

ABSTRACT

Behind the current search for a method of teacher education that will yield consistent, predictable outputs, lies the deeper issue of who has legitimate substantive and procedural control over teacher education in advanced capitalist democracies. An examination of current trends in new processes of teacher education suggests that the legitimacy of university control over teacher education is in serious question and that the power relationship between the university and the political-economic sector is being redefined.

Sandra L. Pekarske\*

## The Knowledge Legitimation Crisis and Competency-Based Teacher Education Curricula

Discussions concerning the appropriate form and content of teacher education sequences have always occupied a natural and necessary place in educational journals, in the programs of the conferences of educational societies, the organizational and evaluational meetings of departments of education, and within the agendas and activities of administrative and legislative bodies concerned with chartering and approving teacher education programs. Such discussions have recently, however, become charged with a new sense of urgency and immediacy, and suggest a quest for an unerring process of teacher education. This quest has a variety of identifying titles such as *Who Should Educate Teachers*, *Extending the Practica*, *Technology and Improving Teacher Education*, *Why Our Teachers Can't TEACH*, and the sometimes more sophisticated *Integrating Theory and Practice in Teacher Education*. Descriptions of new designs for teacher education sequences abound e.g., the Georgia State model, the Simon Fraser model, the Harvard-Newton model, the Washington model, etc. Indeed, several state education departments in the U.S. as well as colleges and universities have developed program "banks" whereby contributing a description of a "new" teacher education program gives one access to the program exchange bank. Clearly, monitoring these new methods of educating teachers is providing a quantitatively large research base for faculty and graduate students in the educational disciplines and we must anticipate an increasing volume of literature on this aspect of teacher education.

The purpose here, however, is to examine some of the current attacks on teacher education which underlie these new programs from a sociology of knowledge viewpoint in an effort to identify the source of these attacks, the "interests" of the parties involved, and the significance of various responses. Specifically, it will be suggested that much of the present concern of teacher education centres with developing new processes for educating teachers derives from their attempts to deal with accountability demands in general and legislative mandates such as Competency-Based Teacher Education (CBTE) in particular. Further, and most importantly, it will be argued that the root critical educational policy being affected is the issue of who has legitimate substantive and procedural control over teacher education in advanced capitalist, educationally democratized societies.

Given that teachers, scholars, researchers and students in educational studies are being asked with increasing insistence to attend to and choose or develop new modes of teacher education, it strikes me that before engaging in theoretical

\*Sandra L. Pekarske teaches at the Christian Brothers College, Memphis, Tennessee.

debates over these models, we need to investigate *why* this issue has been raised in this way at this particular time. If the present policies of colleges and universities involved with teacher education are being impugned or challenged, then who are the dissatisfied parties and what *kind* of changes would satisfy them? What is the direction and purpose of the changes being called for? And how would the changes being called for affect other members of the educational and political sectors?

In answering these questions, we must be careful to separate those debates which are essentially between competing learning theories and methodologies from those debates which are essentially concerned with the adoption of a particular educational *policy*. For example, to understand the real significance of the nearly wholesale adoption of competency-based teacher education in the United States and the interest of several Canadian provinces, we need to know not merely what learning theories are being accepted in CBTE, but also what impact the shift to CBTE has on the control of teacher education curricula and the very conduct of teacher education. That is to say, the adoption of particular educational theories and methodologies into practice as educational policy is perhaps best understood in light of the socio-political ramifications of these theories. However compelling the internal logic of an educational theory, its popularization or lack of popularization in educational practice may best be understood in terms of the political-economic sector.

It is for this reason that the changes in teacher education will be examined from a sociology of knowledge perspective. I believe that this kind of socio-historical analysis of who manages the way in which reality is constructed and presented to the participants of the social order will provide a powerful explanatory tool for analyzing changes in teacher education. More-over, investigations of new modes for teacher education strongly suggest that the legitimacy of university control over the knowledge base, and how and to whom it should be transmitted, is in question. Since, as Basil Bernstein and others have suggested,<sup>1</sup> changes in the knowledge code or in the rules for changing the code may be indicative of shifts in the power base, an examination of changes in teacher education at this level should also yield some insight into the relationship between the way particular constructions of reality become legitimated knowledge and the character of the broader social context.

One of the primary functions of schooling, of course, is socialization; and in societies characterized by universal or nearly universal compulsory school attendance, the knowledge transmitted by schools can provide a central key to that society's version of the proper ordering of man in society, and of the way things are, and why this is so. In short, schools transmit the principles of social reality and the rationale for these principles — the ideology of the dominant group or groups. (The separate schools debate which developed in Canada provides one example of explicit recognition that the world view taught in schools have a normative as well as a cognitive element.)

At the university level, transmittal of the ideologies legitimizing the dominant political and economic group(s) in that society become highly important. Because of the close temporal relationship between the university experience and participa-

---

<sup>1</sup>Basil Bernstein, "The Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge", in *Readings in the Theory of Educational Systems*, Earl Hopper (London: Hutchinson University Press, 1971); Richard Heyman, "Towards a Comparative Sociology of School Knowledge", paper presented to the Annual Meeting of AESA, New York, N.Y., 1974; and Michael F. D. Young, *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*, (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971).

tion in the social order in a political and economic sense, acceptance of the appropriate principles legitimizing the ordering of man in society becomes especially critical to the maintenance of the social order. This further implies that study of the knowledge base in the university sector and who controls that knowledge base will be revealing of the power structure in that society.

More concretely, in early North America, the college experience provided an important stamp of legitimation for the ascribed elite. College attendance provided a further distinction between the elite and the masses by giving the elite a knowledge stock and moral base not possessed by "others" — knowledge which was attributed to give the elite special insight into the "best interests" of the body politic. The clientele of the university sector became the leaders of the governmental and business sectors of society; and, thus, government, business, and education were tied through their *membership* and promoted and maintained common "interests."

Movement to a primarily industrial economy, however, brought a number of changes. A growth in the need for technical expertise brought new clientele to the universities, members of the technical corps who sought social and political legitimation through a university degree. University curricula became less sectarian and more secularized. Educational historians have detailed the changing function of universities from the development of genteel professionals to the meeting of specific manpower in the context of a corporate capital industrial state, i.e., the development of human capital.<sup>2</sup>

The change from elite to mass tertiary education further necessitated some change in the knowledge base and some selectivity in its presentation to various segments of the mass audience. Since only a portion of those attending the university sector were representative of the socio-political elite, the clientele were no longer *prima facie* safe in terms of their certain compliance with the existing social order. As Veysey has noted:

The university. . . has become largely an agency of social control. The custodianship of popular values comprised the primary responsibility of the American university. It was to teach its students to think constructively rather than with impudent and disintegrative independence. It was to promise, with repetitious care, that the investigations of its learned men were dedicated to the practical furtherance of the common welfare. It was to organize its own affairs in such a businesslike fashion as to reassure any stray industrialist or legislator who chanced onto the campus.<sup>3</sup>

Human capital must be developed in such a way as to ensure that the needs of the "real world" are attended to in a "disciplined" way.

Turning more specifically to the matter of teacher education, it has been argued by higher education specialists that the movement from genteel professional to developed human capital represents an attempt to reunite the interests of the educational and economic sectors (if not in terms of membership, at least in terms of *function*) and to restructure higher education to efficiently produce a technical and supervisory work force.<sup>4</sup> Teachers comprise a very significant segment of this work force in an educationally democratized society.

<sup>2</sup>These terms, "genteel professional" and "developed human capital," come from Andrew R. Trusz, *The Activities of Governmental Education Bodies in Defining the Role of Post-Secondary Education Since 1945: A Comparative Case Study of the State of New York and the Province of Ontario, 1945-1972* (ED.D, diss., SUNY-Buffalo, 1977).

<sup>3</sup>Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 440-441.

<sup>4</sup>Trusz, Chaper 5, draft p. 19.

Since 1940, of the various professional and technical occupations, teachers and engineers have grown the most rapidly in absolute terms, while scientists and technicians have grown by far the most rapidly in proportional terms. The members of these four occupations, together with accountants. . . represent the five professional and technical occupations most deeply and critically dependent upon higher education for the acquisition of job-related skills. . . The workers in these five occupations, therefore, together with a significant slice of the managerial, sales, and service personnel, represent the true constituency of the college-educated technical and supervisory wings of the working class.<sup>5</sup>

Realizing this, it should come as no surprise that governmental interest in and involvement with teacher education has intensified greatly in the past three decades. While a detailed description of governmentally linked educational administrative and legislative bodies is not in order here, studies of the activities of these bodies leave no doubt that their major interest has been the efficient operation of teacher education programs to satisfy identified manpower needs.

One constant in the transition from an agricultural to an industrial corporate capital economy has been the effort of the academic world to reflect and accommodate the emerging relationships of the reconstructed social world in its function, style, and clientele and to preserve its own important role as the legitimator of those relations.<sup>6</sup>

University professional schools (such as university affiliated schools of education) and governmental agencies have for some time courted each other in a relationship which exchanges legitimation services for licensing services. The university as the traditional source of "new" knowledge and guardian of the purity of "old" knowledge offers a sense of legitimate authority to that which is taught in these professional schools. Hence, a primary mode for the "upgrading" of professional and technical schools has been to officially associate them with an established university. Governmental agencies then, in their role as protectors of the public, have awarded credentials, usually in the form of professional licenses, to the graduates of university-sanctioned professional schools in a rather *pro forma* manner.

While many of these governmental bodies have also exercised some control over teacher education programs by means of occasional inspections and evaluations of the easily quantifiable descriptive characteristics of the schools (e.g., the number of appropriate volumes in the library, faculty-student ratios, etc.), the *knowledge* content of these programs has been considered firmly within the domain of university expertise and authority. The state in this circumstance is taking a distinctly administrative role; it accepts the curricular decisions of the university as the most legitimately authoritative knowledge base available, and does not concern itself with the problems of knowledge production, legitimation and dissemination.

It was indicated in the introductory remarks that a change in this relationship between governmental education bodies and university teacher education schools is one crucial aspect of the present movement toward competency-based teacher education. Since CBTE is clearly a highly significant development in teacher education in recent years, with 31 state education departments in the United States mandating CBTE as the primary or sole process for teacher education as well as the interest of a number of provincial ministries and Canadian schools in aspects of CBTE, it would be helpful at this point to describe the essential features of a com-

<sup>5</sup>David N. Smith, *Who Rules the Universities: An essay in Class Analysis* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974), p. 199.

<sup>6</sup>Trusz, Chaper 5, draft pp. 3,18-19.

petency-based program as a case model of a current developmental trend in teacher education. These features can then be examined in terms of both certain historical trends and the present social context.

While a distinction must be made between the rationale for the content of individual CBTE programs and the rationale for the *design* of competency-based teacher education programs,<sup>7</sup> what is interesting is the attempt to transfer or extend certain learning principles into policy principles. Within the literature, the most widely quoted and accepted description of CBTE is that developed by Stanley Elam in 1971. According to the Elam definition, the five essential elements that must be included in a program for it to be considered a competency-based program are:

- (1) Competencies (knowledge, skills, behaviors) to be demonstrated by the student are:
  - a. derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles.
  - b. stated so as to make possible assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies.
  - c. made public in advance.
- (2) Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are:
  - a. based upon, and in harmony with, specified competencies.
  - b. explicit in stating expected levels of mastery under specific conditions.
  - c. made public in advance.
- (3) Assessment of the student's competency:
  - a. uses his performance as the primary source of evidence.
  - b. takes into account evidence of the student's knowledge relevant to planning for, analyzing, interpreting, or evaluating situations or behaviors.
  - c. strives for objectivity.
- (4) The student's rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competency rather than by time or course completion.
- (5) The instructional program is intended to facilitate the development and evaluation of the student's achievement of competencies specified.<sup>8</sup>

Similarly, Houston and Howsam (1972) have stated that the two essential characteristics of CBTE are (1) precise learning objectives defined in behavioral and assessable terms, and (2) accountability. Since the competencies to be mastered and the evaluational techniques are made public 'in advance', the teacher-in-training is therefore held accountable for meeting the established criteria in the manner specified. (Notice the philosophical assumption implicit in these definitions that there does exist 'true fact' or an epistemological base concerning (a) what it is that people must be taught and (b) how this teaching should proceed.)

In addition to these basic elements of CBTE, there are also a number of implied, related or desirable elements which are commonly associated with CBTE. These

---

<sup>7</sup>Thomas Shuell, E. Ransdell, B. Kestelmen, and P. Coye, *An Evaluation of the Cheektowaga-D'Youville-Medaille-Sloan Program in Competency-Based Teacher Education* (Educational Research Center, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1974), p. 18.

<sup>8</sup>Stanley Elam, *Performance Based Teacher Education: What is the State of the Art?* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Performance Based Teacher Education Series, 1971).

include: (1) field-centredness, (2) modularized instruction, (3) emphasis on exit rather than entrance requirements, (4) learning controlled through feedback systems, (5) the program as a whole is systematic, and (6) program decisions should have broad-based consent.

Theoretically, the delivery system in CBTE is rooted in training psychology, those aspects of social learning theory that are concerned with modeling and imitative behavior, and in systems analysis strategies for the development of effective man-machine systems.<sup>9</sup> The impetus for the development of this type of delivery system for teacher education, according to the advocates of CBTE themselves, was a growing public concern for accountability and the development of technologically and theoretically sound instruments for analyzing teacher performance. Accountability, in education as in any (other) business, includes both attention to cost-benefit analyses and the assigning of responsibility for outcomes. CBTE promises a more "scientific" systems approach aimed at increasing both the efficiency of the teacher training process and the dependability of the teaching behavior of those trained by this method. It can be asserted that the phenomenally rapid rate of acceptance of CBTE by state education agencies is a function of the attractiveness to the current political and economic elite of the predictability and accountability features of CBTE as a behavioral modification strategy. The rapid adoption of CBTE is also congruent with the apparently "natural" historical trend of continuously increasing programmatic activity on the part of the state in educational matters.

Democracy, it was asserted, could not survive without an educated populace and it became the legitimate right of the state to see to the provision of grammar schools for all its citizens. It was not long before state-supported secondary schools were established which competed with the private academies. Most provinces and states now have directly and indirectly publicly-supported institutions and programs at the tertiary level. Furthermore, in both Canada and the United States, agencies exist at the federal level which provide research support and informational and evaluational guidance for these extensive systems of public education. The Canada Council which was established to promote the arts, humanities and scientific endeavors both within and outside of universities, supports a considerable amount of educational research. In the United States, an Office of Education (USOE) was established in Washington D.C., to provide programmatic guidance and financial assistance - the latter usually being linked to the former. (Incidentally, it might be pointed out that the U.S. Office of Education provided the initial impetus for CBTE through the issuance of a request in 1967 for proposals with the specific purpose of restructuring teacher education. USOE has since then provided financial incentives for the development of competency-based programs through at least four major research programs including Teacher Corps, the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development Task Force '72, The Multi-State Consortium of Performance Based Teacher Education, and the Elementary Teacher Education Models Project.)

Perhaps the most frequently offered justifications for the extension of state input into professional education programs centres around the notion of the state as an agency responsible for the well-being of its citizens. If the state is to insure its citizens of the competence of its practicing professionals through licensing procedures, then it must have some confidence in the form and content of the schools. When the professionals are acting as public servants actually employed by

---

<sup>9</sup>Shuell, et.al., p. 19.

the state, there is further a financial interest. The rhetoric of the New York Regents Statewide Plan for the Preparation and Practice of Professionals for Elementary and Secondary Education, for example, reveals both the pose of father-like concern from the state toward its citizens and an acute awareness of vested financial interest:

The Impact of the professional staff of the public schools on the State and its citizens is of considerable significance. That staff affects generations of citizens in their most formative years, and almost all of the State's population is affected thereby. The importance of the teaching population is highlighted by the fact that approximately three-quarters of a school district's operating budget is directly related to the support of the professional staff.<sup>10</sup>

Given this perceived need by the state to provide surveillance over public professional schools, let us examine in greater detail the mechanisms typically provided by in CBTE programs through which the government can extend and increase its control.

In the United States, the adoption of CBTE requires a change in the evidential bases acceptable to the state for accreditation purposes concerning the validity of any particular teacher training program. Traditionally, accreditation in the United States has been a check-list procedure; that is, a teacher education program seeking accreditation would submit a document to the appropriate state education authority outlining such matters as the curricular requirements of the program, the credentials of the faculty who would staff the program, the facilities and resources available to support the program, and so forth. Programs would then be checked to see that the physical and personnel resources outlined met the standards currently acceptable to the state and perhaps a site visit would be made to verify the information submitted in the proposal. The mandating of CBTE, on the other hand, changes the emphasis in the accreditation process from an examination of program resources to an examination of program objectives, contents, and procedures. The state is no longer simply interested in verifying that programs are what they say they are; the state is interested in specifying and controlling what in its view such programs ought to be. Rather than evaluating the appropriateness of the resources provided for a teacher education program, the state apparently now feels confident to evaluate the appropriateness of the aims, contents and instructional procedures of the program.

Let us focus more specifically on the changes in program evaluation and teacher licensing procedures resulting from the CBTE movement.

Firstly, colleges and universities wishing to offer course sequences in teacher education apply to the appropriate state education department for chartering - that is, official recognition and approval of their program. This application, as stated earlier, formerly consisted of rather complete description of the proposed program, generally including course titles. These applications then provided the state bureau of licensing with information regarding the course sequences offered at various institutions. These descriptions were at least theoretically helpful to the state in making decisions regarding the licensing of individuals who presented themselves to the state for a temporary license on the basis of college transcript records. Periodically, the state education department would inspect these colleges and universities to insure that their teacher preparation programs were consistent with their descriptions of such. Individuals desiring to be teachers, on the other hand, were evaluated primarily on the basis of completion of particular courses and course distribution requirements set by the state. Not all of the courses needed to be taken at the same institution.

---

<sup>10</sup>"Master Plan on Teacher Education, ¶ 6" (New York State Regents Report, November 1972).

The advent of CBTE offered the political sector an opportunity to withdraw, over a specified period of time, its former approval from all college and university teacher sequences and to demand new applications. A new format was developed for these applications which would provide a qualitatively different kind of program description for the state's consideration. Typically, these new applications must provide the following: (1) a statement of the rationale and proposed objectives of the program; (2) an identification of the entrance requirements and screening procedures for the program; (3) a listing of the specific knowledge, skills, and behaviors which will be taught and for which its students will be held responsible; (4) the assessment procedures to be utilized for each of the above; and (5) a description of the provisions made for program self-evaluation and self-correction. Furthermore, the state, in its own words, does not want simply to check to see that programs have considered each of the above factors; the state education agencies have and want to continue to develop their own substantive standards concerning objectives and program contents. Consider, for example, the following directive from one state education department to colleges and universities with teacher education programs:

... colleges and schools seeking to submit teacher preparatory program proposals are urged, after reading these guidelines, to communicate with the Bureau of Teacher Education to discuss program aspirations prior to planning and writing a proposal. Staff members are available for consultation and, in addition to advising on approvability of program styles, may be in a position to suggest successful approaches used by other programs in their experience.<sup>11</sup>

Indeed, sample or model programs acceptable to the state have been made available to colleges and universities for their use in writing their own programs. One such model program for Reading Specialists offered the following listing of the competencies necessary for reading teachers:

the Intern will be able to:

1. explain the four factors contributing to reading difficulties.
2. administer and score the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test.
3. apply the Bond and Clymer reading expectancy formula using data from previously administered test.
4. administer and interpret the results of the San Diego Quick Assessment test.
5. administer and interpret the results of the Dolch 220 list of service words.
6. design, administer and interpret the results of a "flash test".
7. understand the uses of the Spache, Dale Chall and Fry readability formula to a given test.
8. apply the Fry readability formula to a given test.
9. design, administer and evaluate a Cloze test.
10. name two informal reading inventories, cite four purposes for administration of them, and be able to evaluate information derived from an IRI.
11. design, administer and interpret an informal reading inventory.
12. cite the seven subtests of the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty.
13. administer and interpret the results of the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty.
14. prepare a case study of pupils with reading difficulties providing for appropriate diagnosis, prescription and evaluation.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup>The University of the State of New York, the State Education Department, Bureau of Teacher Education, "Memorandum to Teacher Education Consultants From William E. Boyd, Subject: Draft Guidelines and Form TE 173; November 1972," p. 8.

<sup>12</sup>From Reading, (R-007:CDMS 2), Competency Components of Cheektowaga-D'Youville-Medaille-Sloan Program in Competency-Teacher Education, 1972).

Whatever your opinion concerning the validity of this set of competencies for training a first-rate reading teacher, the above list does illustrate the detail with which the state is interested in the specification and evaluation of knowledge contents. It seems clear that the state either no longer wishes to or feels that it needs to accept the knowledge contents offered by the university as *prima facie* legitimate. The reason for this I believe lies in the disenchantment of the political sector with an educational system currently characterized by increased rising costs on a already overburdened tax base, teacher strikes, some evidence of decreasing achievement levels (the complaints are familiar) and in the perceived scientific/technocratic validity of CBTE — a validity more promising in the present social context as a source of legitimation than that offered by traditional modes of scholarly thought.

Since CBTE programs consist of systematically organized skill learning, performance and assessment schedules, it is further maintained that teacher education students must experience a single program in its entirety in order to satisfy licensing standards. That is, education students can no longer transfer between programs or, more importantly, select their own personal sequence of courses; licenses will only be awarded to those who have completed an “approved” program (and hence the extraordinary pressure felt by the colleges to develop such programs).

There is a further interesting aspect to the licensing procedures resulting from the implementation of CBTE. Traditionally, the awarding of the teaching credential was a simple administrative task of verification of the credentials submitted by individuals. The implementation of CBTE theoretically moves the licensing process from the hands of the state and into the hands of a consortium of local school district and teacher education officials. Procedurally, CBTE programs typically require those wishing a teaching credential to provide a recommendation for such in writing from a designated local school district administrator, a representative of the local teacher bargaining agency, and from the appropriate college or university official. While the state education officials promoting the adoption and implementation of CBTE refer to this scheme as a model for “shared decision-making,” it also serves to diffuse and confuse accountability. Rather than having a clear line to the agent responsible for licensing teachers, under CBTE the public is asked to hold the colleges, the school district, the teacher union, and the state licensing bureau accountable together. Instead of protecting the public, therefore, this licensing procedure can have the opposite effect of further obfuscating accountability by making it even more difficult to obtain redress for their concerns. This “shared decision-making” can also effectively co-opt potentially disruptive groups by giving everyone a place and stake in the system. In short, the mandating of CBTE programs displays a certain political finesse; the state is thereby able to insinuate its influence more deeply than ever into the content and process of teacher education while, at the same time, reducing its formal accountability.

What is the source of the state’s confidence in its own ability to make legitimate qualitative evaluations of the knowledge contents and instructional procedures of university teacher preparation programs? Or, what is the basis of the university’s loss of control over knowledge codes? The knowledge legitimation function of the university becomes increasingly problematic as the socio-political context becomes more and more dominated by a scientific/technocratic ideology. Traditional sources of knowledge such as logical deduction, reflective debate, reflexive reasoning and analysis of experience, and so forth come to be regarded as somehow “primitive.” These traditional forms of academic reasoning lack the apparent quality of certainty that is the *raison d’être* and promise of positivistic science. The prepossessing attractiveness of scientific “certainty” to the state is obvious given

its economic as well as ideological functions. The state quite understandably embraces the scientific/technocratic approach to knowledge as a more inveterate and constant partner than the community of logical and reflective "thinkers." Thus, contemporary science and technology are accepted as a new and better source for the legitimizing of power and privilege.<sup>13</sup> The natural effect of this on university-governmental relations is that to the extent to which the university wishes to maintain its knowledge legitimation function, it must strive to make its knowledge contents appear more scientific. That is, the scientific/technocratic ideology places a constraint on the manner in which university workers, i.e., scholars, create and validate new knowledge and on the care with which they examine and preserve the old.

This scientific ethos, moreover, mediates the selection of particular educational theories as the basis for policy decisions. The source of the state's confidence in its ability to make legitimate qualitative evaluations of the contents and instructional strategies of teacher education programs derives from the promotion of competency-based education as a scientific method, indeed as a "systems" approach to teacher education, capable of assessing, correcting, and maintaining its own validity by means of a feed-back loop mechanism. Although an analysis of the "scientific" content of competency-based education schemes is not within the scope of this paper, it clearly may be argued that the claims regarding the scientific validity or authenticity of CBTE are at best premature, if not exemplary of a fundamental false consciousness concerning the nature of science. On the other hand, such arguments are to a large extent superfluous for "despite the best and worst efforts of students, teachers, school administrators, college professors, and/or administrators, the performance movement is no longer within their control."<sup>14</sup>

### Conclusion

One important area of analysis for sociologists of education lies in the explication of the specific relationships which exist between the "interests" of the political economy and the development of particular educational policies and practices within a specific historical context. My intention has thus been to examine the CBTE movement, the most successful current developmental trend in teacher education, as a function of historical events and the socio-political context.

The adoption of competency-based teacher education schemes by governmental education bodies is consistent with both the historical trend of continuously increasing state involvement in educational matters and a social context mediated by a technocratic ideology and the development of "Science" as a source for the legitimation of power and privilege. The bringing of the universities more within the direct control of relevant governmental bodies illustrates the continued rationalization of coordinated efforts by the political, economic, and educational sectors aimed at the efficient production of human capital. The prevalent technocratic ethos further supports this trend in its general accountability demand for an educational system that will yield consistent, predictable outputs. With the adoption and implementation of CBTE, the state feels it has secured a scientifically self-regulating system for the preparation of its school teachers. This system is then superior to and outmodes or eliminates the need for university-based teacher education curricula.

---

<sup>13</sup>Trent Shroyer "Toward a Critical Theory for Advanced Industrial Society," in *Recent Sociology: No. 2*, (ed. Hans Peter Dreitzel, New York: Macmillan, 1970), p. 210.

<sup>14</sup>Theodore Andrews, "Atlanta or Atlantis? PBTE and State Implementation," *Journal Of Teacher Education* 24 (Fall 1973):232.

The kind of socio-historical analysis of who manages the knowledge stock, that is — the way in which reality is constructed and presented to the members of the social order, called for by the sociology of knowledge provides a powerful method for uncovering the significant effects of new policy mandates in education. From such an analysis it appears that the real significance of CBTE is that it redefines the power relationships between the political-economic sector and the universities. The effect of CBTE is to enable the state to increase its control over the knowledge contents transmitted by universities. CBTE provides profound opportunity for manipulation of the knowledge stock and the view of reality presented thereby.

A côté de la recherche permanente de méthodes qui débouchent sur une formation valable et prévisible des enseignants, se pose, dans les démocraties capitalistes, le problème de savoir qui exerce sur cette formation un contrôle officiel et positif.

Si l'on examine les tendances actuelles des nouveaux modes de formation des professeurs, on constate que la légitimité du contrôle des universités est fortement remise en question et que les rapports entre l'Université et le secteur politico-économique sont en train de se modifier.