chronological phases through which teacher preparation in Australia has passed from 1788 to the present. They termed the first phase 'the unregulated phase' and it ran until approximately 1850. The second phase ran from 1851-1945, during which the emphasis was on both an apprenticeship model through a pupil-teacher system and on in-college teacher preparation following the introduction of teachers colleges, with the provision of teacher preparation courses in the universities being in the minority. The third phase is one that witnessed the hegemony of the teachers colleges. The fourth phase was one during which the Commonwealth government entered the world of teacher preparation with the creation of CAEs and the absorption of many

teachers colleges within them, while they also offered courses in other professional areas. The next, and present, phase began in the late 1980s with the creation of what became known as the 'unified national system' and during which teacher preparation came to be located almost solely within faculties of education in universities.

### **The Current Situation in Relation to Teacher Preparation in Australia: developments and Uncertainties**

Engagement in initial teacher preparation across Australia has become a large enterprise. In 2013, there were 79,623 students enrolled as student teachers in the nation (Australian Government Department of Education and Training, 2014). Also, 17,900 students graduated as teachers in the same year and many of them entered the national teaching workforce of 261,585 full time equivalent teachers. At this point, there were more than 450 programmes in 48 institutions (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2014). While most of these institutions were universities, a few colleges and TAFE providers were also involved. At the same time, while the number of programmes might seem to be very large, this observation should not be overemphasised since the listing included each program for preparation to teach each secondary school subject specialisation, including mathematics, science, physical education, English, social sciences, visual arts, and languages.

A trend over the last number of years has resulted in the postgraduate route to obtaining a teaching qualification being emphasised. This has largely been due to length-of-programme concerns. The result is that most institutions have moved from one-year postgraduate diplomas to two-year Master of Teaching awards. Also, the accreditation regulations for most postgraduate programmes of teacher preparation now require that one must have graduated with this new masters' degree.

Currently, there are eight teacher registration authorities across the country whose role is to monitor both entry into the profession and one's continuing practice within it. All have governing councils or boards, usually comprising representation from employers, schools, unions and universities. Programmes of teacher preparation are accredited by the relevant State or territory teacher registration authority in order for graduates to be eligible for teacher registration in that State or Territory. Also, registered teachers are usually granted registration in other States or Territories through mutual recognition procedures. The accreditation processes themselves have led to teacher educators being swamped by the production of huge volumes of documentation. Much of this relates to ticking boxes in matrices (Mockler, 2015) in order to relate the assessment of programmes of preparation to the nation's 'Professional Standards for Teachers'. These standards are the result of a long period of work whose origins can be traced back to 17 July 2003, when the Australian Government Minister for Education, Science and Training, Dr Brendan Nelson, announced that an institute to promote quality teaching and school leadership would be established.

A Consortium of the Allen Consulting Group, Dr Gregor Ramsey and Deloitte was then commissioned by the Federal Department of Education, Science and Training to develop an implementation strategy to establish the Institute (Allen Consulting Group, Department of Education, Science and Training, 2003). Based on submissions and consultations, a detailed implementation strategy and establishment plan was presented to the Australian Government in March 2004. Teaching Australia was then established. It had four core functions: professional standards and accreditation professional learning and course accreditation research and communication promotion of the profession. It was launched as a permanent body on 5 December 2005, following a period of interim operation as the National Institute for Quality Teaching and School Leadership (NIQTSL).

Teaching Australia became the **Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership** (AITSL) in 2009, with a brief to advance

the effectiveness and standing of the teaching profession through assuming responsibility for rigorous national professional standards, fostering and driving high quality professional development for teachers and school leaders, working collaboratively across jurisdictions, and engaging with key professional bodies (JCQTA, 2009). By now, work on a set of Australian Professional Standards for Teachers had commenced under the auspices of the Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs (MCEECDYA), which was renamed the Education Council in 2009. Also, significant work was undertaken by the Australian Standards Sub-group of the Australian Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs Senior Officials Committee (AEEYSOC) during 2009-10. The Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) assumed responsibility for validating and finalising 'The Standards' in July 2010 (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2018). This body is entirely owned by the Australian government, with the Federal Education Minister being its only member.

To be eligible for employment in Australian schools one must now hold a 4-year full-time equivalent higher education qualification, structured in one of the following ways:

- A 3-year undergraduate degree plus a 2-year graduate entry teaching qualification;
- An integrated qualification of at least 4 years combining discipline studies and professional studies;
- A combined degree of at least 4 years;
- Other combinations approved by teacher regulatory authorities in consultation with AITSL deemed equivalent to the above.

The fourth structure outlined above leaves a certain amount of room for alternative modes of teacher preparation. Nevertheless, all pathways into teaching in schools in Australia, require strong university involvement (Department of Education, 2018).



At the same time, the national policy in teacher education has been notoriously difficult to implement in the education sphere in Australia. Despite all State ministers of education agreeing to the establishment of AITSL and signing up to national standards, some States have insisted on adding their own variation to them. In New South Wales, for example, what have been termed ‘elaborations’ of the standards have been imposed in the areas of classroom management, special needs, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander education, ICT, and literacy and numeracy, even though all of these areas are addressed in a more general way in the articulation of the national standards (New South Wales Education Standards Authority, 2018). This outlining of additional requirements has added further to the huge documentation process with which providers of courses of teacher preparation have to engage.

There is also concern about the decline in the level of student achievement scores required by certain universities for entry to undergraduate programmes of teacher preparation. The associated argument is that teachers who cannot master challenging academic content themselves are unlikely to be able to teach it, regardless of their personal characteristics or experiences. This, however, is not a problem in relation to all providers and particularly and is particularly not so in relation to the ‘older’ universities, which have been very resistant to dropping their entry requirements. In the case of The University of Western Australia, for example, established in 1913, teacher preparation programmes have always been, as they still are, postgraduate programmes with standards of entry that are very high. This applies in relation to the three areas in which teacher preparation is offered: secondary school teacher preparation, primary school teacher preparation, and early childhood teacher preparation. Only graduates with an undergraduate degree of a minimum of 3 years of study are accepted for entry. Also, because most of them are graduates of UWA, they have to have already achieved very high scores in their tertiary entrance examinations for undergraduate study. Indeed, over the last number of years it has not been unusual to have students enrol to a teacher [preparation programme to already have a masters or a PhD degree.

Notwithstanding such pockets of excellence, however, the content of the 2014 Federal government report, *Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers* (Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group, 2015) indicated that an historical trend of regularly calling for an overhaul of approaches to teacher preparation in Australia had not died out. It identified the following as being key problem areas:

- The Australian Professional Standards for Teachers were being weakly applied;
- Australians were not confident that entrants to programmes of initial teacher preparation were the best fit for the job;
- Not all programmes of teacher preparation were equipping graduates with evidence-based teaching strategies;
- Providers of teacher preparation programmes were not assessing classroom readiness against the Professional Standards;
- There was insufficient support for beginning teachers.

What was then proposed was that entry to programmes be restricted to those students achieving in the top 30 per cent of the school-leaving cohort nationally, improving the quality of programmes, and enhancing partnerships with schools in order to ensure a better integration of theory and practice.

Since then, the focus within the field has been on emphasising the outcomes of programmes of teacher preparation rather than their content, on raising the quality of entrants, and on gathering evidence on the impact of the graduates of the various providers on student learning. While welcomed by policy makers, as evidenced by their rhetoric, the pursuit of these foci also has major financial implications. Where it all leads to eventually remains to be seen. For the moment, however, it is difficult on cogitating this matter not to recall Beeby's stages of education development, which focus on the qualitative aspects of teaching and gives emphasis to the role of the teacher as the key change agent to facilitate progress through 'the dame school stage', 'the stage of formalism', the 'stage of transition' and 'the stage of meaning' (Beeby, 1966).

Beeby's 'dame school stage' is characterised by ill-educated and untrained teachers who are only able to teach a very narrow subject content through rigid techniques of memorization using simple prescribed texts. At the 'stage of formalism' teachers have received a basic training but are ill-educated. Learning experiences for pupils in this stage are well planned, but the tendency is to use rote learning methods and prescribed texts in an inflexible and authoritarian manner. The 'stage of transition' is characterized by teachers who have received a basic training but who are better educated than teachers at the 'stage of formalism'. Lessons taught during this stage still tend to reflect a formal, prescriptive rote-learning approach, but greater emphasis is given to understanding the meaning of what is being taught. In the 'stage of meaning', teachers are well educated and well trained. A variety of content and methods, including problem solving, are now used within a wider curriculum, to cater creatively for individual differences of learners.

Applying this framework to the current situation regarding teacher preparation in Australia one is inclined to conclude that while the aim following the establishment of the 'unified national system' in the late 1980s, was to provide programmes designed with 'the stage of meaning' in mind, in more recent years providers have been forced to restructure their programmes and retreat to a level comparable with Beeby's 'stage of transition' in order to produce more compliant and less politically informed and less politically motivated teachers.

One can, in similar vein, arrive at insights by drawing upon the literature on professionalism and professionalization. During the CAE phase, those involved in teacher preparation found their occupation becoming more professionalised, with terms like 'teacher training' being abandoned in favour of 'teacher education' (Mayer, 2014). This was also a time when they worked within largely self-governing institutions; "teacher educators had programmatic control over the way they prepared teachers and to some extent, they also influenced the political agendas related to professional learning and professional practice of in-service teachers." (Mayer, 2014) Following teacher preparation coming to

be located almost totally within faculties of education in universities from 1989, this trend, as indicated above, continued for a while. What one now finds, however, is suggestive of a deprofessionalization of those in the field as exemplified in the return of the language of 'teacher training' to centre stage in the national discourse, in the regulatory bodies not being under the sole control of the providers, and in the nature of the regulations laid down.

What, on the other hand, does not receive a lot of emphasis in current policy discourses on teacher preparation in Australia is the notion of 'the teaching continuum', where one is seen as progressing from beginning teacher and novice teacher, to the mid-career stage and on to the late-career stage (O'Donoghue, 2017). This notion is embraced by those responsible for teacher preparation in a wide variety of countries, including Japan, Germany, Poland, Singapore, New Zealand and Scotland. While the stress on the part of those shaping the teachers' standards movement in Australia implies that one can produce classroom-ready teachers at the end of the programmes of initial preparation, and that the quality of these programmes can be judged by the impact of beginning-teachers on student learning in their first year of teaching, the countries mentioned above are stressing the importance of adopting more enlightened approaches in their highly organised and heavily funded beginning-teacher mentoring programmes.

Australia has, on the other hand, embraced the 'teach for' movement which has been promoted internationally. Dale (2014, p. 39), in drawing attention to this movement has argued that it is based on the idea "that competition will lead to the improvement of teacher education, and the encouragement of alternatives to the traditional university-based form, from both public and private suppliers". Specifically, he has argued, the 'teach for' movement consists of

....social-enterprise-based organizations, claiming to recruit outstanding graduates to teach in schools where the majority of pupils come from the poorest families. They typically receive

### *Teacher Education Reform in Ireland*

abbreviated forms of training and are expected to teach in disadvantaged schools for two years, before moving into leadership positions in education or in the wider business world (Dale, 2014, p. 39).

Back in 1989, an American student, Wendy Kopp, came up with an idea of ‘Teach For America’. The following is a summary by Exley (2014, np) of subsequent developments.

The idea Kopp had was that high-flying graduates should be recruited to teach in low-performing schools in the most impoverished communities. They should be sent on short, intensive courses to learn the basics, before being placed into schools with a teacher shortage. Kopp’s proposal was taken up by Mobil (now ExxonMobil), who approved funding of \$26,000 to get the programme underway. By 2012, 22 years on, the programme had received more than 48,000 applications, resulting in 5,800 teachers being posted to schools across 46 regions in the US, from Alabama to Washington.

In 2002, social entrepreneur Brett Wigdortz founded ‘Teach First’, a similar UK scheme, which grew from an initial cohort of 180 to become the biggest graduate recruiter in the country.

‘Teach for Australia’ (TFA) mirrors the developments elsewhere. It is a Federal Government program designed to attract talented graduates into the teaching profession by providing a fast-track career change. It recruits what are deemed to be academically able graduates with both personal qualities suitable for teaching and a commitment to reducing disadvantage in education. Once selected, candidates receive six weeks of formal preparation, after which they study a two-year part-time teacher education program. During this two-year period they have a four-fifths of a full-time teaching load in a disadvantaged school, with support being available from an in-school mentor and external specialists.

This is a very small-scale, but expensive initiative, costing just under \$100,000 per graduate compared with an average cost of about \$23,000 to produce graduates through the more conventional pathway. It is embraced enthusiastically by government. On the

other hand, the Australian Education Union has characterised it as “an expensive failure”, “a distraction” and “a waste of money that will do nothing to help disadvantaged schools”. It has also been calculated that less than half of the original cohort of 45, who began in 2010, are still teaching.

Furthermore, the evidence suggests that TFA graduates are, far from outperforming their fellow teachers, at best on par with them.

The lack of enrolment of indigenous people until very recent times in programmes of teacher preparation and in programmes preparing individuals as teacher aides is also in need of more attention. In fact, it is even difficult to arrive at a sense of the developments that have led to the present situation. On this, there is a need for in-depth research on the background and developments that led to no significant initiative being taken until ‘enabling programmes’ were offered in the 1970s in three tertiary institutions, under the title of ‘enclave support programs’. The three institutions were Mt Lawley CAE in Western Australia, at Townsville CAE in Queensland, and at the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education in South Australia. In the programs, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students were offered the same range of studies, given the same assessment, and graduated with the same award as all others in their wider student cohort, namely, a 3-year Diploma of Teaching (Primary). Also, staff members were appointed whose role was to assist students in dealing with their course work and developing the necessary skills to proceed through the course to graduation. This involved providing both counselling and academic support, including in the form of special tutorials.

According to the Blanchard Report, which was produced in 1987 by the Federal House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, the success of these programs lay in the fact that they provided a supportive atmosphere for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students in what was a very competitive and often very alien atmosphere (Blanchard, 1987). Also, in 1979, the National Aboriginal Education Committee (NAEC) declared that it was “of fundamental importance, for both the social and economic

development of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island people, that Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders be significantly represented in the professions. It also pointed out that “there were only 72 qualified and practising Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander teachers” in the nation (National Aboriginal Education Committee, 1979). Also, in 1980, there were fewer than 300 Indigenous graduates in tertiary education in any degree program. While much has been done since then to address the situation, there is still room for great.

## **Conclusion**

Currently the Australian university sector, as was pointed out in this paper at the outset, almost has a monopoly in the provision of courses and programmes for the initial preparation of teachers across the nation. It has also demonstrated that there are particular ‘troubling’ dimensions to current developments in the field. These relate to a variety of areas, including accreditation as a teacher, tensions between State and federal governments on teacher requirements, regular calls for an overhaul of approaches to teacher preparation, an emphasis on the outcomes of programmes of teacher preparation rather than their content, and little emphasis being placed on the notion of ‘the teaching continuum’ in the current policy discourse.

While not wishing to end on a depressing note, perhaps the final word should belong to Susan Davis (2017), *Deputy Dean Research for the School of Education and the Arts at Central Queensland University*. She points out that there are 42 pages of instructions for institutions applying for accreditation for their courses of teacher preparation and that the hours of work that have to be undertaken to provide the documentation required is enormous. This is not surprising since, in all, there are seven standards of teacher preparation, supported by 37 focus areas. Pre-service teachers have to demonstrate that they can meet all of these, and the documentation submitted for the accreditation of courses must show how each will be catered for in the teaching, and how the assessments to be used will demonstrate that students have acquired them all.

*An outcome of the demands of the situation by depicted Davis is that it is almost impossible to include approaches in courses of teacher preparation that cultivate creativity. Indeed, she points out that there is no mention of either creativity or innovation in the teaching standards. A long term consequence of this approach in promoting 'sameness' in teacher preparation could be what Eisner pointed out back in the 1960s, could result from a perpetuation in 'sameness' in school curricula, namely, "cultural rigor mortis" (Eisner, 1969, p. 14). One can only hope that policy makers will soon return to recognising the importance of taking heed of those who would apply to the field of teacher preparation the wisdom in William Bruce Cameron's adage that "not everything that counts can be counted and that not everything that can be counted counts" (Cameron, 1963, p. 13).*

## References

- Allen Consulting Group (2003). *Establishing the National Institute for Quality Teaching and School Leadership*. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training.
- Anderson, D. 1990. The Public/Private Division, in L. J. Saha and J. P. Keeves, (eds.), *Schooling in Australian society: Sociological perspectives*, ANU Press, Canberra.
- Austin A. G. and Selleck, R. J. W. (1975). *The Australian government school 1830-1914 - Select documents with commentary*, Pitman, Melbourne.
- Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2014). *Annual report 2014-15*. Canberra: Australian Government Department of Education and Training.
- Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (2014). *Annual report 2013- 2014*. Canberra: Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership.
- Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (2018). *Australian professional standards for teachers*. <https://www.aitsl.edu.au/teach/standards>
- Barcan, A. 1980. *A history of Australian education*. Oxford University Press, Melbourne.



*Teacher Education Reform in Ireland*

- Beeby, C. E. (1966). *The quality of education in developing countries*. Cambridge, MA:
- Blanchard, C. A. (1987). *Return to country. The Aboriginal homelands movement in Australia. Report of the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs*. Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service, pp. 151-152).
- Cameron, W. B. (1963). *Informal sociology: A casual introduction to sociological thinking*. Random House, New York, p. 13.
- Connell, W. F. 1993. *Reshaping Australian education 1960-1985*. ACER, Melbourne.
- Dixon, R. (2005) *The Catholic community in Australia*. Openbook Publishers: Adelaide.
- Department of Education (2018). *Teaching in Australia. Everything You Need to Know*.  
<https://www.tes.com/jobs/careers-advice/teaching-overseas/teaching-australia-everything-you-need-know>
- Eisner, E. (1969). Instructional and expressive educational objectives. In W. Popham, E. Eisner and H. Sullivan (Eds.) (pp. 1-18). *Instructional Objectives*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, p. 14.
- Gardiner, D., O'Donoghue, T.A. and O'Neill, M. (2011). *Constructing education as a liberal art and as teacher preparation at five Western Australian universities: An historical analysis*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Hogan, M. C. (1987). *The sectarian strand: Religion in Australian history*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.
- JCQTA (2009). AITSL.  
<http://www.jcqta.qld.edu.au/index.php/about-us/affiliation/aitsl/>
- Kandel, I. L. (1938). *Impressions of Australian education*. Melbourne: ACER.
- Martin, T., O'Donoghue, T. A. and O'Neill, M. (2012). *Teachers and teaching in vocational education and training institutions: Reflections from Western Australia*. New York: Nova Science Press.
- May, J., Holbrook, Brown, A., Preston, G., and Bessant, B. (2009). *Claiming a voice: The first thirty-five years of the*

- Australian teacher education association*. Melbourne: The Australian Teacher Education Association.
- Mayer, D. (2014). Forty years of teacher education in Australia: 1974-2014. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, Vol. 40, No. 5, p. 461-473.
- Mockler, N. (2015). From [surveillance to formation? A generative approach to teacher performance and development' in Australian schools](#). *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*. Vol. 40, No. 9. <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol40/iss9/7/>
- National Aboriginal Education Committee (1979). *Report of the First National Aboriginal Education Committee Aboriginal Teacher/Teacher Aide Workshop*. Balmain, N.S.W: Aboriginal Training and Cultural Institute.
- New South Wales Education Standards Authority (2018). *Stages*. New South Wales Education Standards Authority, 2018.
- O'Donoghue, T. (2017). *Understanding contemporary education: Key themes and issues*. London: Routledge.
- Praetz, H. M. (1974). *Where shall we send them: The choice of school for a Catholic child*. Melbourne: Hawthorn Press.
- Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (2014). *Action now: Classroom ready teachers*. <https://www.studentsfirst.gov.au/teacher-education-ministerial-advisory-group>
- Wilkinson, I. R., Caldwell, B. J., Selleck, R. J. W., Harris, J. and Dettman, P. (2006). *A history of state aid to non-government schools in Australia*. Canberra: Commonwealth Government of Australia.