

TEACHER TRAINING IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

by
HANS-JURGEN APEL

Note : A reprint from " EDUCATION", Volume 47, (1993) edited by the Institute of Scientific Cooperation, Tübingen, Germany, with their kind permission; This publication is a biannual collection of recent German Contribution to the field of Educational Research - Editor)

How young people can and should be trained by means of a course of studies to become teachers had repeatedly been the subject of academic debate and official regulations since the late 18th century. This debate is connected with the introduction of political directives concerning training for the teaching profession. What is the special task of teachers, and what is the specific difficulty of an academic training for the responsible exercise of the office of teacher ? How can people be prepared for dealing with children and adolescents, and for arranging learning situations for the best of the learners and for the promotion of general progress ?

Introduction

Talking of the relation between theory and practice in teacher training means embarking upon a perennial discussion. In doing so, one at once encounters two contrary views, which are expressed in corresponding models of teacher training : one approach being to combine theory and practice (one-phase training), and the other to give differing emphasis to theory and practice in two separate phases of training : first as theoretical studies with practice as an appendix, and after that carrying out teaching practice with appended theoretical considerations. The second approach has become standard official practice. How can one arrive at a well-founded judgment of

the suitability of the one or the other from ? It appears to me to be useful for the discussion to take up once more the ideas that were put forward on this topic in the early 19th century by J. F. Herbart and F.D. Schleiermacher. Because of the clarity of their argumentation, they can form a point of reference for the necessary assessment.

However, first of all there is a second point that requires clarification : The chosen topic already contains an ambiguous formulation in the pair of concepts "theory and practice". For within the context of teacher training "theory and practice" can be understood as part of this training, and various questions asked, e.g. to what extent "theory and practice" can be linked at all in a course of studies at tertiary level, whether the training of teachers should be theoretical

or practical, whether and how "theory and practice" can and should be coordinated and **complement** each other within the course. Put thus, the relationship between "theory and practice" is the focus of interest, and consequently at the same time the opposition between two traditional lines of teacher training, namely primary school teacher training, carried out in special colleges, and high school or grammar school teacher training, carried out at the university. But the terms "theory" and "practice" in the topic named above can also be understood differently, that is, "theory" as a conception or guideline for action, and "practice" as action guided by this conception. In this case, the analysis is concentrated both on the connection of theory and practice and the understanding of the connections and conditions that lead to the realisation of failure of the conception in the actuality of training. This aspect too is the subject of much debate in the discussion. The first perspective opens up a view of the history of the dispute about whether and to what extent theory should determine teacher training alone or in conjunction with practice. The second takes us to a history of complaints about the fact that what is valid and appears meaningful in theory is not able to be realised in practice. Both these perspectives are embedded in a basic argument about whether an academically based teacher training should be carried out in one phase or in two phases. After the decision of educational policy-makers in favour of two-phase training, the argument continues as to what relation the subject-related, subject-teaching and general educational components of the studies should bear to one another.

In the present text, it will be primarily the first aspect, that is, the relation between theory and practice in teacher training, that

will be discussed, without, however, completely neglecting the second. It seems to me important here to make clear the limits of what can be done at university; in the course of studies, all we can do is to provide a basis for future action. This should be done by means of theoretical studies in academic disciplines, subject-related method, and selected topics of general education. Academic thinking about education and instruction should first be developed, then related to the practical problems of the classroom. Principles of educational action should be discussed and tried out. This theory must be theoretically underpinned, so that later action under empirical conditions that can be theoretically underpinned becomes possible. Here we soon encounter the fundamental problem of any tertiary training for a particular profession: academic theory concerns itself with practice or areas of practice and action in practice, describes, analyses, compares and experiments, but by reason of its general statements always remains at a certain remove from action. This results in one problem of teacher training: how can that which in theory is correct and properly perceived be realised in practice, under pressure of the situation? How can principles of action and the requirements of the situation be reconciled? Since the time of its institutionalisation, teacher training has been supposed to find answers to this question through the integration of practice with theory and theory with practice.

The debate about the possibilities and requirements of teacher training has recently revived, as the conclusions of an investigation of the Commission on Educational Theory for schools and teacher training of the German Association for Educational Studies (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Erziehungswissenschaft) (Bager et al.

1990) show. The commission compares structural guidelines for teacher training in the various states of the German federation, and complains rightly about the generally lack of importance of theoretical educational studies within the course as a whole. To prove this one need only look at the weighting of the theoretical component of the course and the examinations. This situation promotes the theory of specialists, but does not support the education of future educators. For this reason, the commission demands a correction of the current practice : by means of projects, teacher training must be more theoretically supported and at the same time practice-oriented. The theoretical studies should be stressed as a central qualification for the teaching profession and possibilities of a one-phase teacher training examined again. At first, this sounds convincing. But even from the perspective of academic education, the position is on closer inspection too one-sided. It is the position of committed representatives of particular interests in educational theory, but in my view it lacks a balanced discussion of the requirement that Herbart stated long ago, that the educator must possess both "thinking power and science", but also "pedagogical tact". This double qualification needs to be borne in mind.

Teachers must be experts in certain subjects and in putting them across, but at the same time experts in suitable educational action in the school and in the classroom. It is certainly necessary to regain terrain in teacher training that was lost in the early 1970s, but first of all it is important to make really consistent use of the existing possibilities. This leaves open questions such as the following : what should form the centre of teacher training ? How are theory and practice to be coordinated during

training ? How can teacher training be meaningfully organised as education of the whole person together with the occupational component ?

Anyone wishing to join in this debate should have sought answers to the following questions :

- What should teachers be able to do ? What qualifications should be required for action in this profession ?
- How should they be prepared for this ?
- Where do the difficulties in the preparation lie ?

These three questions will now be discussed.

1. What should teachers be able to do ?

Teachers must above all be able to teach, i.e. be able to "put over" a subject, and also "be nice", as the pupils say. All classroom instruction is a particular form of teaching, a methodically formed, social teaching-learning situation, in which a set of facts is to be brought within the horizon of experience of some learners. In the course of such instruction, knowledge is to be acquired, skills developed, and social and moral behaviour practised. By contrast to learning by experience and intercourse, school instruction is goal-oriented, structured, planned teaching tied to guidelines and preconditions, with the objective that the pupils learn something. The structuring refers to the subject-matter concerned and the learning process aimed at. The planning relates to the shaping of the teaching-learning situation, which may be conceived either as open in the direction of learning by experience - or closed - learning by information. Between these two poles, forms of "open closedness" (Grunfeld) are possible. School instruction consists in the transmission of or the stimulus to acquire a

set of facts. It is based on decisions of teaching strategy relating to objectives, choice of content, media and methods. The point of departure is the pupils' own activity and their learning potential. The point of orientation is the curriculum. Each instruction unit fulfils various aims, e.g. :

- Existing experience is to be taken up in order to transmit basic knowledge and skills with suggestions that go beyond it.
 - The participation of the pupils themselves is to be appealed to by means of items corresponding to their abilities.
- This is to support an increase in independence in learning, social behaviour and the assessment of situations.
- The development of responsible behaviour in a community should be practised by means of appropriate tasks.

This requires the practising of social virtues as the basis of responsible action in society.

To these objectives, which are mentioned repeatedly in theories of education from the early 19th century onwards, there can be assigned ways of handling teaching-learning situations, which however need to be modified according to the type of school concerned ? Such means are :

- direct instruction by means of spoken indications (e.g. praise, suggestion, warning, reprimand)
- indirect instruction by means of setting tasks and requirements to learn particular material
- the principles and forms of action that characterise the school as a place of common living and learning.

Classroom instruction can, to complement this, be presented as a relevant interaction, marked on the one hand by the

spontaneity, on the other by the receptivity of the learners, and at the same time tied to functional roles in the class, determined by the "discipline", "achievement" and "motivation" (Diederich 1988) of all concerned. Compared with experience of everyday life, this is an artificial learning situation, created and maintained by teachers. The shaping of this situation cannot be left to accident.

Teachers must - as K. Mollenhauer says - develop "a certain intent awareness of the difference between the possible and the actual". Their "first virtue" is, according to him, "attention, ability to listen, patient observation" (1985, 121 et seq.), and their second, shaping teaching-learning situations in a challenging way and having a professional assessment of educational matters.

Teaching in school acquires its own dignity through the place at which it takes place. "The institution as such educates" (Bernfeld), by means of its forms, rules, effects, experience in situations demanding achievement, informal relations in the everyday routine of school. This process must be complemented by carefully planned educational actions, namely by the "supporting" of the good and "counteracting" (Schleiermacher) that which is undesirable in the community. Therefore teachers combine measures such as disciplining and acting according to rules with guiding pupils towards independent activity. They practice both closed and open forms of learning. All instruction should combine these contrary functions, and has the task of leading the pupils through dependence to independence, through receptivity to spontaneity. In this, teachers have a special task : they are acting in a concrete present with respect to a not yet available, only guessable future, while tied

to official demands. In this situation, they must put forward to young people objectives that they could wish for themselves, if they were already adult. They are fundamentally obliged "to challenge the reasoning powers of the child, by demanding (from their pupils) mobility and conceptual effort" (Mollenhauer 1985, 141). By the manner of their teaching and through their example they must themselves present plausibly desirable forms of action, and transmit the values of a democratic way of life. Teachers are expected to radiate commitment, but also to be able to guarantee teaching-learning situations, to exercise social control, and to discipline by firmness and checking work.

Teaching, then, is a planned, methodically organised form of educational action, in which "supporting" and "counteracting" are intentionally deployed, in order to promote wide-ranging knowledge and independence, proceeding from the independent activity of the learners. This presupposes clear objectives, stimulating subject-matter, and the placing of possibilities of action at the disposal of the learners. Only then can instruction take place that can have an educative effect through the promotion of existing talents, planned requirements, individual advice and the evaluation of learning progress and achievement.

What is required in order to fulfil professional functions of this kind, and should therefore be provided in study and training? I should like to mention three elements that have always been regarded in educational thought as indispensable preconditions for teachers' action:

- 1.1 "thinking power and science" (Herbart)
- 1.2 "tact" (Herbart) and "levelheadedness" (Schleiermacher),

- 1.3 "commitment and reflection" (Flitner).

1.1 "Thinking power and science": in his *Allgemeine Pädagogik* (General Theory of Education) published in 1806, Herbart states that the educator must possess "thinking power and science" in order to be able "to see and present reality in human fashion as a fragment of the great Whole" (Herbart 1989, Vol. II, 7). "Thinking power and science" are the expression of an analytical and systematising procedure. To Herbart they are necessary but not adequate preconditions of the educator. In two early lectures (Herbart 1989, Vol. I, 279 et seq.), Herbart connects thinking power, science and action in educational practice. This makes it apparent that the concept of "thinking power" becomes clear only through that of "science". Herbart defines "science" as a "set of theorems amounting to a totality of thought, which may diverge and proceed as consequences from principles and as these from general principles" (ibid, 283, et seq.). Science, then, is a deductive system of theorems in which order and system predominate. Thus knowledge means more than insight into factual states of affairs and their interconnections, more than the penetration of phenomena; it means the spiritual construction of reality. In this connection, Herbart speaks of theory as a form of thinking in principles: "Theory, in its generality, extends over a wide area of which each individual in practising it touches on only an infinitely small part; in its indefiniteness, which follows immediately from the generality, it passes over all the details, all the individual circumstances in which the practitioner will find himself in any given case, and all the individual rules, considerations, efforts, by

which he must deal with those circumstances. In the school of theory or of science, therefore, too much and too little is always learnt for practice" (ibid., 284). The thinking power possessed by the educator must be scientific, or theoretical, in nature. It is, says Herbart, the precondition for recognising interrelationships, to deduce insights from principles, and at the same time to think about reality generally. On the path to this pinnacle of science, the future educator must learn to acquire knowledge and to systematise it into a unity³.

Of what kind must this knowledge be? and what kind of thinking power is necessary to qualify for educational action? A well-founded knowledge of reality, which first should be "examined", then "(re)presented". The educator, then, should have the knowledge of the reality to be taught! and the spiritual faculty to penetrate it himself and from this level of knowledge to present it. With relation to the professional activity of teaching, the educator/teacher first requires a well-founded knowledge of the subject-matter to be taught, specialist knowledge. From Herbart's "General Theory of Education", however, it may be concluded that this is not enough. He must further acquire fundamental knowledge about the possibilities of transmitting knowledge, about teaching and educating. Only as the initiated can teachers understand various spheres of historico-social reality, and pass their wide knowledge of these on to learners. With relation to the teaching situation, we would now-a-days say that they need fundamental knowledge of a particular subject, together with knowledge and skills for the teaching of this subject and general education, in order to teach properly. In his lecture on education of 1826, Schleiermacher names "knowledge and ability to teach" as the requirements of

the teacher for instruction. The "knowledge" relates to the knowledge of the subject-matter and teaching it, the "ability to teach" a qualification to transmit subject-matter to be taught from properly educative points of view. Herbart, too, saw the necessity of this capacity. He therefore referred, as well as to "thinking power and science", to the necessity of "educational tact" as "the highest jewel in educational art" (Herbart 1989, Vol.II, 39).

"Teaching ability" shows itself, to speak in modern terms, as skill and educational imagination. One can describe as the skill of teachers a particular art of judgment and action in educational situations, based on knowledge of the subject concerned and of the conditions of the action, of preconditions for learning, and possibilities of teaching. This is to be regarded as an expression of professional ability, and as such is grounded in the course of studies. The academic foundations are broadened by application in practice and by a debate on theory and method. The skill of the teacher shows itself in the way in which subject knowledge is gained and methodically presented, how practice is shaped by understanding, but also how questions of moral education are dealt with and situations mastered. One thing in which this skill expresses itself is teaching with imagination, the alternation of teaching and learning, and the flexibility of the teacher's intervention according to the requirements of the teaching and learning. Well-founded action combines knowledge with experience in the mastering or shaping of a situation. It is based on an assessment of the situation which is in turn preceded by ideas about the objective of the action. Such an assessment is not a direct putting into action of theoretical knowledge, but an application of knowledge and experience adapted to the specific

conditions of the situation. It is not a matter of mere "common sense", but a task for the solution of which "as a rule special knowledge of an academic kind" is assumed. "Only those possessing the necessary qualifications are entitled to judge and give an opinion" (Koch 1991, 241) - a clear indication of the need for fundamental subject and educational knowledge.

1.2 "Tact" and "levelheadedness": now, how do well-founded actions come about? How can general theory be connected with the special demands of practice? How do assessments of different situations take place on the basis of "academic special knowledge"? In the above-mentioned lecture, Herbart utilises fundamental ideas of a philosophy of the power of judgment to attain to a solution to these questions. He starts from the logical distance between theory and practice, and names "educational tact" as an important link between them. In this connection, he observes, concerning the process of educational action: "Now, however good a theoretician is, when he puts his theory into practice a missing link will interpose itself quite involuntarily between theory and practice, that is to say, a certain tact, a rapid judgment and decision" (Herbart 1989, Vol. I, 285). This judgment takes place as a reaction to the demands of a situation, and is based on a rapid estimate of the circumstances and an immediate decision as to possible intervention. The judgment of the actor, arrived at under the pressure of the situation, is determined "primarily by his feeling and only distantly by his conviction" (ibid). Thus, according to Herbart's view, it is not primarily the expression of a judgment of the reason, but predominantly expresses feeling and volition. As such, it fills the gap "left empty by theory" (ibid., 286) with a regulatory

effect.

In Herbart's "General Theory of Education", "educational tact" is presented as the expression of empathy in the process of learning and education. Here it shows itself as a form of behaviour which enters into the process of intellectual appropriation which Herbart calls a "basic rhythm of concentration and reflection" and intervenes in it. "Concentration" and "reflection" are to Herbart the impression of intellectual activity, the basis of education and of all educative teaching. The essential of educational tact, in this case, consists in the teacher's "sensing" when concentration on a particular subject-matter must be supplanted by systematic reflection on this subject-matter. This empathy leads to a regulation of the process of learning and education. Tactful understanding and empathetic intervention in the learning process has remained until today an indispensable quality of the educational action of the teacher. It can only take place on the basis of systematic knowledge as a consequence of intelligent judgment, and is thus also under the influence of personal feelings, sensations and perceptions.

This observation leads to a problem of training: if educational tact depends on empathy and can thus only inadequately be operationalised as a condition of educational action, how can ways be laid down for teaching this tact to young persons? How can people be trained to be "tactful" teachers? Let us discuss once more Herbart's view that tact "only forms during practice; it forms through the effect of that which we experience during practice, our feeling. This effect will differ, according to our mood; and we can affect this mood of ours by means of taking thought" (Herbart 1989, Vol. I, 286). So tact, the "ability for action in sure command of the situation" (Muth

1989, 15) and "sensitivity in dealing with others" (ibid.,12) only manifest themselves in practice, and cannot be planned in advance, though they might be prepared for. How, and by what, can tactful action be prepared for? Being an unpredictable task of suitable action in educational situations, it cannot take place by means of practising fixed patterns of action. It must remain a spontaneous reaction. According to Herbart, the future educator can "prepare by taking thought, reflection, research, theory....not so much his future actions in particular cases as rather himself, his mind, his head and his heart for the proper acceptance, grasp, feeling and judgment of the phenomena awaiting him, and the situation into which he will get" (ibid.). Thus "science" can best prepare the teacher for the art of action, because only thinking in general permits one to experience the significance of the particular. This does not exclude practising particular modes of behaviour, but puts this form of teacher training in its proper place, complementary to the study of historical theory. Herbart appears to have seen things correctly here when he observes: "Only in action does one learn the art, does one acquire tact, skill, cleverness, dexterity; but even in action only those learn the art who have learned the theory in thought beforehand...and have determined in advance the future impressions that experience was to make on them" (ibid., 286 et seq.). Here he is referring to the faculty of educational judgment, the ability to subsume the individual case by distinguishing between possible principles, rules and laws.

Thus preparation for practical action is made fundamentally by theory, by practice in systematic thinking, by knowledge of the sets of facts, principles and rules known to apply to education. For instance,

educational action urgently requires a clear view of the objectives and means of education, of possible forms of influencing, of learning and its preconditions. This knowledge, combined with a "gift for invention" (ibid.,287) practised by means of examples, permits a well-founded assessment of existing educational circumstances. "Considerations" (ibid.) of this kind can provide a path to judgment and action, but not more, for the action also follows the impetus of the situation, which in turn is received and interpreted subjectively, by means of as Herbart says - a "peculiar way in which he (the educator : H.J.A.) by reason of his feeling for order, by reason of his judgment of human circumstances, is affected and excited by the events taking place before him" (ibid., 290). By "tact", Herbart clearly wishes to refer to rational and emotional bases of action. Judgment and decision may form the basis of all educational tact, but they are dependent on various elements such as convictions, knowledge, feelings and the perception of situative conditions.

If we transfer these insights to the conditions of today, it can be observed with regard to a theoretical basis of educationally responsible action that the basis of such action is solid theoretical knowledge together with practice in possible modes of action. Knowledge in particular subjects, the teaching of particular subjects, and general education, complemented by knowledge of philosophy, (educational) psychology, the sociology of education and political science, are therefore the basis of the knowledge specific to the teaching profession. They cannot, however, guarantee well-founded, tactful educational action. In addition, experience is indispensable as it is gained by the teacher himself in practice lessons, and can be seen

in recordings of classes, and read in reports on educational situations. Here we meet up with a central question : how does the combination of specialist subject knowledge, knowledge of the teaching of specialist subjects, and general education result in the knowledge required to guide the teacher and a "basic educative attitude" (Reble 1992)? - a question that will be discussed again later.

The concept of educational tact has drawn attention to an important side of teacher behaviour, the judgment of educational situations according to principles and other premises. A second quality of teachers to be discussed is "levelheadedness" (Schleiermacher). This is an equally important principle of educational action, resting, however, on different premises.

Schleiermacher demands this mode of behaviour from teachers when dealing with learners. Only in this way can sufficient account be taken of what the learners as subjects already are and wish to become, and what society demands of them. As a principle of educational action, "levelheadedness" is to be related to the educational process. Schleiermacher interprets education as a form of action in particular situations in which either existing talents are stimulated and guided or their further development is hindered.

According to Schleiermacher's insight, both forms of intervention bear a certain relationship to each other : " The nature of education lies in the fusing of the two skills : supporting and counteracting must coexist; we regard each of them alone as inadequate" (1966,54). Theory, Schleiermacher's position runs, has the task of discussing this fusion. In it, support and counteraction are to be discussed as principles of educational action. Practice requires putting the

principle into effect; this requires "the levelheaded attitude", "true levelheadedness" (1966,55), a faculty based on clear ideas of objectives and on knowledge of the forms of education and their effects. Levelheadedness is the basis of the educational power of judgment. Every judgment of educational situations requires clear ideas - about the goal, means and conditions of the action, the levelheadedness dealing with the potential of educational action. Its contrary would be rashness. Rash action is when one ignores the dialectic of this educational principle. This is possible either by exaggerated or insufficient supportiveness, or by the corresponding forms of counteraction. Levelheadedness is always necessary in dealing with people, to prevent damage by hasty judgment and situations brought about by this. In particular when dealing with children and adolescents, teachers must restrain rash emotionality both in their language and their actions. Levelheadedness is the model for the solving of conflicts.

1.3 Reflection and commitment : W. Flitner has named the "reflexion engagee" of the educator the fundamental form of educational thinking and action. He defines the self-conception of the educator by calling the theory of education "a responsible mode of thinking including a spiritual decision" (Flitner 1966, 18)⁴. This thinking is carried out in a spirit of responsibility for young people "who need education, training, spiritual welfare advice, and support for their powers of self-education" (ibid.). What, then, does responsibility consist of ? This relates to decisions that are made about possibilities of experience and behaviour, but in such a way that we may assume that those affected by these decisions, were they already capable of

responsible action, would wish to act in a comparable way. In this sense, teachers are responsible, says Flitner, only to those to be educated. They must do this in reality, at least as teachers, but also always in the eyes of society. This renders more difficult responsible practice, requiring as it does taking into account and balancing out various expectations and claims.

"Commitment" generally refers to an "inner obligation or a feeling of obligation towards something." Educational commitment means responsibility and the personal effort connected with this of teachers towards children and adolescents and their claims for self-development through school instruction. It is based on notions about duties towards others. In concrete terms, commitment is expressed both in understanding of problems in learning and behaviour and in the consistent allotment of tasks in class. Reflection means "thinking something out or over, considering" - in this case considerations guided by theory. This is the basis for levelheadedness, indispensable as thinking about one's own actions and their consequences in responsible action as a teacher. Like the concept of educational tact, these characteristics are less easy to grasp than the other, previously mentioned preconditions, but they are typical features of educational action, which requires levelheadedness and tactful proceeding.

For educationalists committed to teacher training, the following questions remain: how can we lay the foundations by means of a course of studies for the kind of educational and methodical action described above? What qualifications can be formed by this course? How can we guide students to the seriousness of educational thinking and action given the remote and abstract nature of university

education? In order to approach an answer to this question, let us discuss the second question formulated above.

2) How should Students be Prepared for the Situation as Teachers?

Let us commence with a historical retrospect. In the major German-speaking countries, the institutionalisation of teacher training took place from the early 19th century onwards⁵. The educational administrations decided on two types of institution, 'seminaries' and universities. At the newly-created seminaries or teachers' training institutes, elementary school teachers were given a strict training for their later activity; together with instruction in subjects and teaching method, class visits and teaching practice formed an important part of their training. At the universities, meanwhile, future teachers at secondary schools studied the subjects that they wished to teach later; during the university course of studies, there was hardly any connection made between theory and practice. This separation of theory and practice was justified by the view that those who had mastered a subject would also be able to teach it. Despite this argument, the separation of theory and practice was soon recognised as a deficiency in the training of teachers for secondary schools. Early attempts at correction, such as the introduction in the 1820s of a trial year after the final university examination were not, however, able to solve the problem since the further educational training depended on the methodical ability of the mentors at the schools⁷. Whereas the seminary training of the elementary school teachers was to some extent improved, but essentially remained as it was up to the

period of the Weimar Republic after World War I (and in the states of Bavaria and Baden-Württemberg even later), high-school teacher training was decisively modified in the 1890s. A second phase of training in teaching method at 'high-school seminaries' or postgraduate institutes was introduced, and thus the two-phase model of teacher training generally valid today was institutionalised- at first, however, only for high-school teachers. This confirmed the separation of theory and practice in teacher training.

Let us consider this development from the point of view of the training regulations. In the second half of the 19th century, the future elementary school teacher, after attending elementary school himself, attended a preparatory institution ("Praparandie") for three years, followed by three years at a teachers' seminary, where he was given instruction in the relevant subjects and subject teaching, and practical training. His subject knowledge was limited, in accordance with his future duties, and his training in method was supported by practice. In Prussia from 1854 onwards elementary school teachers had (like high-school teachers) to take a second teachers' examination, two to five years after their first, provisional appointment. This already foreshadowed a two-phase training, except that the connection between theory and practice during the first phase was retained. After their school-leaving examination ("Abitur"), the future high-school teachers first acquired a general academic qualification. In Prussia from 1866 onwards, and in Bavaria from 1873, a clearly subject-oriented course of university studies was prescribed in the place of general studies. It included a philosophical component, but remained without practical relation to the intended profession. In the 19th century,

practical teaching was learnt as a kind of craft, which from the 1890s onward took place in a second phase of training, in which practice was complemented by instruction in lesson planning and teaching method.

In 1926, with the opening of the first Academies of Education (Pädagogische Akademien), a fundamental change in the training of elementary school teachers took place. These institutions had been conceived as "Bildnerhochschulen" (educators' academies) and were meant, in the spirit of the "Jugendbewegung" or Youth Movement, to be small-scale "living communities of educators" in which the training of teachers took place by means of living and learning in the community, complemented by play, singing, and travel. The drill of the seminaries was to be put aside, but the combination of theory and practice particular to them was to be retained. The Nazis subsequently politicised this training in so-called "Teacher Training Universities", and after 1941 degraded the training of elementary school teachers by the institution of teacher training institutions which resumed the seminary tradition.

After the Second World War, the notion of the academy was taken up again. During the 1960s the Teachers' Academies (Pädagogische Akademien) were further developed as Teachers' Training Colleges (Pädagogische Hochschulen) institutions in which academic theory in teaching and research gradually gained in importance over against practical training. The practical elements of the course of studies were delegated to practical training departments, so that the link between theory and practice within the academic institution itself was broken. At the same time, the training of teachers for primary schools and Hauptschulen, the least academic of the 3 kinds of secondary school, was organised

in two phases : at Teachers' Training Colleges (PHs) the basics of subject knowledge, subject-teaching techniques, and general educational theory and method were acquired, and method and teaching practice were carried out in "seminars".

The period of reform in the late 1960s and early 1970s was a phase of intensive debate about teacher training. This was to be adjusted to the new forms of schools and produce a new type of teacher, differing from his predecessors by his special attitudes to educational action. As well as being an instructor, the new teacher was above all to be able to give the pupils competent advice, assess them properly, and educate them responsibly. It was hoped to gain particular advantage from directly coordinating theory and practice during the first phase of training. To this end, a one-phase teacher training course was tried out in North German states during the 1970s. However, its execution suffered from the difficulty of finding academic teachers competent in both theory and practical teaching, or good practitioners with corresponding theoretical qualifications. (How this has been achieved in the new federal states of the former German Democratic Republic in the last couple of years, without a loss of theoretical knowledge, remains to be investigated.) The social crisis in the teaching profession over the past 15 years or so, which led to considerable unemployment among trained teachers, also brought about a decline of interest in questions of teacher training, and resulted both in a decline in teacher training measures and in a reduction in training facilities. General education components were cut down in favour of subject-related ones. Endeavours at reform were no longer fashionable; the universities were developed with other points of emphasis.

The conclusion is that the development over more than a century has been in the direction of two-phase teacher training. The first phase contains the study of subject knowledge, subject-teaching skills and general educational foundations. This phase of training contains, together with the academic-theoretical studies, practical areas whose possibilities of experience could be better integrated into the course of studies by the college teachers, despite inadequacies. Paul Heimann stressed this requirement as long ago as 1962 in his draft *Didaktik als Theorie und Lehre* (Method as both Theory and Teaching), in which he stressed that the school practice components of the course offered an opportunity to combine theory and practice in a meaningful way.

Let us, after this digression, take up again the question as to how young people should be trained as teachers. If we want people with thinking power and science, tact and level-headedness, reflection and commitment as teachers, the answer—even if it appears a commonplace—can only be through thorough study both theoretical and practical. Theory is to give them academic clarity, and practice the chance to test and criticise what they have learned in theory. This procedure is a process of education in the course of which young people are to acquire "ability to act independently in the service of the True, the Beautiful and the Good" (Diesterweg 1909, 17), so that they themselves will have striven for the goal that they are to pursue once again in their teaching in school and the intercourse with their pupils. They should be developed ("gebildet") rather than moulded ("erzogen") by their training, for they come to us already moulded by school, many with enthusiasm and commitment for their future task in informing and

forming the young, less for the course of studies that precedes this. Educational studies must give them an opportunity, besides the acquisition of knowledge, above all to discuss the aims and means of education, so that they themselves desire the "True, Beautiful and Good", and pass on this desire through their example, their habits and their teaching, by means of work and play.

What form is this training to take? In his "Guide" (1850), Diesterweg gives an indication still worth considering today: "Every teacher should study the things that are part of general human education, and additionally those that fit him most for his profession; think them over thoroughly; grasp the individual truths in themselves and in their connection with the Whole, relate them to cognate things, and investigate their relationship with intellectual powers" (1909, 35). Each teacher should carry out these studies in such a way that the relevant tradition of writings extant is thoroughly learned and reflected on. "Learning the tradition" and "independent thinking" (Diesterweg) are the two forms of study that are able to lead to "thoroughness of convictions insights and knowledge" (ibid., 36). Here, academic studies must be complemented by practical experience, and in the process the relation of theory to practice must be decided, and how they should be carried out and coordinated in the two phases of teacher training.

The two-phase form of teacher training determines the course of studies, which is the basic component, carried further by the following teaching practice, with accompanying seminar training, to the conclusion of the training. This is of course a truism, but is too little noted in practice. This fact has consequences: the university course for teachers is incomplete, and passes on

'rough diamonds', as it were, to the trainers in the institute of education ("Seminar"). It ends without having adequately practised the ability to teach or developed ability and imagination in practical teaching. Its primary task is to promote "thinking power and science", and to give indications of "tactful and level-headed" action in school and teaching. The Seminar training must therefore proceed from the foundations laid at the university, and develop the practical side of the profession of teaching on the basis of relevant theory. The focus of this phase of professional training is the training in method and the handling of pupils. Here teaching ability and imagination are to be developed. Teacher training can only function with both fields of training cooperate, that is, when the teachers at university pay attention to both the theory and the practice of this field of profession activity and elevate it to the status of object of instruction in subject-teaching method and general educational principles. For this reason a form of cooperation between university teachers and Seminar Teachers must be found, in order to create continuity between the two phases of training.

Then a second idea is important: The coordination of theory and practice already begins during the first phase of teacher training - another truism that is too little taken note of. In all regulations for teacher training, theoretical studies are to be coordinated with teaching practice. Against the repeatedly made criticism of teacher training as being too remote from practice, I should like to state that teaching practice offers an opportunity to combine theory and practice during the first phase of training. However, this opportunity is made too little use of by academic teachers, as long as teaching practice is inadequately prepared and evaluated. There are certainly several reasons for this, of which I will

mention only two. One is the inadequate number of hours allotted to the central subjects of practical and school education and teaching planning and method during the university course of studies; the other is the traditional aversion to practice on the part of many university teachers. This lack hinders the necessary preparation and evaluation of the teaching practice, in which the specific tasks of observation and planning should become the subject of academic reflection, if the teaching practice is to be meaningful.

3. Where are the Problems in Teacher Training to be Found ?

In conclusion, I should like to discuss the difficulties that arise in the training of young people to become responsibly acting teachers, in three points. First, the fragmentation of portions of academic theory; Second, the currently dominant concept of "teacher training"; and thirdly the relation between theory and practice.

3.1 Academic theory : the fragmentation of the academic theory of education into numerous disciplines with disparate segments of educational action as their respective topics has contributed to the loss of a coherent system of educational theory. But a systematic survey of what "teaching and instruction in and through the school" means is a basic precondition for teachers' developing thinking power and science in the educational field. The objectives and the means of educational action under institutional conditions are the first thing to be worked out. First one must know what one wishes and for what purpose, and how one proposes to achieve it; then individual problems can be suitably classified.

3.2 The concept of "teacher training" : the authors of training regulations have totally

underestimated the difficulty of combining differing subjects within university courses of education. Only in rare cases, such as that of medicine, are university research and theoretical teaching consistently coordinated in training for a field of professional activity. The combination of the humanities and cultural studies within a course of education is a meaningful objective, but in practice functions only superficially, because agreement as to the selection of material between representatives of different subjects is difficult to make and even more difficult to realise. The university principle of the freedom of teaching and research often prevents the coordination of courses in the various subjects involved in the basic sector of educational studies. Furthermore, educational studies cannot function properly because too little time is devoted to them. Compared with the subject-study component, the educational component has generally been pushed into the background from the 1980s onwards. The combination of subject studies, subject-teaching method and general education is in theory a reasonable combination, but in practice it is one-sided because of the dominance of the subject studies.

University teacher training, centres, on academic studies. I see this as being in theory a successful basis for future teacher action, but practically as a programme that cannot be realised in actuality.

3.3 The relation of theory and practice : all studies for the office of teacher are a preparation for action in school and instruction by means of theoretical studies to which practical experience is appended. During the first phase of training, a predominant amount of theory is combined with a small proportion of practice. In the

second phase of training, by contrast, practice predominates, combined with less theory. The dilemma of practice is the lack of integration into the course of studies, generally, teaching practice ought to be thoroughly prepared and worked over subsequently, but this would demand in turn devoting more time to theoretical studies, if the theoretical component of training - the basis of the development of thinking power and science - is not to be impaired.

At the present time, we must live with these inadequacies. Although the preparation and appraisal of teaching practice play an important and repeatedly underestimated part in the course of studies for trainee teachers, they cannot currently be appropriately exploited for the task of teacher training. Here there are still opportunities for the development of a theoretically well-founded professional training. Teaching practice during the course of studies can provide fields of experience that make a mark on the personality. The reason for the repeatedly observable neglect of this sector of training is the traditional separation of academic theory and its application. With the "Berliner Didaktikum", F. Heimann provided a model that still deserves attention today. University teachers in those faculties one of whose emphases is the coordination of research and teaching with teacher training must take this challenge seriously, and develop a concept in which theory and practice can be meaningfully coordinated.

4. Final Remark

What appears to me to be the main priority at the present time is not the demand for new accents in educational

theory in the study course for teachers, but to begin with the consistent use of existing opportunities offered by two-phase teacher training. This does not mean eschewing criticism and innovation, but rather the endeavour to take the requirements of teacher training seriously. This should be done by means of three measures:

- (1) by a thorough academic training for young people wishing to become teachers,
- (2) by the planned integration of practice into the course of studies, and
- (3) by the increased interlocking of the first and the second phase of training

Teaching young people to be teachers depends, of course, on their interest in this task, but it also requires clear ideas about the objectives and means of educational action and concrete practice

NOTES

1. The topic discussed is treated historically and systematically as "professionalisation". Since the 1970s there has been a considerable body of literature on this topic.

2. The means, then, apply to all kinds of school, but have to be concretised differently in the elementary school than, for instance, the secondary modern. These 'means' are not methods of teaching.

3. This proposal was in some cases understood, in the training of elementary school teachers in the 19th century, to mean that the future teacher should have studied logic and psychology. This is the reason why seminar manuals of education often contain a brief relevant portion on this topic.

4. The vagueness of such statements makes it harder to relate this theory to practice.

5. On the development of high-school

teacher training in Bavaria and Prussia, cf. Apel 1989; on that of elementary school teachers in Prussia, Sauer 1987 and Schadt-Kramer 1990, which also contains further literature.

6 Exceptions prove this rule; cf. Apel 1986; Schubring 1983.

7 It may be remarked in passing that this trial year also fulfilled a disciplinary purpose by serving as a political check on the candidates.

8 In his "Theory of Education", Paulsen names these three forms, "example, discipline (habituation) and instruction", as means of the formation of the will.

REFERENCES

- APEL, H.J.** 1986, "Gymnasiallehrerbildung zwischen Wissenschaft und fachdidaktischer Orientierung". Vischr.f.,Wiss. Pad,62. Jg., 3. 289-319.
- APEL, H.J.**1989. "Die Ausbildung zum Gymnasiallehrer im 19. Jahrhundert". Schreiber, Magister, Lehrer, ed. Joh.G.Prinz v. Hohenzollern/M.Liedtke. Bad Heilbrunn. 291-306.
- APEL, H.J.**1990, Schulpädagogik, Eine Grundlegung. Köln, Vienna.
- BAYER, M.** et al. 1990. "Ausgewählte Ergebnisse einer Untersuchung über strukturelle Veränderungen in den Lehramtsstudiengängen". Erziehungswissenschaft. 1 Jg., 2. 24-86.
- BENNACK, J.** 1909, "Schulpraktika im Lehramtsstudium". Bildung und Erziehung 3.331-346.
- DIEDERICHS, J.**1988, Didaktisches Denken, Weinheim.

DIESTERWEG, A. 1909. Wegweiser zur Bildung für deutsche Lehrer. ed. K. Wacker. Paderborn.

FLITNER, W. 1966. Das Selbstverständnis der Erziehungswissenschaft in der Gegenwart. Heidelberg.

GIESECKE, Hermann 1985. Das Ende der Erziehung, Stuttgart.

HERBART, J.F. 1989 (Orig. Langensalza 1887). Samtliche Werke. Bd. I u. (ii) ed. K. Kehrbach/O. Flugel. Ahlen.

KOCH, L. 1991. Logik des Lernens. Weinheim.

MOLLENHAUER, K. 1985. Vergessene Zusammenhänge. Über Kultur und Erziehung. Weinheim, München.

MUTH, J. 1989. "Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Theorie und Praxis in der Pädagogik". Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. 9-16

RAMSEGER, J. 1991. Was heißt "durch Unterricht erziehen"? Weinheim.

REBLE, A. "Pädagogische Grundhaltung - ein nicht immer beachteter zentraler Zielpunkt der Lehrerbildung". Theorie und Praxis in der Lehrerbildung. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Prof. Dr. H. H. Schróder, ed. H. Ernst et al. München.

SAUER, M. 1987. Volksschullehrerbildung in Preussen. Köln. Vienna.

SCHADT-KRAMER, Claudia. 1990 (Diss. Köln). Die pädagogische Bildung der Volksschullehrer im 19. Jahrhundert. Hamburg.

SCHLEIERMACHER, F. 1966. Pädagogische Schriften. Düsseldorf.

SCHUBRING, G. 1983. Die Entstehung des Mathematiklehrerberufs im 19. Jahrhundert. Weinheim.