

Teacher Education in New Zealand, 1920–1980: Curriculum, Location, and Control



1 2 1 1 9 5

Gregory Lee

University of Waikato

Howard Lee

University of Otago

This paper argues that teacher education in New Zealand during the period 1920–1980 was characterised by constant debate over the content, location, and control of teacher education programmes. Successive reports into teacher education are examined, with special regard to their recommendations about the curriculum, the most appropriate institutional environments(s) within which to deliver training programmes, and the matter of which authority—the central Department of Education or the regional education boards—was thought best suited to control the training process. It is argued that complaints were voiced more frequently from the mid 1920s about the low status of the teaching service, the inadequate time assigned to academic and/or professional studies, and the lack of co-operation between teachers' colleges and universities in their educational activities. By the 1960s the minimum period of teacher training had been extended by one year, and educationists began to react more favourably to earlier suggestions that closer relationships ought to be encouraged between universities and colleges. The conclusion is reached that although by the end of the period under review some of the institutional conservatism and isolation surrounding colleges and universities had given way to a willingness to explore new arrangements for teacher education, debates over the nature, scope and site of teacher education continued.

The underlying assumption, ... is that the central authorities require and should have the power to exert controls over every significant detail of the operations of the national system for teacher education. But such powers have not been sought, nor granted, in respect to other major professions; and it is worth noting that a large number of other professions ... have been freed from such detailed regulatory control ... it looks as though the assumption underlying this particular form of central control is too deeply embedded for it to be even openly discussed let alone modified

(Mitchell, 1968, p.51).

Among the many themes to emerge from an historical study of teacher education in New Zealand are those relating to its control, content, and location. As Mitchell has indicated above, the question of which authority should gain ultimate control over teacher education programmes—the central Department of Education, the regional education boards, the teachers' colleges or the universities, or some combination thereof—has been subjected to infrequent critical analysis. There had been, for example, no doubt in George Hogben's mind, when Inspector-General of Schools (1899/1915), that the Department was the proper authority to exercise policy oversight and control over all educational institutions, with the notable exception of the four universities then in existence (Roth, 1952, p.104). Accordingly, he favoured placing teacher education under the purview of the Minister of Education (who would approve matters of policy and administration), but with the organisation being undertaken by the local education boards. This was an entirely predictable response given the highly centralised system of educational administration that had been forged under the Education Act of 1877 and that was to govern education policy and practice in New Zealand for the next 112 years.

The Department of Education and Teacher Training

Hogben's thinking was warmly endorsed by James Parr, Minister of Education in the conservative Massey ministry (1920/1926). As an ardent and unapologetic interventionist in all things educational, Parr saw the extension of Departmental control as being entirely consistent with his relentless quest for 'educational efficiency' (Lee & Lee, 1998). The result was that a (predictable) conflict arose between the two authorities closely involved in educating teachers—the Department of Education (acting under the Minister's direction) and the education boards (Butchers, 1932, p.143). The 'evolutionary expansion' of the central Department in the early twentieth century led to it being widely regarded (and, occasionally, criticised) as the 'final controlling factor in post-primary as well as primary education' (*Bodkin Report*, 1930, p.7), although this status did not prevent those education boards associated with teacher education from strenuously objecting to the Department's attempt (in 1927) to gain complete control over the four training colleges. These boards objected to

an increasing measure of control over the colleges [being exercised by the Department], through conditions attached to the [financial] grants, the right of inspection, and the power to make regulations governing admission, curriculum, bursaries, salaries and other essential features of the organisation.

(Butchers, 1932, p.143)

The stand off between the Department and the Wellington Education Board in particular, culminated in the introduction of new regulations in 1929 which gave the former authority 'the controlling voice' (Butchers, 1932, p.143). But the passage of such 'centralising' legislation should have come as no surprise, given Sir Edward Gibbes' earlier remark, as a former Secretary for Education, that

because the provision of virtually the whole of the money spent on education com[es] from the national purse, the control of expenditure of that money must naturally and inevitably be in the hands of the Government, that is, the representatives of the people who provide the money.

(Gibbes, 1928, p.19)

Gibbes also suggested that government had to adopt this approach when promoting a 'nationalised' education system (p.18). Consequently, this system was controlled by the central Department of Education whose officials, according to John Caughley, Director of Education (1921-1927), had the authority to 'draw up a Dominion scheme for the training of teachers', besides carrying out several other functions (Caughley, 1925, p.816).

Caughley's comments on teacher education in 1925, however, did not extend to a discussion of the role of universities in providing such training. Instead, mention was made only that 'students in the teachers' training colleges may also receive free university education' (p.820). What were absent were the numerous criticisms that had been made for at least two decades about the lack of co-ordination between the work undertaken in these training colleges and the universities; the lack of balance between academic study, the theory of teaching, and practical classroom experience; and the question of which authority should exercise ultimate authority over teacher training. These (and other) issues were examined comprehensively by Harry Reichel and Frank Tate in 1925, in their joint report on university education in New Zealand commissioned by James Parr.

The Reichel-Tate Report, 1925

Reichel and Tate claimed that although currently 'it is not practicable, even if it were desirable, to give all candidate teachers a full or even a partial university course together with a course of training in practical education' (*Reichel-Tate Report*, 1925, p.32), changes were certainly overdue. They believed that groups of trainees should be chosen to study for full or partial university courses, with some having their two-year training extended for up to three years (p.32). Reichel and Tate stressed that teaching had to become 'a calling ... [that had] prestige and standing in

public opinion', and that it must have the 'power of attracting recruits' (pp.3738). They wanted to see 'a more general recognition in public opinion of the value of the work which teachers do' (p.38). Such a recognition would be gained, Reichel and Tate declared, only when trainee teachers acquired 'adequate scholarship' and 'adequate professional training' (p.33), which would enable them to work as 'capable and inspiring teachers' (p.33).

The suggested reforms included clarifying the presently vague relationship existing between Professors of Education in university schools of education or education departments and the local training college staff, without giving the former 'directive power over the training system' (p.34). Reichel and Tate's preference was for a Professor of Education to also be the Principal of a Teachers' College; it was assumed that such an appointment would ensure that some kind of balance between academic and practical work could be achieved. Without this joint appointment, it was thought that

there was a danger lest the sound, practical preparation, now the rule [in training colleges], should be lost in the endeavour to bring all teachers under the influence of one [a university-based education professor] whose main concern appeared ... to be the educational theory studied along the lines of its historical development and philosophy (p.34).

Reichel and Tate had surprisingly little to say about two year primary teacher training in New Zealand, apart from reporting that this training was 'based upon subject method rather than upon philosophic theory' (p.34) and recording their opinions that these graduates could 'do effective work from the time they leave the training college' because they had gained 'an insight into the content and significance of the course of study for elementary schools' (p.34) in their college programme. Their principal recommendation concerning primary teacher training was that trainees must have received 'a full secondary education' (p.37) *prior* to entering a college, so that training colleges could cease to operate both as a high school and a professional school (p.37). A close reading of the Reichel-Tate report reveals that the Commissioners were much more interested in commenting on the perceived deficiencies of *secondary* teacher training. They maintained that at present there was insufficient time 'for the study of culture subjects' and for students to receive professional training (p.33), because of the New Zealand practice of carrying on university study and professional training concurrently (p.33). Reichel and Tate were adamant that secondary teacher trainees should study university courses full-time for three years and graduate with a degree *before* undertaking training college work ('special training') for one year (p.35). They

reasoned that because there were essential differences in the 'method', 'organisation', and 'life' (p.36) of primary and secondary schools, necessitating the appointment of 'specialists' to teach secondary trainees, universities were deemed to be the most appropriate institutions to train secondary teachers (p.36). Secondary training should also be provided at one university college only, 'for the present at least' (p.36), Reichel and Tate concluded. Moreover, such training ought to be distinctly different from that provided for primary trainees (p.36).

The Bodkin Report, 1930

As we might have expected, the mere release of the Reichel-Tate report did not coincide with the prompt elimination of the perceived deficiencies with teacher training in New Zealand. Accordingly, the Bodkin Committee in 1930 recorded similar concerns to those expressed by Reichel and Tate: there was 'a lack of proper co-ordination and co-operation' between training colleges and university schools of education (*Bodkin Report*, 1930, p.62), and teacher training had become characterised by 'a want of co-operation, unconcealed friction, and manifest waste' (p.77). Teacher training, the Committee suggested, was further hindered by an inadequate system of 'specialised professional training' for post-primary teachers (p.77) and the 'reciprocal duplication' of the subjects taught in colleges and universities (p.78). These problems would be largely overcome, the Committee confidently predicted, by creating within every university a Faculty of Education whose staff would have responsibility for organising and controlling teacher training (p.85). Such a 'consolidation' would permit the 'linking up [of] the theory of education with all branches of practice' (p.80), promote 'ultimate economy' in the use of resources and institutions (p.80), enable specialised teaching in arts and science to be given (p.84), and 'make possible the organisation of effective educational research work' (p.84).

Notwithstanding their desire to see the four existing training colleges controlled by the neighbouring universities, the Bodkin Committee was not prepared to exclude involvement by the Department of Education. Their decentralisation proposal, although intimately connected with the local administration of the education system (p.83) specifically included Departmental representation in the Faculties of Education to ensure that 'the training given is of a practical character in keeping with the actual work of the schools' (p.85). Furthermore, the Committee recommended that the Department control trainees' final certification, thereby controlling the colleges' 'output' and 'admission to the service' (p.85). But they disagreed with Theo Strong's argument, as Director of Education (1927-1933), that training colleges should be controlled by the

Department in order to 'secure the most efficient type of training', and because teacher training was seen by Strong as 'a national education service' (p.83). Instead, the Committee maintained that Departmental control *ipso facto* would not improve the quality of the relationship between training colleges and universities regarding teacher training (p.83). They also understood that the training colleges had been 'for many years a continual bone of contention' between the Department and Education Boards, and that the system of 'divided administrative control' had impaired the colleges' efficiency (p.78). The Bodkin Committee was therefore keen to call a halt to this situation, having already declared that 'there is probably no part of our educational organisation so badly in need of consolidation and unification of control as that which relates to the training of teachers' (p.77).

Underpinning the Committee's comments was their concern to see teaching become recognised publicly as a profession of the same standing as engineering, law, and medicine (p.80). If this was ever to occur, then it was essential that teacher training be controlled by universities and delivered by staff employed in a Faculty of Education. The Committee's position was that

there seems to be no sound reason why intending teachers should be trained in separate institutions and denied the advantage of rubbing shoulders with students preparing for other walks in life ... [in fact, because] their life's work has wholly to do with children, there is no more need for such intercourse for intending teachers than for any other class of students (p.84).

In this and other regards the Committee was influenced by James Hight, Rector of Canterbury University College. Hight had identified the 'conflict of loyalties' that arose when students had to attend both training college and university classes; these students were unable to identify fully with either institution (*Bodkin Report*, 1930, p.80). His preference was for students to undertake their academic work *prior* to commencing their professional training. Hight believed that trainees' professional work would improve: they would be more creative and experimental in their classrooms, and could employ 'revolutionary, epoch-making [teaching] methods' derived from their 'higher academic training' (p.81).

The Reichel-Tate and Bodkin reports' recommendations were not enacted, however, on account of the worsening economic depression from 1931. The Forbes-Coates coalition government's fiscal retrenchment policy had led to the closure of the Dunedin and Wellington Training Colleges in 1933, as suggested by the Shirlcliffe (Economy) Commission in 1932 (Cumming & Cumming, 1978, pp.247-248). All four training colleges were

closed in 1934; two were re-opened in the following year and the remainder began admitting teacher trainees from 1936 (Allan, 1971, p.126).

The new Minister of Education in the first Labour government, Peter Fraser, was keen to assign control of the four training colleges to their local universities, in keeping with one of the Bodkin Committee's recommendations (a committee on which he had been a member). Others, however, were less keen: fearing a loss of administrative control, five of the country's nine education boards remained implacably opposed to Fraser's idea that degrees in education should be awarded by the universities (Cumming & Cumming, 1978, p.259).

The New Education Fellowship Conference, 1937: Boyd, Davies and Kandel

Fraser's suggestion that universities exercise control over teacher training fell on fertile ground. Support was forthcoming from at least three prominent educationists, William Boyd, Isaac Kandel, and E. Salter Davies. In his addresses to the 1937 New Education Fellowship Conference in New Zealand, Boyd predicted that 'the existing training colleges might become schools of education within the university system' (1938, p.429). Once established he believed that a *minimum* four-year training period could be insisted upon, 'comparable with the course of medical training', and one that would include the study of 'the philosophical disciplines which underlie education', specifically philosophy, ethics, sociology, and psychology (p.428). When combined with 'studies related closely to actual school work' and practical work experience, Boyd was fully satisfied that trainees would not become 'practitioners with limited general culture or academic people weak on the practical side' (p.428).

Arguably, Kandel and Davies' main contribution was to emphasise the relationship between locating teacher training in a university setting and the resultant professionalism of the teaching service. To this end, Kandel envisaged that there would be a 'change in status of teachers from that of subordinates to that of members of a profession with greater freedom and less regimentation' (1938, p.427). In a similar vein Davies asserted:

It is manifestly desirable that young men and women who are being trained for the teaching profession should be associated with their fellows who are being trained for the other learned professions. Such association is one of the most potent elements of a liberal education (1938, p.432).

To put the point another way, Davies was convinced that the 'segregated' nature of stand-alone teachers' colleges meant that trainees could mix only with those of 'similar training and outlook' (pp.432-433).

Consequently, he argued that it was more likely 'in the wide spaces of a university [rather] than in the cloisters of a training college' that teacher trainees would acquire 'the most precious gift of a liberal education', which Davies saw as conveying 'a love of knowledge' and a 'humility' (p.433).

Mason and the New Zealand Educational Institute

While the major recommendations made by Reichel and Tate, the Bodkin Committee, Boyd, Davies, and Kandel were not implemented owing to New Zealand's involvement in the second world war, they had by no means fallen on deaf ears educationally and politically. Rex Mason, Peter Fraser's successor as Minister of Education, readily conceded that two-year primary training was not sufficient to prepare teachers to 'meet all the demands of the modern primary school', and that the training period had to be extended 'as soon as conditions permit' (1945, p.67); that is, when war ceased. However, Mason stopped short of announcing the institutional structure(s) within which such extended training might be offered in the future. Under the heading of 'Questions yet to be answered', he asked the 1944 (Christchurch) Conference on Education, 'What should be the relationship between the training colleges and the university colleges?', and 'Is the present system of control of training colleges satisfactory?' (1945, p.68). For his part, Mason did not provide any clues about his own policy preferences in relation to these questions.

The New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI) Executive, however, were more forthcoming than the minister. The occasion of the Conference on Education in October 1944 – an event that few educationists dared miss—provided the perfect forum in which to outline the Executive's proposals to the wider educational audience. In August of that year the Institute's Executive had supplied Conference members with a comprehensive booklet on the topic of 'educational restructuring', within which recommendations were made about primary teacher training. Echoing many of the views of Boyd, Davies and Kandel, the NZEI declared that teacher training must 'in future be on a scale and for a period commensurate with that of similar professions' (New Zealand Educational Institute, 1944, p.56), and that, as a science and 'no longer merely a vocation', training for teaching had to be 'as complete and as thorough' as that applicable to any other science (p.56). Teachers' professional status was assured, the Executive claimed, if a four year Diploma of Teaching, a Bachelor of Education and a Master of Education degree were introduced, each to be issued by the University of New Zealand. It was proposed that the diploma course would be mandatory; few details were given about the precise content of the optional degrees (p.59).

Mason's concern that too many trainee teachers had not had a complete secondary schooling (1945, p.67) was addressed by the NZEI; only those applicants with a Higher Leaving Certificate (a post university entrance qualification) should be considered as candidates for training (pp.57-58). Ideally, this training should take place in one of four 'Teachers' Colleges', each of which ought to be 'affiliated with the University of New Zealand and incorporat[e] the present Training Colleges' (p.56). The Institute's Executive then proposed that at least one-half of the training course be dedicated to practical training (p.59), and that the remaining time be devoted to providing students with 'a sound general training ... in education [and] practical psychology', training in the 'principles' of teaching, and continuing instruction in the core secondary school subjects (p.58).

In the immediate post-war period, several educationists continued to lament the deficiencies inherent in teacher training. John Murdoch, for example, echoed familiar sentiments when he stated that too many college entrants are 'ill-equipped', 'ill-educated', and 'immature and inexperienced in the ways of life' (1946, p.16) to derive much of value from their subsequent training. Murdoch was keen to see teachers exercise 'real freedom' in their work, but they were presently hampered by the Department of Education who 'imposed' their will on teachers (p.18). It was vital that all trainees leave college 'with a broad cultural foundation', and that both 'scholarship' and 'classroom technique' be rewarded and respected equally (p.17). All too often, Murdoch remarked, teachers displayed a 'contempt ... for sound learning' because their practical competence was valued more highly in the teaching service than their academic ability (p.17). These and other concerns led the Director of the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER), Arnold Campbell, to report in 1948 that 'a lengthening of the training college course' was a government priority (Campbell, 1948, p.186). But he sensed that such a reform, by itself, might not secure the Labour government's desired end. Campbell observed: 'it may well be that a complete reorganisation of existing arrangements for the preparation of teachers will have to be undertaken' (p.186).

The Campbell Report, 1951

Given Campbell's appointment as chair of the Consultative Committee on the Recruitment, Education and Training of Teachers (1948-1951), it seems reasonable to have expected that some far-reaching reforms might have been proposed. But they did not materialise. In what the Cummings label as 'an unexciting document' (Cumming & Cumming, 1978, p.315), the Campbell report recommended that the Department of Education should

continue to exercise ultimate authority over the administration of training colleges, through the medium of education boards, in preference to universities (*Campbell Report*, 1951, p.112). The Committee's reasoning was that a surrendering of control to universities would result in

a risk of serious lack of co-ordination between the Department's general educational policy and what was done in respect to the recruitment, education and training of teachers. Further, a very large administrative burden would be placed on the university (p.112).

The Committee was fully satisfied that within a college rather than a university environment, trainee teachers would be the recipients of a 'liberalised' education and training (pp.2-3). Acquiring a 'good general education and professional knowledge of some depth and accuracy' (pp.2-3) was necessary for trainees in the 1950s, because they would be teaching in a schooling system that had undergone a significant transformation in curricular content and emphasis attributable, in large part, to Beeby's appointment in 1940 as Director of Education (1940-1960), the recommendations of the Thomas Committee (1942-1943) on the post-primary school curriculum and the School Certificate examination, and the passing of legislation in 1944 raising the school leaving age to 15 years, thereby making some post-primary schooling compulsory for all primary school leavers (Openshaw, Lee & Lee, 1993, pp.168-176). The Campbell Committee, for their part, knew that these changes had impacted already on the schooling system, which created an immediate demand for more teachers in the nation's classrooms. Such a demand militated against the Committee recommending a compulsory three-year training period for aspiring primary teachers (*Campbell Report*, 1951, p.9).

As Noeline Alcorn has observed, 'the Committee's report could hardly have appeared at a more difficult time' (Alcorn, 1999, p.66). A serious teacher shortage meant that condensed ('pressure cooker') training schemes had to continue, and the standard of entry to training colleges could not be elevated. To this end, John Watson (1956) reported that 'since the forties it is true that the intellectual quality of entrants to teachers' colleges has declined' (Watson, 1956, p.4). Between 1941 and 1956, he observed a 'sharp and steady drop' in the percentage of college students who undertook university study (p.12). This observation was confirmed by Alcorn who noted that 40 per cent of college entrants in 1958 held a university entrance qualification compared with 80 per cent in 1946 (Alcorn, 1999, p.66). Watson also stated that in 1930, 9 per cent of primary teachers held degrees whereas 8.8 per cent of the primary service were degreed in 1955 (Watson, 1956, p.10). He maintained that the situation had

to change because, like Boyd, Davies and Kandel previously, Watson believed that 'university degrees are an indication of the professional status to which the teaching profession is entitled' (p.13). A solution lay in encouraging most, if not all, first year training college students to take university classes. That trainees would benefit from this study was beyond doubt, Watson implied, because the training college population (along with the university one) was a 'superior group', within which a high proportion '[came] from the top 10 per cent (IQ 119+) of the population in terms of general intellectual ability' (p.8).

Teacher Education in the 1960s

Fifteen years after the Fraser government had held its Conference on Education, coinciding with the publication of *Education Today and Tomorrow*, the Nash (Labour) government's Minister of Education, Philip Skoglund, established a Commission on Education. In addition to examining such diverse matters as the administration of the New Zealand schooling system, developments in Maori education, and the case for and against the granting of state aid to private schools, as part of the Commission's comprehensive educational stock-taking, teacher training received considerable scrutiny (*Currie Report*, 1962). Not surprisingly, perhaps, the Commission pointed to the need for 'fundamental reform' in the latter area (p.481) because of the delay in implementing proposals suggested earlier (for example, three year primary training). Some of the 'sweeping changes' (p.487) involved establishing English style university institutes of education (echoing a recommendation of the 1944 English McNair Committee Report, *Teachers and Youth Leaders*), so as to permit universities to assume responsibility for teacher training from the Department of Education and education boards (*Currie Report*, 1962, pp.500-511). Such a responsibility included assigning authority to the proposed institutes to award certificates leading to teacher registration. Although Ian McLaren later asserted that these institutes had not been established because they were 'unnecessarily complicated, costly and ill-suited to New Zealand conditions' (McLaren, 1974, p.150), their failure to materialise did not stop teachers' college-university relations from remaining a major topic of discussion throughout and beyond the 1960s.

Discussion had also been stimulated from at least two other quarters: the *Report of the Committee on New Zealand Universities (the Parry Report*, 1959) and the *National Advisory Council on the Training of Teachers* (set up by Blair Tennent in 1963). The Parry Committee, having been disappointed by the lack of enthusiasm among universities to introduce professional courses, sought to encourage them to become more involved in both the professional and general education of primary and

post-primary teacher trainees. Similarly, the National Advisory Council (in 1967) wanted universities to reflect on the role they might occupy in teacher training (McLaren, 1974, p.150). Consequently, the Council proposed that in future, teachers' colleges should only be built 'in close proximity to a university' (Cumming & Cumming, 1978, p.338). The universities' typical response to suggestions that they enter *directly* into teacher training was summed up by the Cummings as follows:

Professors saw nothing strange in the university becoming a technical institution for the production of accountants, architects, dentists, doctors, lawyers and engineers yet standing aloof from the training of teachers. Their conception of 'training' was that which had held sway during the greater part of the nineteenth century (pp.316-317).

McLaren had earlier linked the universities' attitude to their perception that teacher training was associated with 'low scholarly demands' and poor academic standards (1974, p.151). Equally important was his observation that teachers' colleges tended to be 'as suspicious as the universities' (p.151). In that environment, the former sought to preserve their 'distinctive character and traditions'—their physical, academic and professional independence—in preference to gaining 'greater academic respectability' (p.151) contingent upon a closer liaison being secured between colleges and universities. The creation of teachers' college councils from 1968, Desmond Minogue concluded, allowed the colleges to maintain their long-established relationship with the Department of Education and education boards, while at the same time encouraging closer associations with the universities (Minogue, 1971b, p.88). According to McLaren, the Department had *not* been supportive of closer college-university relationships, for fear of losing their control over teacher training (McLaren, 1974, p.151).

One reason behind this resistance was that Departmental and education board officials did not believe that a university education was essential for primary teachers (Minogue, 1971b, p.93). The NZEI and the National Advisory Council on the Training of Teachers maintained as a non-negotiable policy, however, that teaching must become a graduate profession. The Department's attitude can be explained by a reference to the 1964 Education Act, within which, according to Frank Mitchell, 'detailed regulatory control' was prescribed (Mitchell, 1968, p.51). Mitchell was especially critical of the high level of Departmental and government control over teacher training. He concluded that this type of centralised control had neither been sought nor granted in relation to 'other major professions' (p.51), and that it conflicted with the Currie Commission's (1962) recommendation that the Department surrender control over

teacher training to universities (Mitchell, 1968, p.51). Mitchell lamented that

the notion of 'control' is so deeply embedded in administrative minds and has received so little critical examination that it is beginning to assume gargantuan proportions and some disturbing implications as far as education in this country is concerned (p.52).

Mitchell's complaint appears to have been justified in the light of Keith Sheen's (1967) comment, as Director-General of Education, that Departmental intervention was central to 'the simultaneous development' of teacher training (AJHR, E-1, 1967, p.5). Sheen advocated a 'wider and deeper collaboration between teachers, teacher trainers, and departmental officers than has ever prevailed before'; he envisaged that this collaboration would be established 'on a firm basis' by 1972 (p.5). But Sheen said nothing about the relationship between colleges and universities either in relation to the commencement of three year training in 1966¹ or with reference to the establishment of college councils as 'new controlling authorities' (p.30). The New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI) was more forthcoming, however. They argued in support of university schools of education, on the grounds that 'well educated, well qualified and well trained men and women' (New Zealand Educational Institute, 1966, p.3) were needed in the teaching profession, and that teachers' colleges' academic standards could then be 'raised to a university level' (p.7).

The Education Development Conference, 1974-1975

The nature of the relationship between universities and teachers' colleges did not escape the attention of four working parties set up under the banner of the Education Development Conference (EDC) in the mid 1970s. This Conference, convened by the Kirk Labour government, provided a rare opportunity for a whole host of educational issues and concerns to be discussed nationally not only by educationists and administrators but also by individuals and spokespeople for several interest groups. With respect to teacher training, the report of the *Working Party on Improving Learning and Teaching* (Lawrence Report, 1974) expressed support for developing 'even closer relations between universities and teachers' colleges in future (p.105), but expected the Department of Education to continue to have the main responsibility for teacher education (p.96). The Lawrence Committee wanted to see an increase in the range of functions performed by colleges (beyond the pre-service level, to also include continuing education courses). They believed that this could be achieved at the same time as encouraging 'co-operative teaching arrangements ...

and the greatest possible degree of co-operation' between colleges and universities' (p.105). The Lawrence Committee concluded that 'local conditions' will ultimately determine the relationship between these institutions (p.105), but they did not venture an opinion on college-university mergers.

The Nordmeyer Committee—the *Working Party on Organisation and Administration* (1974)—echoed many of the sentiments of the Lawrence Committee. Support was expressed for fostering 'fruitful co-operation at the local level' (*Nordmeyer Report*, 1974, p.91), and recognition was given to the government's ultimate decision-making authority in all educational matters (p.78). Unlike the Lawrence Committee, however, the Nordmeyer Committee was prepared to discuss the ideal institutional arrangements for teacher training. In reaching their conclusion that colleges and universities were 'sufficiently distinct in purpose to warrant the preservation of their separate identity' (*Nordmeyer Report*, 1974, p.92), the Nordmeyer Committee strenuously objected to the 'growing desire' among teachers' college staff to see their institutions gain degree-granting authority (p.92). To permit colleges to award degrees, the Committee asserted, would mean 'creat[ing] unnecessary confusion' among the public, leading to colleges being deprived of their existing 'special status' and 'sell[ing] themselves short by awarding 'degrees' which obscure their own distinctiveness' (p.93). As matters presently stood, the Nordmeyer Committee believed that there was too much course overlap between colleges and universities. Responsibility for minimising this 'undesirable course duplication' lay with the universities because they had been able to exercise their academic autonomy, unlike the teachers' colleges (p.79).

The recurring theme of closer college-university relations was repeated in two reports prepared by the Advisory Council on Educational Planning (the steering committee for the Educational Development Conference's discussion groups), *Proposals for Change* (1974) and *Directions for Educational Development* (1975). The 1974 report predicted that once colleges gained more freedom from the Department of Education—as they should—greater 'co-operation and co-ordination' between tertiary institutions would follow automatically (*Holmes Report*, 1974, p.20). The resulting increase in autonomy of teachers' colleges was not expected to lead to mergers between colleges and universities because it was thought important for each type of tertiary institution to 'preserve their separate identity' (p.20). There was also no suggestion that colleges and universities would compete for students; only that training programmes should be established co-operatively (p.21). Similarly, the *Directions for Educational Development* report endorsed the establishment of closer relationships between universities and their neighbouring colleges, for the

reason that 'the development of comparative experience' would inevitably improve the quality of teacher training (Holmes Report, 1975, p.66). But the latter conceded that 'the preparation of intending teachers is a contentious and difficult area' (p.66), and made no comment about institutional mergers.

The Post-Primary Teachers' Association

The cautious observations and recommendations of the various EDC reports concerning teacher training were not echoed to the same extent by the Post-Primary Teachers' Association's (PPTA) Curriculum Review Group report (*Munro Report*, 1974). In their comments on secondary teacher training the Munro Committee noted that although there was disagreement over the ideal institutional arrangements for training (p.79), educators and the public alike could be confident that universities, degree-granting institutes or colleges of education can (and did) link academic and professional study together effectively (p.38). The Committee predicted that criticisms of university involvement in teacher training—that they gave an academic emphasis to subject studies, encouraged academic specialisation, and perpetuated a narrow academic tradition (pp.38, 80, 89)—would be resolved when 'policy-makers [were] prepared to state unambiguously the kind of academic training student-teachers require' (p.39). They maintained that degrees in education from universities such as Massey and Waikato had already proven useful in demonstrating that a balance could be achieved between academic and professional studies (p.38).² After stating that a training programme must be '[based] on the kinds of activities that will occupy a teacher's life' (p.23)—one that will make his or her behaviour 'educationally effective' (p.23)—the Committee boldly declared that 'new organisations for teacher-training are imperatively needed' (p.78). In order to avert possible complaints about the latter remark, however, they added that existing training institutions were *not* about to be terminated (p.78). Furthermore, the Committee sought to reassure some sectors of the educational community that the government's substantial investment in the two existing secondary training facilities³ made the creation of wholly university-based secondary teacher training unlikely, at least in the 'foreseeable future' (p.89).

Academic commentaries on teachers' college-university relationships

Educators with particular interests in teacher training in New Zealand may wish to ask whether or not the Educational Development Conference had taken careful account of the literature available on the topic. If they had, then some of the EDC participants may well have objected to comments

made by two university academics, Ray Adams and Des Minogue. In a concise overview of the development of New Zealand teacher training, Adams pointed to the establishment of teachers' colleges and universities as independent institutions, with the result that the latter all too often gave 'characteristically oblique and perfunctory' recognition to professional education (Adams, 1970, p.162). The preoccupation of colleges with immediate classroom demands meant that these institutions were never likely to become 'hotbeds of radical educational revolution' (p.166). Rather, they tended to produce teachers lacking 'fire in their bellies', individuals whom Adams described as being 'sincere, well-intentioned if mildly insecure craftsmen' (p.166). In his view, these teachers also lacked 'an empirical foundation to shore up their professional actions' (p.166).

Minogue's contribution, by comparison, emphasised the benefits likely to accrue from the establishment of institutes of education (as proposed by the 1962 Commission on Education), within which a full integration of college and university resources could occur (Minogue, 1971b, pp.94-95). 'Integration [of teachers' colleges] with the universities rather than an increase in separatism' (p.97) ought to happen, he argued, because the 'broad and deep general education' gained therein could be set constructively alongside professional studies (p.91). Minogue expected that graduates from such institutions would be able to successfully apply the 'principles and methods' they had learned in their professional studies (p.91). Universities were obliged to enter fully into teacher training for the following reasons:

If [they] continue to deny to teachers the general and professional education which they at present give to doctors, lawyers, architects, engineers and other professions, they are missing their most effective opportunity to share in shaping public education.

(Minogue, 1971 b, p.95)

There was, however, another reason why Minogue was keen to see more university involvement in teacher training. He believed that New Zealand teachers' colleges would take a cue from Britain and the United States of America, and would soon lobby for the right to offer their own degrees (p.96). It was preferable that universities and colleges integrate, in the expectation that they would eventually offer a four or five year degree course (p.96). Minogue concluded that in this respect, progress 'can be no faster than that which was acceptable to the various interests involved' (p.99). This observation was especially pertinent, given his understanding that for more than 60 years the college-university relationship had been 'the subject of disputation' (p.93). Nevertheless, Minogue assumed that

this dispute could be resolved largely by institutions assigning equal weighting to general education and professional studies. The Hamilton Teachers' College -University of Waikato model of co-operation was held up as being worthy of emulation because within it, university study and professional training was more likely to receive equal emphasis (Minogue, 1971a, p.27). Minogue was adamant that teachers should no longer be 'educated at an academic level below that of university graduation' (p.28), and that the unified system of teacher education achieved by mergers between colleges and universities may improve the situation (p.29). Similar recommendations were also made by the Dalziel Committee on university-college relationships in the following year (*Dalziel Report*, 1972, pp.18-23).

Although unequivocally supportive of institutional mergers, Minogue sensed that there might be definite obstacles to their attainment. He remained convinced that the central Department of Education would still wish to maintain extensive control over teacher training, regardless of where it was offered (Minogue, 1971a, p.132). The presence of 'obdurate vested interests' (p.132) -for example, the Department's control over college curricula and teacher recruitment-meant that structural and other reforms could not be introduced swiftly. Furthermore, Minogue understood that university and college staff frequently viewed the study of 'Education' differently. The former usually defined Education as an academic discipline in an arts or social science faculty (as a 'multi-disciplinary area of general value'), whereas college lecturers tended to equate it with professional studies first and foremost (p.109). Minogue suggested that New Zealand universities and teachers' colleges would be well served if they followed the Hawaiian model of teacher education. In his opinion this model 'struck a new balance' between the two different conceptions of Education, with the result that cultural and professional aspects gained in meaning (pp.28, 56). A five-year teacher education programme made these objectives easier to satisfy, Minogue concluded (p.56).

Notwithstanding Adams and Minogue's articulate pleas for structural and attitudinal changes to be implemented in teachers' colleges and universities, there remained little official willingness to embrace major reforms in teacher training throughout the 1970s. To this end, Noeline Alcorn observed that until a decade ago a 'professional consensus' was readily discernible in the New Zealand education system, based upon notions of 'collegiality and a relatively shared culture' (Alcorn, 1999, p.75). These notions underpinned the 1979 *Review of Teacher Training* (the Hill Report) which, Alcorn claims, was generally 'anxious to identify strengths in the existing training provisions' (p.69). Nevertheless, the Hill

Committee chose not to ignore the current debate over college and university relationships. Approval was given to the development of closer institutional relationships, preferably as a result of exercising local initiative, although, as Alcorn points out, the Committee had not considered that such relationships could lead to 'a weakening of the corporate culture on which the colleges had prided themselves, and which had so influenced the socialisation of primary teachers' (p.69).

Content, Location, and Control of Teacher Education

Between 1920 and 1980, discussions about teacher training in New Zealand tended to focus on three main issues: content, location, and control. Debate occurred over the relationship between academic, subject, and professional studies, the emphasis assigned to each, and over their most appropriate location (within a college or a university school of education). Furthermore, the perennial question of which authority – the central Department of Education or the regional education boards—should exercise control over teacher training still remained unanswered in any definite sense. But there were some signs of a growing acceptance by university academics of the idea that professional studies in education should receive the same respect as other types of professional endeavours. The separation of colleges from universities was seen in some quarters as a direct hindrance to this process. Accordingly, it was suggested that colleges no longer operate like seminaries. The institutional isolation created 'a static orthodoxy of outlook' (McKenzie, 1980, p.275) and inhibited creative thinking, analysis, and research. On the matter of content, David McKenzie warned that while it was vital that trainee teachers come to appreciate 'the relationships between schools and society' and can 'analyse educational questions in a disciplined manner' (p.278), the professional training programmes must aid students' teaching ability if an institution's credibility is to be maintained (p.281). Not surprisingly, therefore, McKenzie declared that 'there is a valid distinction in objectives between study in a general area and study with a particular professional purpose in view' (p.281). The main obstacle to achieving such recognition lay with the desire of some institutions to 'wear the trappings of alleged academic status' (p.281).

In 1968, Daniel Noda of the University of Hawaii told educators that the success or otherwise of any teacher education programme can be ascertained by the extent to which it erects 'a bridge between idealism and realism, between theory and practice, and between the academic setting of the university and the realistic, demanding environment of the classroom' (Minogue, 1971a, p.111). Although there is evidence that some New Zealand educationists were thinking along similar lines by about 1980, a

subsequent study of teacher education during the last twenty years should reveal the degree to which Noda *et al.*'s thinking has underpinned our more recent educational discourse and practice.

REFERENCES

- ADAMS, R.S. (1970). Teacher training. In R.J. Bates (Ed.), *Prospects in New Zealand education* (pp.158-169). Auckland: Hodder & Stoughton.
- ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL PLANNING. (1972). *Aspects of teacher education: Working papers prepared by the Standing Committee on Teacher Training* (Paper No.2, Relationships between teachers' colleges and universities). (The Dalziel Report). Wellington: Author.
- ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL PLANNING. (1974). *Educational Development Conference, 1973-1974: Proposals for Change* (The Holmes Report). Wellington: Government Printer.
- ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL PLANNING. (1975). *Educational Development Conference: Directions for Educational Development* (The Holmes Report). Wellington: Government Printer.
- ALCORN, N. (1999). Reviews of teacher education in New Zealand, 1950-1998: Continuity, contexts and change. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 5, 63-76.
- ALLAN, J. (1971). Teacher education. In F.W. Mitchell (Ed.), *New Zealand education today* (pp.123-133). Wellington: Reed.
- APPENDICES TO THE JOURNALS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES [AJHR]. (1967). Report of the Director-General of Education. E-1.
- BOARD OF EDUCATION. (1944). *Teachers and youth leaders* (The McNair Report). London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- BOYD, W. (1938). The training of teachers. In A.E. Campbell (Ed.), *Modern trends in education: The proceedings of the New Education Fellowship Conference held in New Zealand in July 1937* (pp.427-429). Auckland: Whitcombe & Tombs.
- BUTCHERS, A.G. (1932). *The education system: A concise history of the New Zealand education system*. Auckland: National Printing Co.
- CAMPBELL, A.E. (1948). New Zealand. In G. Jeffery, F. Clarke, A. Judges, N. Hans, I. Kandel, E. Evans, M. Read, J. Lauwerys, & R. Evans (Eds.), *The Year Book of Education* (pp.183-187). London: University of London Institute of Education and Brown Brothers.
- CAUGHLEY, J. (1925). The education system of New Zealand. In M. Fraser (Ed.), *New Zealand Official Yearbook* (pp.816-822). Wellington: Government Printer.
- COMMITTEE ON NEW ZEALAND UNIVERSITIES. (1959). *Report of the Committee on New Zealand Universities* (The Parry Report). Wellington: Government Printer.
- COMMISSION ON EDUCATION IN NEW ZEALAND. (1962). *Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand* (The Currie Report). Wellington: Government Printer.
- CUMMING, I., & CUMMING, A. (1978). *History of state education in New Zealand: 1840-1975*. Wellington: Pitman.
- DAKIN, J.C. (1973). *Education in New Zealand*. Auckland: Leonard Fullerton.

- DAVIES, E.S. (1938). The training of teachers in England. In A.E. Campbell (Ed.), *Modern trends in education: The proceedings of the New Education Fellowship Conference held in New Zealand in July 1937* (pp.429-438). Auckland: Whitcombe & Tombs.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. (1978). *Review of teacher training* (The Hill Report). Wellington: Government Printer.
- GIBBES, E. (1928). The expansion of the education department. In I. Davey (Ed.), *Fifty years of national education in New Zealand: 1878-1928* (pp.10-19). Auckland: Whitcombe & Tombs.
- Improving learning and teaching: Report of the Working Party on Improving Learning and Teaching* (The Lawrence Report). (1974). Wellington: Government Printer.
- KANDEL, I.L. (1938). The preparation of teachers. In A.E. Campbell (Ed.), *Modern trends in education. The proceedings of the New Education Fellowship Conference held in New Zealand in July 1937* (pp.426-427).
- LEE, G., & LEE, H. (1998). An experiment in educational efficiency: The New Zealand junior high and intermediate schooling movement. *Teachers and Curriculum*, 2, 21-28.
- MCKENZIE, J.D.S. (1980). Teacher education in New Zealand: An appraisal. In G.H. Robinson & B.T. O'Rourke (Eds.), *Schools in New Zealand society: A book of readings* (pp.272-283). Auckland: Longman Paul.
- MASON, H.G.R. (1945). *Education today and tomorrow*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- MINOGUE, W.J.D. (1971a). *Hawaiian and New Zealand teacher education: A comparative study*. Wellington: New Zealand Educational Institute.
- MINOGUE, W.J.D. (1971b). Some problems of teacher education. In F.W. Mitchell (Ed.), *Looking ahead in New Zealand education* (pp.86-99). Wellington: Reed.
- MITCHELL, F. (1968). Some underlying assumptions. In F.W. Mitchell (Ed.), *New Zealand education today* (pp.47-55). Wellington: Reed.
- MURDOCH, J.H. (1946). *Education in transition: A short study of educational trends in New Zealand* (New Zealand Looks Ahead, Reconstruction Series No. 7). Wellington: New Zealand Institute of International Affairs.
- NEW ZEALAND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE. (1944). *Educational reconstruction: Reconstruction in primary education*. Wellington: Author.
- NEW ZEALAND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE. (1966). *Summary of policy*. Wellington: Author.
- NEW ZEALAND POST-PRIMARY TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION. (1974). *Teachers in change: Report of the Curriculum Review Group on the Education and Training of Secondary Teachers* (The Munro Report). Auckland: Longman Paul.
- OPENSHAW, R., LEE, G., & LEE, H. (1993). *Challenging the myths: Rethinking New Zealand's educational history*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Organisation and administration of education: Report of the Working Party on Organisation and Administration* (The Nordmeyer Report). (1974). Wellington: Government Printer.
- PARTON, H.N. (1968). Higher education in New Zealand today. In F.W. Mitchell (Ed.), *New Zealand education today* (pp.134-144). Wellington: Reed.
- RECESS EDUCATION COMMITTEE. (1930). *Report of the Recess Education Committee on Educational Reorganisation in New Zealand* (The Bodkin Report). Wellington: Government Printer.

- Recruitment education and training of teachers: Report of the Consultative Committee set up by the Hon. Minister of Education in November 1948 (The Campbell Report).* (1951). Wellington: Department of Education.
- ROTH, H. (1952). *George Hogben: A biography*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- ROYAL COMMISSION ON UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN NEW ZEALAND. (1925). *Report of the Royal Commission on University Education in New Zealand (The Reichel-Tate Report)*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- WATSON, J.E. (1956). *The intellectual status of students entering teachers' colleges, 1941-1956 (Bulletin No.5)*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

NOTES

1. Two-year primary teacher training was phased out between 1966 and 1971, to be replaced by three-year training programmes (Dakin, 1973, p.97). The three-year course first began in 1966 at the Dunedin and Hamilton Teachers' Colleges (AJHR, E-1, 1967, p.30), planning for which continued to involve the Department of Education working with college principals and staff. Prior to three-year programmes training colleges awarded no qualifications but from 1968, colleges were able to award the Teacher's College Diploma after a three-year (Division A) programme had been completed. The Department of Education issued the Trained Teacher's Certificate (TTC) which was both a teaching qualification and a registration certificate (*Lawrence Report*, 1974, p.101).
2. The Hamilton Teachers' College and the University of Waikato joined together to offer, through a School of Education, a four year Bachelor of Education (BEd) degree from July 1967. Student teachers were still able to study in a three year Teachers' College Diploma course, however (Parton, 1968, p.141). Massey University (Palmerston North) also offered a BEd degree and a postgraduate qualification, the Diploma of Education (DipEd). The University of Otago (Dunedin) also had a DipEd, which gave qualified student teachers some credit for their teachers' college studies. Victoria University of Wellington offered courses toward a BEd and a DipEd (Dakin, 1973, pp.103-104), but the University of Auckland was regarded as 'antagonistic' toward being involved in teacher education (Cumming & Cumming, 1978, p.338).
3. Secondary teacher trainees (Division B) students took a three-year course, leading to a BA or BSc. The programme combined university courses with professional studies at a teachers' college. After one year of satisfactory teaching in a secondary school the Division B graduates were awarded a Diploma in Teaching (Dakin, 1973, p.100). Nevertheless, specialist secondary teacher training in commercial and home economics subjects was available within teachers' colleges at Auckland (the Auckland Secondary Teachers' College) and at Christchurch (in the Secondary Division of the Christchurch Teachers' College); these students did not attend university classes. Two other programmes were also available: Division C and Division U. The former consisted of a one year course (at Auckland and Christchurch only) for those

trainees who had completed most, or all, of their university degree or diploma study. Division U was for students who were granted a Secondary Teacher Studentship to enable them to graduate from a New Zealand university with a degree or diploma, and who were then contractually obligated to take a teacher training course (Dakin, 1973, pp.101-102).