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Teacher training and teacher education in England and Norway: a comparative study of policy goals

Paul Stephens*1, Finn Egil Tønnessen1 & Chris Kyriacou2
1Stavanger University College, Norway; 2University of York, UK

In this paper, we examine the complementary and differing state-defined roles of beginning schoolteachers in England and Norway by investigating centrally mandated initial teacher preparation programmes in both countries. Through comparative analysis, we get to see the roles that the policy-makers in London and Oslo seek to confer upon the educators of future generations of schoolchildren, as well as exploring opportunities for cross-cultural policy learning. In broad terms, we found that centrally prescribed initial teacher training in England is, as its name implies, a training model that seeks to induct trainee teachers into the practical skills and willingness necessary for: instructing pupils in National Curriculum subjects, managing classroom activities, setting homework to consolidate and extend classroom work and providing pupils with a safe learning environment. Centrally prescribed initial teacher education in Norway is, as its name implies, an educative model whose goal is to help student teachers to: reflect and act upon the practical implications of educational theory, instruct pupils in National Curriculum subjects, display leadership in the classroom, act as a member of a caring profession, promote Norwegian values and provide pupils with a safe learning environment.

Introduction

Western governments spend a lot of public money on education, and, in an era characterized by the pursuit of national targets, the policy-makers want ‘value for money’. Schools in particular and also the colleges and universities that educate and train schoolteachers are today subject to an unprecedented degree of central control. Our focus in this paper is on teacher preparation. Our settings are two western countries, England and Norway. In both countries, the policy-makers have designs on the content of initial teacher education and training, some of them similar, others different.

Official expectations of appropriate teacher knowledge represent state-mandated ideals that may or may not affect what teacher educators (and their students) actually do on campus or in the schoolhouse (see, e.g., Page, 2001). Curricula of intentions (in this case, government wish-lists) do not always square with curricula as interpreted or ignored (Goodlad, 1994; Jennings, 2001). As Bauman (2002) argues, rarely, if ever, is the history that we make ‘made to order’ and seldom does
it resemble the original game plan. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume that national educational goals do have some influence on professional socialization (Kallestad & Olweus, 1998), even if such goals often meet varying degrees of resistance.

**Focus of study**

This study documents and compares the centrally mandated pedagogical content of Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) courses for the preparation of teachers in England and Norway. Because the content in England applies to undergraduate and postgraduate initial teacher training (in Norway, there are separate criteria for undergraduate and postgraduate courses), our findings also broadly apply to English Bachelor of Education (and similar) programmes. The aim is to compare policy-making intentions in the two countries as these are set out in state-sponsored programmes for the preparation of future teachers. We also scrutinize the potential of cross-cultural policy learning.

**Theoretical underpinnings**

In order to sharpen the analysis of intended educational outcomes, we have borrowed the concept of ‘curricula of intentions’ and its attendant theoretical anchorage from Goodlad (1994), who, not unlike the sociologist C. Wright Mills (1973), is interested in tracing the origins of ‘big impact’ decisions in society. The scholarly detective work of these two social scientists leads to the identification of powerful groups variously described as ‘fiefdoms’ by Goodlad and ‘the power elite’ by Wright Mills. Goodlad’s fiefdoms, in the context of American higher education policy, are the faculty of colleges and universities, where professors set the curricula and students partake of them. Wright Mills’s power elite—also American—operates on a higher societal rung, holding sway over national politics (including educational policy), the military and the economy. In each case, however, there is a chain of command, with those in the upper-middle and upper echelons of society constantly reminding the rest of us how things ‘should’ be run. The fact that Goodlad’s higher education planners in America are in the foothills of the power elite does not detract from his theoretical position that from some high point the intended curriculum emerges.

In England and Norway, the high point is at the top of the power structure, where the political elites in each country set out the national criteria for teacher preparation. These criteria vary according to specific cultural context, with Weber’s (1968) theoretical distinction between ‘specialized training’ and ‘cultivation’ capturing the essential differences. Broadly speaking, English initial teacher training (ITT) provides training in the practical skills of teaching, whereas Norwegian initial teacher education (ITE) is concerned with the cultivation of public duty, construed as moral and pedagogical stewardship.
A comparative approach

A comparative approach is appropriate in this study because national cultures and cultural learning between nations influence educational ideas and practices locally and globally (Alexander, 2001). Educational policies that draw upon this transfer need to be informed by a knowledge and understanding of contextual sensitivities and of the ensuing risks and promises of cross-cultural experimentation (see Crossley with Jarvis, 2001). There is a lesson (and a warning) here for policy-makers: a common policy idea can be interpreted and acted upon differently when it is transferred to a different setting (Broadfoot, 2002).

Consider, for example, the importance that policy-makers in England and Norway attach to the development of effective classroom management skills. In each case, the policy intention is to help intending teachers to establish and maintain a productive learning environment, but how this is to be achieved is context specific: directive management in England, democratic leadership in Norway. These preferred styles mirror important aspects of different national cultures: the one—even in the liquid modernity of the twenty-first century (Bauman, 2002)—still quite authoritarian, the other relatively permissive. The uncritical importation of a ‘firm manager’ style from England to Norway or of a ‘democratic leader’ style in the other direction would probably confuse pupils. This does not, however, rule out the potential benefits of selective policy learning of the kind that carefully (and critically) adapts promising ideas to local settings.

Training and education

In England, policy-makers speak of ‘teacher training’. In Norway, the official designation is ‘teacher education’. The terms ‘training’ and ‘education’ signify different pedagogical cultures: the one ‘practical’, the other ‘learned’.

The potential tension between these two pedagogies is well known in England, where a public body known as the Teacher Training Agency works alongside university faculties of teacher education and where postgraduate trainee teachers study for a Postgraduate Certificate of Education. ‘Training’ envisages effective teaching as equivalent to performing set mechanical tasks well. ‘Education’ implies that good teaching is based on scholarship and disciplinary knowledge applied to a variety of situations. In Norwegian translation, the term also carries normative connotations.

English university culture has traditionally prized an academic education over practical training, even to the extent of providing an initial academic underpinning for elite professional courses, as in, for example, pre-clinical medical studies. Moreover, most applicants to PGCE courses in England have previously studied an academic subject at university that they will later teach at school. But the year ahead, as set out in government directives, is full of practical concerns, with a marked reduction of time devoted to academic study and moral debate. This, at any rate, is the policy intention.

The Norwegian counterpart of the English PGCE is Praktisk Pedagogisk Utdanning (PPU) [Practical Teacher Education]. ‘Utdanning’, like the German word ‘Bildung’,
envisages education as a process of cultural formation and enrichment, and, in that regard, it emphasizes the cultivation of character (see Weber, 1968). In keeping with this theme, Norwegian ‘utdanning’ is long on critical discussion and moral inquiry and short on uncritical reliance on cookbook recipes. By contrast, English ‘training’ advocates ‘the’ facts of the matter as revealed through expert practical knowledge (see Weber, 1968).

In Norway, where there is greater but not complete parity of esteem in higher education between the academic (which still has the overall edge) and the vocational (which sometimes wins in areas linked to the national economy, notably oil), Practical Teacher Education is, rather paradoxically, quite heavily steeped in theory. This works well for students who have studied an academic subject at university before embarking on a teacher preparation course, but is arguably less well adapted to students who have vocational qualifications. The Norwegian PPU, unlike the English PGCE, is not just open to university graduates. Applications are also invited from students who are qualified in fields such as construction, oil rig technology, shipbuilding, nursing and social work. Hultgren and Stephens (1999) have described the Norwegian counterpart of the English PGCE as a postgraduate/post-occupational certificate of education (PG/OCE). But for present purposes (to avoid too many acronyms), the designation PGCE is used for both the English and the Norwegian courses.

**Recent reforms in teacher preparation programmes**

The Norwegian state has played a key role in ITE courses for much of the twentieth century and continues to do so today. English statism in this area, while important during the late Victorian era, waned during the twentieth century, but is prominent once again. Governmental decisions are initiated and take shape in social situ, where the voices of the powerful usually have a big impact at the policy level. This pattern holds true in England and Norway with regard to state-sponsored reforms in teacher preparation programmes. But the structural and cultural contexts—which situate higher education policy—differ in a number of ways.

The distinctive mark of British (particularly English) society at the macro policy level is its ceding of economic stewardship to the global market on the one hand and, on the other, its (renewed) embrace with social engineering in the public sector. In broad terms, the deregulation of economic markets and the cultural policing of state undertakings, such as education and health, began in earnest during the Thatcher years of the 1980s, and the trend continues unabated under the Blair administration of the twenty-first century.

Social engineering is of particular relevance to the present study. For the ‘engineers’—in this case, the political elite—are making policy decisions that bear upon schooling and teacher training. Indeed the Prime Minister, Mr Blair, has made it clear that education is his special project. From a political perspective, the project is considered too important to be left to local initiatives, which is why decisions about what to teach and how to assess performance have become more centralized. Politicians have been especially pernickety over what should be taught in schools.
and how intending teachers should be prepared for their future role. The driving force behind the introduction of a National Curriculum for schools in the late 1980s was that many pupils were leaving school without the knowledge and skills that the government believed they ought to have. Similar thinking lay behind the government’s national blueprint for ITT in the early 1990s.

Insofar as teacher preparation is concerned, the intention has been to depoliticize and ‘deintellectualize’ the teacher’s role by mandating courses where instructional and control skills take precedence over moral and political issues and educational theory (see Wright & Bottery, 1997). The original driving force behind this mission was the New Right politics of the 1980s and 1990s, but, as Apple (2003) notes, what were once seen as rightist policies are now often seen as ‘commonsense’. As a result, New Labour, whilst billing itself as a centre-left party, is actually repackaging some of the ideas of the New Right (Walsh et al., 2000).

With regard to English ITT, the ‘commonsense’ approach has led the present Labour Government to continue the legacy of the Standards Movement. Teacher knowledge, as divined by government policy-makers, is set out—in advance—in a series of practice-heavy, theory-light ‘professional’ skills (or Standards), and competence is measured against external benchmarks. The system has been likened to a delivery system where knowledge is packaged and transmitted and where quality control consists of checking to see if technical ‘mastery’ of the required techniques has been achieved (Parker, 1997). This approach looks neat and efficient on paper, but it fails to take account of what Duncan (1998) calls the messy kind of wisdom: teacher knowledge that can only be acquired in practice and through personal experimentation.

Things are different in Norway. This is a country where the policy-makers are bucking global trends by running a welfare state on egalitarian principles. Some New Right ideas are filtering in, but the operative word is ‘filtering’. Popularly described as a ‘Milton Friedman Free Zone’, Norway boasts high taxes, high-quality welfare, free university education, generous unemployment payments and more. Keynesian economics still outmanoeuvre monetarist pressures in the public sector, where social justice rather than commercial viability is the dominant (but not the unchallenged) discourse. The global phenomenon described by Ball (1998) as the ‘loss of “Keynesian capacity” ’ (p. 120) has not yet arrived in Norway. Nor have New Right policy ideas been significantly incorporated into the policy-making channels of the state. Reluctance to bow to external pressures is also reflected in the decision to buy selected European Union (EU) privileges rather than apply for full EU membership.

As in England, policy-makers in Norway are seeking to influence the content and process of schooling and the way that teachers are prepared for their role in society. However, the envisaged role for teachers, as set out in policy documents, has more of a moral flavour than its English counterpart. Intending teachers are expected to base their professional work on core Christian and humanistic values such as equality, compassion and solidarity. They are also reminded that teaching is a caring profession, care being understood as creating an enabling environment for all children (see Shakespeare, 2000).
It is not the task of this paper to consider the extent to which state mandates in Norway (and in England, for that matter) keep or lose their momentum in what Goodlad (1994, p. 154) characterizes as ‘the journey from statehouse to school-house’. That said, the policy-makers’ quest for civitas (or moral virtue linked to public service) is less likely to be rejected or diluted in a country like Norway, where ministry officials, teachers and campus tutors tend to share similar pedagogical values (Hultgren & Stephens, 1999).

The current PGCE programme in Norway was launched in August 1998 (Kirke, Utdannings-Og Forskningsdepartementet [KUF], 1999), the same year as a revised PGCE programme (Department for Education and Employment, 1998)—since revised again in 2002 (Department for Education and Skills, 2002a)—appeared in England. As we write (2003), a further reform of the Norwegian PGCE has just been implemented for full-time PGCE students, but the part-timers will still follow the 1998 programme for another year. The new script offers more autonomy for local ITE providers, but the general pedagogical principles remain largely intact.

The English context

What to teach in ITT courses in England has long been the responsibility of faculties of education. In 1992, the Department for Education (DfE) broke with tradition by setting out a series of Competences (later called Standards) that had to be met by PGCE students before qualifying to teach in secondary schools. The DfE circular 9/92 (DfE, 1992), the government’s first plan (the Victorian age aside) for centrally mandated ITT, heralded a radical departure from previous, sometimes ad hoc, training programmes. The new model would send a clear message: what trainee teachers learn in the lecture hall today would be applied in the classroom tomorrow.

The latest (as at 2003) government criteria for ITT (which apply, with certain phase-specific provisions, to both undergraduate and postgraduate courses) were presented in Qualifying to teach (DfES, 2002a). The criteria set out the Secretary of State’s Standards (from September 2002), which must be met by all trainee teachers—primary and secondary—before they can be awarded Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). Minimum requirements (course providers are invited to offer extras) are set out chapter and verse in the form of outcome statements, that specify what all trainee teachers must know, understand and be able to do.

Qualifying to teach (DfES, 2002a) is accompanied by the Handbook of guidance on QTS standards and ITT requirements (DfES, 2002b). The Handbook seeks to clarify the government’s requirements for ITT in order to provide ‘a common understanding amongst all providers and partners’ (DfES, 2002b, Section 1, p. 2). Although its title contains the word ‘guidance’, the Handbook has a prescriptive tone. For example, on page 24 of Section 1, it is stated that ‘Training needs to address all the Standards systematically’.

The Standards (heavy on practice pointers, light on theory) are organized in three interrelated sections:
1. Professional Values and Practice;
2. Knowledge and Understanding;
3. Teaching.
Each section is divided into subsections. Thus, for example, subsection 2.1 of Knowledge and Understanding states that trainee teachers who intend to work in secondary schools must know and understand their specialist subject(s) at degree-equivalent level, and subsection 3.3.2.d of Teaching states that they must teach their specialist subject(s) competently and independently, using, as relevant to subject and age range, the National Curriculum Programmes of Study and related schemes of work, or programmes specified for national qualifications, such as work-related learning. The fact that these and the other Standards are prefaced by ‘must’ suggests that there is only limited room for professional innovation.

Qualifying to teach (DfES, 2002a) has little to say about specific subject methods (how to teach history, for example), instead concentrating on general pedagogical principles (how to manage a class, for example). This is in contrast with Norway, where the national criteria for ITE address both general and subject-specific issues in some detail.

The Norwegian context

Central control of teacher education has a long history in Norway. In 1821, the Norwegian government passed a resolution for the establishment of seminaries for the education of teachers. These early teacher education colleges provided courses in Christian Religion, Mother Tongue, Writing, Arithmetic, History and Music, and, later, in Natural Science.

Up until the mid–1990s, the state’s involvement in ITE had been characterized by guidance rather than decree. Things changed in 1998, when the Norwegian Ministry for Education (KUF; since 2001, known as UFD) launched a new national framework for the PGCE programme. The framework was later published as Rammeplan og forskrift for Praktisk-pedagogisk utdanning (1999), which in English reads as ‘Framework and provisions for practical teacher education’ (1999). This policy document is hereafter abridged to Practical teacher education (KUF, 1999).

With 208 pages, Practical teacher education (KUF, 1999) is almost a book, much of it covering specific goals in relation to 22 school subjects. The first two chapters (which we refer to as the ‘preliminary part’) outline the various routes to QTS in Norway, where PGCE courses are especially geared to teaching in junior-high and senior-high schools and in adult education. The preliminary part also explicitly describes the state’s image of the desirable teacher: a ‘learned’ professional, a co-worker, a role model and a carer.

The third chapter of Practical teacher education (KUF, 1999) contains common criteria (Educational Theory and Educational Practice), as well as criteria for Teaching Methods, where content is specific to a particular subject or subjects. Irrespective of what subject(s) they teach, all student teachers take the course in Educational Theory and all of them are required to complete between 12 and 14 weeks of Educational Practice.
For present purposes, the preliminary part (Chapters 1 and 2), along with the sections on Educational Theory and Educational Practice in Chapter 3, are collectively referred to as the ‘Norwegian Framework’ or simply the ‘Framework’. Unlike the English Standards, where theory and practice are interleaved, the Norwegian Framework contains separate theory and practice sections (each with respective subsections), as described below:

Educational Theory:
1. learning and development;
2. societal functions and underlying values;
3. planning, conducting and evaluating teaching and learning;
4. how to organize and how to lead learning;
5. ethics and professional identity;
6. research and development.

Educational Practice:
1. how to teach and how to lead learning;
2. differentiation;
3. communication and cooperation;
4. professional roles and ethics;
5. personal and professional development.

Each of the subsections contains specific pointers. For example, the subsection on learning and development (under the section on Educational Theory) requires student teachers to: engage in critical reflection about their own learning and develop their own learning strategies; consider the individual and social aspects of pupil upbringing, learning and development; take account of learning readiness and cultural background with regard to differentiation; contribute to the diagnosis of pupils with special educational needs (for example, learning and behaviour difficulties) and set in motion appropriate strategies; facilitate experiential learning; support the individual pupil in relation to learning and personal development needs; and be aware of the teacher’s role in adult learning.

The prescribed content under this and other subsections is very explicit. But even though the Norwegian Framework prefaces its prescriptions with ‘students shall be able to’, terms like ‘obtain insights’, ‘develop the ability to participate constructively’ and ‘nurture a conscious and reflective outlook’ suggest that the politicians in Oslo want teacher educators to prepare critical practitioners. There are many possible teacher preparation programmes to be built by Norwegian faculties of education. Central voices echo within the structure, but the same voices urge a degree of institutional autonomy: ‘The individual teacher education institution is responsible for developing the course in line with the goals and structure of the national framework … Teacher education institutions are therefore expected to produce their own curricula’ (KUF, 1999, p. 33).
Method

The main method was content analysis of the common pedagogical content of PGCE courses in England and Norway, as compiled and laid down by the respective ministries for education: the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2002a) in England and KUF (now UFD) (1999) in Norway. By ‘common pedagogical content’, we mean those parts of the two courses that broadly apply to educational theory and practice as opposed to specific teaching subjects such as mathematics and science: namely, the English Standards and the Norwegian Framework, as presented in *Qualifying to teach* (DfES, 2002a) and *Practical teacher education* (KUF, 1999), respectively.

Broad content categories are provided in the two courses under officially compiled sections such as Learning and Development (Norway) and Teaching (England). Deeper interrogation of each category’s specific content and their subsections reveals similarities and differences between the two countries. However, things are not always clear-cut. Some similarities are manifest; others share a partial affinity. Some differences stand out; others reflect contrasting shades of emphasis. At times, differences signify features that are present in one setting for which no opposite or variant has been found in the other setting.

To draw attention to broad similarities and differences between the two countries, we have used the ideal type (after Weber, 1949). This conceptual tool enables us to accentuate categories that are sufficiently coherent to be defined as tendencies. Even so, we have placed inverted commas around some categories to signal our unease about pushing conceptual caricature too far. Ideal types are rarely if ever encountered in pure form in real life, being more or less compromised by exceptions to the rule. Yet the incidence of a limited number of overstated elements in a typology is arguably less important than the general features that make the typology internally consistent in overall terms. Choosing not to use ideal types is to risk using them anyway on an unconscious level or to remain ‘stuck in the realm of the vaguely “felt”’ (Weber, 1949, p. 94).

Bound up with the problem of extracting and typifying key characteristics from the prodigious flow of events that produce political images of teachers, is the issue of data selection. For present purposes, we have chosen to isolate and study, using content analysis, the policy-makers’ discourse as this finds expression in state-mandated ITT and ITE courses in England and Norway. This is not to suggest that other voices, notably those of teacher trainers and educators and student teachers, are unimportant. They are crucial, but they are part of another story.

Findings

Although teacher preparation in England and Norway has different historical and cultural underpinnings, in both countries ITT and ITE are centrally prescribed and controlled. There are other similarities, and these are presented along with differences. In order to sharpen the focus, similarities and differences are explored in relation to common categories: for example, desired teacher image, implied pupil
image, prescribed practice skills and so forth. Aspects of these categories sometimes overlap, as in, for example, the desired image of the teacher as subject expert and the prescribed practice skill of being able to teach the required subject content.

Similarities between the two countries are sometimes clear-cut: for example, ‘one year full-time equivalent PGCE courses’. Other similarities highlight certain variations: for example, ‘differentiate their teaching/differentiate their teaching in mixed ability settings’. Some differences are opposites (or, at least, tending towards opposites): for example, “‘hands-on’ practitioner/‘learned’ practitioner’. Other differences are ‘just different’ without being completely divergent: for example, ‘class manager/class leader’. There are also differences of the ‘present or absent’ kind; namely, something named in one setting but not in another and for which no opposite or variation is indicated. An example is ‘set homework to consolidate and extend classroom work/no reference to this skill’.

Our findings are not all-encompassing. Other researchers might find similarities and differences that we have not reported and they might also interpret things in other ways.

PGCE courses in England and Norway: similar and different typologies

In what follows, the similarities and differences that are highlighted also include matters such as course duration, time spent in schools and so forth. These arrangements provide the structural setting in which intended educational and training goals are located. To omit this background would be to leave things incomplete.

A schematic representation of similarities (including, as appropriate, the identification of certain distinctions) and differences in relation to control of ITT/ITE courses, course specifications and entitlements, desired teacher image, implied pupil image, prescribed theory and prescribed practice skills is provided in Table 1. Similarities are presented in ordinary text and differences are presented in italics.

Discussion

There are lots of different voices jockeying for position in the field of educational policy, among them teacher unions, parent groups and student organizations. But policy-makers create the official discourse, and they take decisions that have national consequences. This is as true in England and Norway for the content of schooling as it is for the preparation of tomorrow’s teachers. Policy-makers in both countries design (and redesign) the educational map, shaping the form and content of the intended curriculum for teacher preparation. They seek to ensure that ITT and ITE providers keep within the defined parameters by linking compliance to funding and, in England, by sending inspectors onto the campus.

In each country there are some striking similarities in relation to control, course specifications and student entitlements. The two governments only fund ITT/ITE programmes that adopt centrally prescribed criteria; college/university–school partnerships (with some exceptions in England) are the norm; the campus oversees
### Table 1. PGCE courses in England and Norway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLAND</th>
<th>NORWAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. State control</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-mandated national Standards</td>
<td>Government-mandated national Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government funding to ITT providers on condition that courses enable trainees to meet the national Standards</td>
<td>Government funding to ITE providers on condition that courses enable students to meet the requirements of the national Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT is usually provided by colleges or universities and schools in partnership, but, in some cases, by schools in consortium</td>
<td>ITT is provided by colleges or universities and schools in partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In college/university–school partnerships, college/university teaches and assesses theory; school facilitates and assesses practice</td>
<td>College/university teaches and assesses theory; school facilitates and assesses practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITT Standards set out the minimum legal requirements for what providers of ITT must do</strong></td>
<td>The ITE Framework and its local interpretation by ITE providers together set out the obligatory requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Specifications and entitlements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year full-time equivalent</td>
<td>One-year full-time equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free tuition</td>
<td>Free tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate entry</strong></td>
<td><strong>Graduate and vocational entry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum 18 weeks &amp; 24 weeks in practice school for primary and secondary (and Key Stage 2/3) courses, respectively</strong></td>
<td><strong>12–14 weeks in practice school</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling portfolio course</td>
<td>Self-contained course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training salary</td>
<td>Means-tested grant; student loan available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Desired teacher image</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State functionary</td>
<td>State functionary and moral agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal role model</td>
<td>Personal role model (role of teachers with immigrant backgrounds important here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject expert</td>
<td>Subject expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison agent (e.g. home–school)</td>
<td>Liaison agent (e.g. home–school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time manager</td>
<td>Time manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and gender sensitive</td>
<td>Culture and gender sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class manager</td>
<td>Class leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Non-ideological’</td>
<td>Cultural custodian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal carer</td>
<td>Member of a caring profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Hands-on’ practitioner</td>
<td>‘Learned’ practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No explicit reference to this quality</td>
<td>Empathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to this role</td>
<td>Provider of lifelong learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Implied pupil image</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capable of active and independent learning</td>
<td>Capable of active and independent learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capable of self-discipline</td>
<td>Able to cooperate with teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to evaluate own performance</td>
<td>Able to evaluate own performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Different and unequal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Different but equal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedient</td>
<td>Wilful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive to school</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to this quality</td>
<td>Caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Prescribed theory</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice-linked</td>
<td>Practice-linked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal and integrated into practice</td>
<td>Extensive with fairly clear division between theory and practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLAND</th>
<th>NORWAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Prescribed practice skills</strong></td>
<td>Teach their subject in line with the prescribed curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach their subject in line with the prescribed curriculum</td>
<td>Plan lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan lessons</td>
<td>Vary their teaching methods and use ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vary their teaching methods and use ICT</td>
<td>Differentiate their teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiate their teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take account of physical, cognitive, affective and social development</td>
<td>Take account of physical, cognitive, affective, moral and social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and gender</td>
<td>development and gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support pupils for whom English is an additional language</td>
<td>Support pupils from minority backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and record pupils’ learning, using appropriate methods</td>
<td>Assess and record pupils’ learning, using appropriate methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify learning (including special) needs and act upon them</td>
<td>Identify learning (including special) needs and act upon them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able, as appropriate, to utilize work-related learning</td>
<td>Able, as appropriate, to utilize workplace learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster pupil motivation</td>
<td>Foster pupil motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and help pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties</td>
<td>Identify and help pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge bullying</td>
<td>Challenge bullying and support the victims of bullying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish positive teacher–pupil relationships</td>
<td>Establish positive teacher–pupil relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work collaboratively with colleagues</td>
<td>Work collaboratively with colleagues, pupils and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use evidence-based research to improve practice</td>
<td>Use evidence-based research to improve practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take part in professional development and contribute to the corporate</td>
<td>Take part in professional development, particularly with regard to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life of the school</td>
<td>professional renewal, and contribute to the corporate life of the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a safe learning environment</td>
<td>Maintain safety in laboratories and workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display generic competences</td>
<td>Display situational expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to this skill</td>
<td>Promote inclusive education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to these skills</td>
<td>Use pupils’ personal experiences and local backgrounds as learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to this skill</td>
<td>resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to this skill</td>
<td>Able to teach adult learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set homework to consolidate and extend classroom work</td>
<td>Make learning an enjoyable experience for pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to this skill</td>
<td>No reference to this skill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

theory (what little there is of it in English ITT) and the school handles practice; courses are one year full-time equivalent; and tuition is free.

A number of common features are also apparent with regard to the policy-makers’ desired teacher image: a compliant (arguably more so in England) state functionary who adheres, as appropriate, to the National Curriculum for schools; a personal role model whose own behaviour is worthy of imitation (in Norway, importance is also
attached to the role of teachers with immigrant backgrounds); a subject expert; a
time manager; a liaison agent; and a professional who takes account of pupils’
gender and other background characteristics.

As regards implied pupil image, in both countries it is assumed that pupils are
capable of active and independent learning, are able to exercise self-discipline
(construed more in terms of cooperative qualities in Norway) and are able to
evaluate their own performance.

Insofar as theory–practice links are concerned, these are evident in the English
Standards and the Norwegian Framework, being more interleaved and less explicit
in England compared with Norway. This seems to highlight the English preoccu-
pation with training and the Norwegian concern with cultivation: the one pro-
gramme shot through with practical relevance, the other highlighting the importance
of theoretical and moral reflection in professional decision-making.

In relation to practice skills, prospective teachers in England and Norway are
expected to be able to: teach the required subject content as laid down in national
school curricula; plan lessons well; employ a variety of teaching methods; differen-
tiate their teaching (in Norway, the ability to differentiate in mixed-ability groups
and classes in a ‘school for all’ is emphasized); use information and communications
technology competently; take account of physical, cognitive, affective, social, gen-
dered and (in Norway) moral aspects of learning and development; support pupils
from minority backgrounds; identify, assess and record—using appropriate meth-
ods—pupils’ learning (including special) needs; motivate pupils; identify and help
pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties; utilize, as appropriate, work-re-
lated learning; challenge bullying and (in Norway) care for the victims of bullying;
establish a positive rapport with pupils; work collaboratively with colleagues; use
evidence-based research to improve teaching skills; embrace professional develop-
ment opportunities (with an emphasis in Norway on professional renewal in a
changing world); contribute to whole-school corporate culture; and provide a safe
learning environment (in Norway, safety refers specifically to laboratories and
workshops).

For the comparative researcher, the discovery of difference is often more interest-
ing than the finding of similarity. We have therefore devoted more space to
contrasting aspects in this paper. Difference tantalizes with the possibility that things
could be otherwise and better. This is not to say that what works well in one society
will prove its worth elsewhere. Best practice, like good wine, does not always travel
well. It needs careful testing in cultural situ and preferably in a setting where
policy-makers, teacher educators, teachers and student teachers are willing to
experiment with new ideas.

We will begin our examination of differences by looking at the issue of central
control of course criteria. In England, the ‘Standards apply to all trainee teachers’
(DfES, 2002a, p. 3), a model that gives limited scope to local curriculum develop-
ment. Wilkin’s (1999, p. 2) description, ‘painting by numbers’, is a relevant meta-
and local ITE curricula together form the compulsory foundation for ITE providers,
teachers and students’. Moreover, ‘ITE should provide student teachers with
insights into policy and pedagogically initiated reform, as well as stimulating them to take part in contemporary debate’ (KUF, 1999, p. 23). Keeping with the painting metaphor, but now borrowing from Bernstein (1996), the Norwegian model seems to envisage ‘a pedagogic palette where mixes can take place’ (p. 70).

There are a number of differences in England and Norway concerning course specifications and entitlements. The English PGCE course is a postgraduate programme, which means that entrants must have a first degree or its equivalent. In Norway, entrants are drawn from a wider field. Some are graduates; others have vocational qualifications. Practice is to the forefront in England, with secondary and Key Stage 2/3 trainees normally being placed in schools for at least 24 weeks and primary trainees for at least 18 weeks. In Norway, PGCE students are in schools for 12–14 weeks. More so than its Norwegian counterpart, English ITT seeks to forge a link between initial training and post-qualification induction and further professional development. This is why ITT providers in England are required to provide Newly Qualified Teachers with a career-entry profile in order to help schools draw up a compulsory induction programme for those new to the profession. The profile provides a summary of a new teacher’s strengths and priorities for professional development and is subsequently updated on a rolling basis during the induction year and beyond. Norwegian ITE providers are under no such obligation, and pre-qualification assessment is often self-contained.

Another difference regarding specifications and entitlements is that PGCE students in England receive a training salary, whereas PGCE students in Norway do not. Norwegian students are, however, eligible for a means-tested grant and a student loan. It is pertinent to note that while ITT providers in England are not always able to attract sufficient applicants for PGCE courses, this is rare in Norway. Indeed, over the past few years, applications to Norwegian PGCE courses have actually risen. Against this background, the English training salary should be seen as one of a number of government measures that have been introduced in order to increase teacher recruitment.

Turning to those aspects of teacher training and education that reflect policy-makers’ preferred image of the teacher’s role, there are some interesting differences between England and Norway. In England, *Qualifying to teach* (DfES, 2002a) contains a subsection on ‘Teaching and class management’ that presents examples of desired class management skills: ‘build successful relationships’ (p. 11); ‘establish a purposeful learning environment’ (p. 11); and ‘set high expectations for pupils’ behaviour and establish a clear framework for classroom discipline’ (p. 12). The trainee teacher is also expected to ‘promote active and independent learning that enables pupils to think for themselves’ (p. 12) and ‘to anticipate and manage pupils’ behaviour constructively, and promote self-control and independence’ (p. 12). This is ‘soft’ rather than ‘tough’ control, but a managing role is still to the fore.

In Norway, by contrast, the designated role is of ‘class leader’ rather than ‘class manager’. To some extent, this reflects linguistic nuances (it is difficult to find a Norwegian word for ‘manager’); but language, in turn, can disclose subtle differences in how social relationships are perceived. There are, in short, contextual factors at work. For a Norwegian, the word ‘manager’ is associated with ‘bossiness’.
‘Leder’ (leader), on the other hand, conveys an orchestrating role. Therefore, when the Norwegian Framework refers to ‘classroom leadership’, the envisaged role is less directive than its English counterpart, placing more emphasis on democratic decision-making than on control: ‘In cooperation with their pupils, colleagues and senior staff, student teachers should be able to cultivate a positive class/group climate’ (KUF, 1999, p. 48).

An interesting feature of the officially approved class management role in England is that it could almost be prised loose from its local setting and transported to other places. It is essentially ‘non-ideological’ in character. The prescribed role is based on instrumental rather than expressive knowledge, on set procedures as opposed to moral contingencies. Weber’s (1968) model of specialized training comes to mind, as does Alexander’s (2001, p. 517) concept of a ‘value-sanitized pedagogy’. Even though the English Standards do refer to pupils’ social, cultural, linguistic, religious, gender and ethnic backgrounds and to a Programme of Study for Citizenship, there is little (if any) reference to the promotion of national culture. In this respect, the Standards seem to reflect what Le Metais (1997) has described as the English habit of not dwelling too much on the importance of values in educational legislation.

However, in Norway the cultural role of the class leader is prominent. The Framework (KUF, 1999, p. 40) requires student teachers to be able to ‘evaluate and understand the historical, present and future role of the school as a societal institution and cultural custodian, and develop a critical and reflective awareness of their own civic responsibilities as teachers’. The Framework (KUF, 1999, p. 10) also stresses that ‘Education should be based on underlying Christian and humanistic values like equality, compassion and solidarity. It should make children and young people fully aware of our common cultural heritage and contribute towards an understanding of ethical principles and norms’.

Respect for other lifestyles is endorsed too, such tolerance being prized as a Norwegian value:

At the same time, education should pave the way for a society based on individual freedom and self-determination, where individuals show responsibility for their own and other people’s lives and well-being. Education should promote respect and tolerance for different cultures and life styles, and thereby combat discriminatory attitudes. It should also foster moral responsibility for the society and the world that we live in. (KUF, 1999, p. 10)

An emphasis on moral purpose lies at the heart of Norwegian teacher education, which is why, borrowing from Weber (1968), we have characterized it as a system based on the cultivation of public service. In Norwegian terms, this implies positioning the teacher as a moral agent charged by the state to develop egalitarian values among the young. By contrast, the English Standards seem to place more emphasis on subject-matter specifics than on the socialization of the young into specific values.

Although a duty of care is emphasized in both countries, context does matter. English ITT presents the teacher as a legal carer, whereas in Norway teaching is considered a caring profession. The legalistic character of the English Standards (DfES, 2002a) is expressed in the requirement that trainee teachers ‘are aware of,'
and work within, the statutory frameworks relating to teachers’ responsibilities’ (p. 6). Care as correct procedure is noted, for example, in the need for intending practitioners to ‘understand their responsibilities under the SEN (Special Educational Needs) Code of Practice’ (p. 8) and to be able to ‘organize and manage the physical teaching space, tools, materials, texts and other resources safely and effectively with the help of support staff where appropriate’ (p. 12). The Handbook of guidance on QTS Standards and ITT requirements (DfES, 2002b) reiterates the statutory notion of care by pointing out the important role that teachers have in the legal framework designed to protect children and adults.

In Norway, caring for pupils is seen more in moral than in legal terms. Teachers must be known by their pupils as people they can turn to for help and support. What this implies, in Nordic terms, is attending to the emotional as well as the learning aspects of child development. The Norwegian Framework is clear on this point: ‘high quality care is a prerequisite for learning’ (KUF, 1999, p. 18). It is the starting point in the teacher–pupil relationship. To quote a prominent Norwegian teacher educator: ‘Contact is care’ (Imsen, 1999, p. 25). But what constitutes care in a Norwegian pedagogical setting? Under the heading ‘The teacher as carer’, the Framework sets out a number of qualities. These include showing warmth and goodwill, ‘being there’ for a child during difficult times, setting boundaries and protecting children from bullying.

Norwegian schools are regarded as ‘moral places’ (see Goodlad, 1994, p. 59) in which ‘Teachers need to care for children and the young through expectations and demands on the one hand and goodwill and warmth on the other’ (KUF, 1999, p. 18). It is relevant to point out that a national study of pupils’ perceptions of teacher behaviour in Norway found that ‘Perceived emotional support from teachers showed the strongest positive associations with desired student behavior’ (Bru et al., 2002, p. 287). Put concisely, a caring classroom manner does seem to work, which in turn adds credibility to the policy-makers’ aims.

The contrast that we make between the implied images of ‘hands-on’ practitioner in England and ‘learned’ practitioner in Norway highlights different priorities concerning theory–practice links. The English Standards are primarily concerned with no-nonsense practice, and academic theory is not prominent. That said, evaluating one’s own practice and ‘learning from the effective practice of others and from evidence’ (DfES, 2002a, p. 6) are presented as concrete pointers for improvement and development. Critical reflection also figures in the Norwegian Framework, but this is supplemented with a strong focus on pedagogy as an academic discipline: ‘New knowledge of the subject (pedagogy) derives from practical experience, empirical investigation and theoretical study’ (KUF, 1999, p. 37).

In line with the egalitarian and tolerant climate of Norwegian schools, the Framework (KUF, 1999) underlines the desired teacher qualities of ‘listening to and understanding the other’s viewpoint’ (p. 21) and of ‘seeking to obtain special insights into the ways in which cultural minorities see things’ (p. 22). Such an explicit expression of cultural empathy is not to be found in the English Standards. Nor do the Standards have anything to say about the role of the teacher as a provider of lifelong learning to adults. Given that rolling portfolio assessment in English ITT
anticipates the continued training and assessment of qualified teachers, this omission is all the more surprising. It is equally surprising to find that Norwegian ITE, which is silent on rolling portfolio assessment, expects qualified teachers to be able to work with adult learners in a society based on lifelong learning.

Moving on to implied pupil image, we have found a number of different portrayals in the respective policy documents.

Egalitarian values are prized in Norway. For this reason, ‘The teaching process must connect with young and adult learners on their own terms’ (KUF, 1999, p. 18). The goal is classroom democracy, with pupils and teachers having an equal say even though their roles are different. The English Standards, on the other hand, envisage a less even balance of power: the teacher as manager and the pupils as managed. In keeping with this theme, teachers in England are expected to set clear standards of pupil behaviour and pupils are portrayed (for the most part) as obedient. The underlying message is that the pupil must adapt to the teacher rather than the other way round. In Norway, the pupil is seen as more wilful and independent, and teachers are encouraged to adapt to unique pupil characteristics and needs. Student teachers in Norway are also reminded that their pupils can play a significant role as caregivers, a function that is not referred to in the English Standards.

Insofar as prescribed educational theory is concerned, the English Standards are relatively silent. Practice implications loom large in the Standards, with theory having more to do with a place—the lecture hall—than with a way of seeing. Students are expected to move easily from the campus to the schoolhouse, so practical knowledge is privileged. The goal is a trained teacher. In Norwegian ITE, even though practice-relevant theory is emphasized, a distinction is made between education as a discipline and education as practice. The Framework also calls attention to the place of meta-theory in teacher preparation. Student teachers are required to explore the historical, philosophical, psychological and sociological contexts of disciplinary knowledge and are also expected to consider the instructional and moral role of the teacher. The Framework contains discrete sections on theory and practice: a script for tutors and a script for mentors. The aim is to prepare a teacher with educated practical abilities and moral purpose.

In terms of practice skills, the English Standards lay down a set of generic competences that the trainee must achieve before QTS can be awarded. The emphasis is on the universal as opposed to the specific, the underlying assumption being that tried and tested procedures usually work anytime, anywhere. However, in Norway the focus is on situational awareness: ‘The spontaneous challenges where teachers have to make quick decisions … in steadily shifting situations set a demanding professional skill’ (KUF, 1999, p. 15); and ‘Practice is a hands-on world with feelings and context contingent decisions’ (KUF, 1999, p. 47).

As a consequence, the intention is to educate a teacher who is willing to embrace a child-centred pedagogy that both identifies and builds upon the cognitive (and cultural) ecology of the individual pupil.

The other main differences between England and Norway refer to practice skills named in one setting and omitted in another and for which opposites or variations
are not indicated. Thus, trainee teachers in England must show that they can set homework to consolidate and extend classroom work. This practice skill is not mentioned in the Norwegian Framework. But other skills (that have neither counterparts nor opposites or variations in the English Standards) are in place. In Norway, student teachers must show that they can: promote inclusive education; use pupils’ experiences and local backgrounds as learning tools; make learning an enjoyable process; and work with adult learners.

Policy implications

It is difficult in comparative research to judge the extent to which actors in different national settings might gainfully learn from each other. Policy-makers must take account of sociocultural parameters, economic goals and value judgements when they develop national programmes for teacher training and education. There are also differences within countries, and this places the word ‘comparative’ in an even wider context. In this paper, we have examined the politics of teacher preparation in England and Norway and we think that there are some selective opportunities for policy learning. Our proposals are suggestive (and normative) but by no means exhaustive. We begin by looking at what England might learn from Norway.

With regard to centrally formulated curricula, English policy-makers might usefully examine the Norwegian model, where the state not only provides but also encourages scope for local initiatives. This approach applies both to the National Curriculum for schools and to the Framework for initial teacher education, neither of which fits the parody sometimes applied to English curricula of ‘teacher-proof packages’. Loosening the political grip in England would devolve more power to the people who are best qualified to take care of the rest, educational professionals. For they know, even if the policy-makers do not, that top-down ‘solutions’ to the challenges of teacher preparation are always incomplete. Establishing a more equitable balance between national and local inputs is a difficult political task, but it is something that policy-makers in England could try harder to achieve.

Norway also offers scope for policy learning in the area of moral pedagogy. An important omission in the English model is a vision of a just society which teachers, as public servants, can play a central role in bringing about. Looking to Norway could offer some valuable insights. Norwegian teacher education positions the intending teacher as a caring professional and a moral steward, whose role is to enculturate as well as to instruct. The English training model is more singularly instrumental, being primarily concerned with instructional and control issues. By leaving too much of the normative dimension to the mercy of caprice, English policy-makers risk letting critical and moral debate slip to the margin. Perhaps they could redress this situation by attaching more importance in teacher preparation to what Mayes (2002) has termed the ‘spirit in teaching’, that is, a striving for the ultimate well-being of the child.

Another lesson from Norway lies in the vocabulary of teacher preparation. Changing the official designation from ‘teacher training’ (as in England) to ‘teacher education’ (as in Norway) would be a good start. This is not just about appearances.
In policy circles, ‘privileged’ words (or dominant discourses) have a habit of solidifying into policy practices. ‘Trainee’ usurps ‘student’ and this designation defines the way ahead: an induction into routinized skills, with little time to ponder the intellectual and normative dimensions of teaching. Yet as Goodlad (1994) tellingly puts it: ‘teachers require training, but they also need education, in the very best sense of the word’ (p. 11). Norwegian teacher education seems to strike a better balance here by providing a practice-relevant education that is neither devoid of scholarly and moral inquiry nor without preparation for field experience. Having said this, policy-makers in Norway could arguably accentuate the practice dimension of the Framework.

The issue of lifelong learning provides yet another area in which policy-makers in England might find it helpful to scrutinize Norwegian ITE. Even though the UK government is officially committed to promoting the learning society (Nicholls & Jarvis, 2002), the English Standards take little or no account of the teacher’s role in lifelong learning. By contrast, the Norwegian Framework addresses the role of the teacher in adult learning and the importance of using instructional methods that are adapted for older learners. Given that the ‘structural grips’ of modernity are yielding ground to a society ‘constantly “on the move” ’ (Bauman, 2002, pp. 26, 36), perhaps more emphasis should be placed in English ITT on preparing future teachers to play their part in lifelong learning.

How to teach in mixed-ability settings poses yet another challenge for English ITT. Being able to differentiate learning tasks is mentioned in the Standards, but this does not have to take place in a mixed-ability classroom. That seems to leave the door open to practices that still segregate children on the basis of ability. Such is not the case in Norway, where the Framework requires teacher educators to prepare intending teachers for work in mixed-ability settings. A lesson here is that the comprehensive ideal can only be realized when teachers are morally committed to and professionally prepared for work in classrooms for all, not just schools for all. It helps, of course, when, as in Norway, the state provides generous funding for educational inclusion.

Looking now at policy ideas in England that might help to improve Norwegian ITE, we will begin by considering the role of campus–school partnerships. In that regard, Norwegian ITE is surprisingly traditional. Campus theory forms the nucleus of teacher preparation, with a few stints of school practice tacked on. The privileging in Norway of what Schwab (1969) calls ‘theoretic’ concerns can lead to problems if student teachers fail to understand that the reality of practice does not always fit a particular conceptual model. Some theoreticians tend to assume that practice is static, whereas, in fact, it is often adaptive and changes over time (Jarvis, 2002). The teacher educators who are best placed to know this are school mentors, who have a prominent role in English ITT but a lower profile in Norwegian ITE. Norwegian policy-makers could redress this problem by giving mentors more responsibility in teacher preparation, thereby curtailing the exaggerated status that theory tends to gain when theoreticians take charge of practical matters. This is not to suggest that practical concerns should usurp theoretical concerns. Teachers need both: theory to make hypotheses and practice to draw conclusions.
Two other areas where policy-makers in Norway could usefully look to England concern setting homework and establishing more continuity between pre-qualification and post-qualification teaching. Unlike the English Standards, the Norwegian Framework does not emphasize the importance of homework in a child’s education. In England, prescribed ITT underlines the need for teachers to extend school-based learning through homework. Even though some Norwegian teachers do set homework, it would help if the Framework provided more explicit guidance to teacher educators in this area. The other area that arguably requires more attention in Norwegian ITE concerns the transition from campus to schoolhouse. English policy-makers have addressed this issue by introducing a rolling portfolio system of documentation and assessment that forms a bridge between pre-service and post-service development. Norway is beginning to make some ground in this area, but still places too much reliance on a system where assessment of skills development is episodic, being mainly confined to the ITE phase.

Finally, we acknowledge that policy learning does not have to involve replacing one national approach with another national approach. Sometimes a blend—a new distillation of ideas—offers a better way forward. Areas where both countries might produce an improved teacher training/education programme include: finding more opportunities for student teachers to combine management skills and leadership qualities so that they can learn to direct and inspire; emphasizing the importance of both legal and moral care in order to foster a learning environment that is procedurally safe and emotionally secure; cultivating a combination of generic skills (for example, the ability to motivate pupils) and situational expertise (for example, knowing how to motivate different pupils in different ways); and promoting a view of adaptation as a two-way process, with schools and pupils adapting, as appropriate, to each other.

To what extent the migration of policy ideas between Norway and England might improve the beginning preparation of teachers in both countries is hard to say. Different cultural contexts would make it difficult to try anything too radical. However, some mutual learning in selected areas might capture the attention of policy-makers.
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