WHERE HAVE YOU GONE, JOHN DEWEY?:

A PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY INTO

THE CONTEMPORARY REFORM

MOVEMENT IN TEACHER

EDUCATION

By

KEVIN B. KIENHOLZ

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1990

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1994

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 2000

WHERE HAVE YOU GONE, JOHN DEWEY?:

A PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY INTO

THE CONTEMPORARY REFORM

MOVEMENT IN TEACHER

EDUCATION

Thesis Approved:

Gretchen Schwarz
Thesis Advisor

John E. Steinbach

David Yell

William M. Sharp

Alfred Larkin
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks are due to my fiend and advisor, Dr. Gretchen Schwarz, who faithfully and consistently inspired me with words of wisdom such as "Spit it out" and "Save it for the book," sage advise indeed for a naturally verbose and rambling writer. I will always be a better teacher and scholar as a result of Gretchen's guidance, cajoling, example, and friendship. I also wish to express my thanks and gratitude to the other members of my dissertation committee: Dr. John Steinbrink, Dr. William Decker, and Dr. David Yellin. Each has provided sound direction to me through this process and every one of them has been an outstanding teacher to me.

I also want to thank my family, which has always supported me in my education, formal and otherwise. Mom, Dad, Granny, and Susan have encouraged my curiosity and motivated me—as Dewey would have it—to learn from life itself. They are my first teachers, and I owe them so much.

Finally, I want to mention the two teachers who have only lately (relatively speaking) come into my life. My wife Cindy did so much to make the past two years of my academic life a possibility by working full-time while I taught, studied, and wrote my way toward the completion of my doctorate. And I appreciate so much the patience of my daughter Kathryn, who sat beside and crawled around me during the writing of much of this dissertation. She, too, is my teacher – and more than makes up in inspiration, personality, and cleverness for what she lacks in age.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY 1

Background 1
Statement of the Problem 3
Research Questions 4
Purpose of the Study 5
Method of Study: A Philosophical Approach 12
John Dewey and the Philosophic Inquiry 22
Design of the Study 24
The Holmes Group: Introduction 28
The Carnegie Forum: Introduction 29
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education: Introduction 30
John Goodlad: Introduction 31
The Researcher 32
Summation 35

II. JOHN DEWEY: THE DRIVE TOWARD RECONCILIATION AND PROGRESS 36

Biographical Sketch 36
Dewey's Direct Statement on the Preparation of Teachers: "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education" 38
Schools and Democracy 44
The Central Role of Community 49
The Value of Growth as an Educational Ideal 55
The Weight and Significance of the Present 60
The Role of Subject Matter 64
Problems and Dissonance in the Learning Process 72
The Necessity of Reflective Thought 75
Experience and Education 78
Teachers, Schools, and Education 83

III. TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM 92

Historical Overview 92
Teacher Education in the United States 96

Chapter Page

The Holmes Group....104
The Carnegie Forum on Education....114
John Goodlad....119
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education....130
Summation....140

IV. JOHN DEWEY AND CONTEMPORARY TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM....141

Points of Comparison and Contrast....141
Schools and Democracy....142
The Central Role of Community....147
The Value of Growth as an Educational Ideal....153
The Significance of the Present....157
The Role of Subject Matter....161
Problems and Dissonance....168
Reflective Thought....171
Purposes of Education....174
The Language of Contemporary Reform Literature....179
Summation....186

V. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND REFLECTIONS....191

Summary....191
Teacher Education: Oversimplified and Trivialized....192
Motivation to Reform: Issues of Time and Place....208
Conclusions....212
Questions for Further Study....219
Pedagogical Impact of the Research....221
Concluding Comment....223

BIBLIOGRAPHY....225

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background

Although many national reports were issued over the course of the 1980s, the National Commission on Excellence in Education likely created the earliest significant shock wave with the publication of its report *A Nation at Risk*. With their efforts commissioned by President Ronald Reagan and Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell, the authors of the report (1983) open their findings with a vision of educational decay and with words of warning:

> Our nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world. . . . If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. (p. 5)

These words sent concentric circles of concern throughout the educational community and the society at large, and within days of its release, educational reform dominated the social and political landscape. Local newspapers, national news programs, and every media outlet in between picked up the story that American education lagged far behind its professed ideals, and that the country would pay a severe price if the problems weren't ameliorated quickly. According to Hunt and Staton (1996), the report "catapulted the issue of educational reform into the public sphere. Not since the launching of Sputnik in the late 1950s has the topic of educational reform figured so predominately in American

public discourse" (p. 271). The race toward reform had begun. Significant questions would remain, however, as to the identity of the major participants as well as which voices might be heard within and above the din which would no doubt ensue.

Predictably, the harsh light which reformers shone on American schools eventually turned to what many characterized as the heart of the problem: teachers. If the students graduating from our nation's schools came up short, the argument generally went, then the fault must rest at least in part with those who fundamentally direct classroom activity. And so, the reform movement story line of the 80s spawned a sub-plot which focused its attention squarely on the preparation of educators. Thus, a number of reformers and organizations interested in the betterment of our nation's schools turned their aggregate attention to teacher education programs. The reports which inevitably followed often painted a bleak and dismal picture of undergraduate teacher preparation, and the remedies suggested ranged from modest tinkering to fundamental overhaul. Newspapers, national magazines, professional journals, educational organizations, and legislators all focused their collective attention on the improvement of nearly every aspect and level of education: the common schools, the universities, the curriculum, the students, and the teachers. *Reform* emerged as education's fundamental agenda item. No doubt seemed to exist as to whether or not the problem had to be addressed. However, the direction these various groups turned to for answers was very much in question. On one hand, each party could give heed to the old saying that "What is past is prologue" and, accordingly, turn to the history of American education for their cues and their answers. On the other hand, the education reform wave could just as easily move forward by following the lead of the various and capricious contemporary voices calling for and

suggesting the massive changes supposedly needed to "fix" the nation's schools. Would the varied individuals and groups participating in this movement to reorganize the country's educational landscape look behind them for a model against which to measure their own ideals and recommendations? Or, without even a backward glance taken in hopes of locating a fundamental figure in the profession's history who might provide guidance and discernment, would they simply push forward? The answer, of course, turns out to vary in degree from report to report and from one series of recommendations to the next.

Although many voices competed for attention and jockeyed for position within the contemporary reform wave in teacher education, a select few moved to the head of the class while influencing the direction of the movement. Among the more influential voices to rise above the commotion of the teacher education reform movement were those of the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Corporation, John Goodlad and the Center for Educational Renewal, and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. The voices represented by these entities have contributed the bulk of the momentum which – at various times – cajoled, prompted, pushed, and prodded the reform efforts aimed at fixing teacher education in the United States.

Statement of the Problem

At the heart of this study resides a quest to locate one of the great historical voices of American education and philosophy within the crush of the recent teacher education reform movement. Does Dr. John Dewey figure – either overtly or tacitly – into the prescriptive equations proposed by the major voices of the contemporary teacher education reform movement? On the surface, this may appear to be an exercise no more

complicated than simply glossing through the index of reform reports, seeking Dewey's name alongside a reference or two. However, an incongruity exists between the general tenor of reform reports and the educational and philosophical writings of John Dewey, a discrepancy which severely complicates this search; while the reformers invariably proffer their ideas in a format which clearly proposes new organizational frameworks for teacher education programs, Dewey rarely made such prescriptive statements. As Brumbaugh and Lawrence (1963) suggest, "For all his systemic exposition of ideas, he is not the author of a system. Only broad outlines can be made out..." (p. 125). As a result, any nexus between the respective agendas of the reform movement and John Dewey will likely be found in the residue of ideas and philosophies rather than a direct attribution or citation. Dewey's work only on occasion lends itself to the quick invocation of a simple aphorism; rather, the reader must most often coax his ideas and beliefs out of his myriad texts. They must be explored and explicated through an analysis more involved than a simple, passing mention. The intersections and connections, if they exist at all, will have to be mined out of the mountains of policy recommendations and program changes suggested by the reformers.

Research Questions

This research plan will be driven, then, by philosophical questions: (1) What pedagogical assumptions underlie the current literature of the teacher education reform movement? (2) What did John Dewey believe about the characteristics of quality programs aimed at developing educators? (3) What evidence of John Dewey's ideas can be discerned in the major voices of the teacher education reformers? (4) And what new

questions, concerns, and insights might be generated by having completed the task of reading John Dewey and reform movement literature in light of one another?

Purpose of the Study

Any developed field of interest or inquiry undoubtedly boasts of at least a few fundamental figures who played a major role in defining that field while pushing their particular areas of expertise in a certain direction. Whether the field be academic, artistic, or cultural, it likely rests upon a foundation built at least in part by an early pioneer whose vision helped dictate the shape of things to come and whose voice must not be ignored by those wishing to immerse themselves in the study of that particular discipline. Jazz great Wynton Marsalis (1990) recognizes that his own father, also a musician, readily acknowledges the importance of looking over one's own shoulder in order to accurately determine the most informed choices necessary in trail blazing – choices which must be faced by anyone hoping to make new and significant contributions to a chosen field: "The kind of belief he had in music would make you realize that you can only go forward by facing the obligation of mastering the weight of what the titans of the idiom have laid down" (jacket notes). Forward progress, then, may very well depend upon some degree of acknowledgment, understanding, and appreciation of one's own past.

Dewey stands, at the very least, near the head of the class of such "titans" of the field and cannot be avoided by anyone wishing to give the appearance of a complete treatment on nearly any topic related to schooling and pedagogy. As Baker (1966) claims, "Any genuine concern for the quality of our educational processes and their products leads, then, to some assessment of his theories" (p. 1). Perhaps more than any other figure in the twentieth century, John Dewey casts his shadow over the landscape of

American educational studies, if not our nation's schools themselves. Therefore, it seems that his ideas ought to be given at the very least a moderate degree of attention if the topic at hand even tangentially relates to matters of pedagogy.

Dewey emerges as a logical choice to serve as this standard bearer primarily because so many people recognize him to be one of those "titans of the idiom," as a central figure of the sort honored by Marsalis. Dewey's writings turn to the subject of education more often perhaps than those of any other American philosopher. Writing about the intellectual foundations of Western thought, Brumbaugh and Lawrence (1963) note that no other philosopher wrote so expansively on the twin subjects of pedagogy and schools, and that he left his imprint not only in the thought of the Western Hemisphere, but also in other corners of the world such as Japan, China, and Turkey (pp. 124-25). They go on to situate Dewey's influence on contemporary educational thought on the same level as that of another giant figure in the field of philosophy: "Plato alone competes with Dewey for having shaped contemporary civilization educationally" (p. 125). Cwiklik (1997) also recognizes Dewey's impact on modern pedagogical thought when he notes that many educational movements thought of as *contemporary* (such as project-oriented teaching and constructivism) should properly trace their ideological roots back to reformers influenced by John Dewey in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (p. 19). And finally, Anyon (1997) likewise places Dewey in the very heart of recent educational reform as she writes about the impact of the reform movement on ghetto schooling:

> The current educational restructuring movement is suffused with democratic ideals: a search for democratic governance in suburban schools, and for "radically

> democratic education for all" in urban schools.... The vision of democratic schools is powerful and important. It is also long standing, with early expression in the work of John Dewey and the Progressive educational reformers of the early twentieth century. (p. 12)

Dewey's currency and acknowledged stature among educators might suggest that little point exists in arguing whether or not Dewey's voice *should* be heard in educational circles as the twentieth century comes to a close. Ideologically, his shadow looms large over the landscape of American education. However, the question remains as to whether his ideas actually translate into the nuts and bolts which hold the educational system together and which incline it to move in a particular direction, and whether his presence might be discerned in the very specific recommendations championed by the loudest and most influential voices in teacher education reform.

Whether or not Dewey remains specifically present in the current teacher education reform literature matters precisely because his ideas are of such fundamental importance to the field as a whole. Stated simply, his philosophical assumptions underpin, directly or indirectly, a major facet of the nation's educational foundation, and to patently ignore them on a wholesale basis becomes tantamount to building an educational castle on shifting sands. If reformers have ignored Dewey and his contributions to the field, they run the risk of turning their backs on a source of ideological inspiration and a wellspring of practical advice. On the other hand, if the reformers have paid homage to his writings by addressing them directly or indirectly in their findings and recommendations, then perhaps they have fulfilled their obligation to

deal with their shared educational heritage in trying to sort out the direction of their collective future.

Recognizing, then, the soundness of many of John Dewey's philosophical beliefs about learning and teaching, his presence in the teacher education reform literature holds forth a promise of generating programs capable of developing talented and capable teachers. If reformers have infused their literature with Dewey's ideology, then one might reasonably assume that his presence would then be felt in the new and improved teacher education programs which could theoretically result. That is to say, the very culture of teacher education programs would take on at least a part of the character which Dewey believed to be essential in regard to teaching and learning; the very classes in which pre-service teachers study might convey something of the flavor of Dewey's own pedagogy. And even if Dewey's name were never directly invoked in a student's undergraduate program, his presence might still be felt and experienced through the philosophical basis upon which the new teacher education system would be built. If Dewey has influenced the reformers' own ideas, students could learn in an atmosphere indirectly tinged with his beliefs about good teaching and learning.

Postman and Weingartner (1969) claim that just such a situation naturally arises in all classroom settings when they note that the real message of any experience in schooling is the way in which the material is taught – not the material itself:

> From this perspective, one is invited to see that the most important impressions made on the human nervous system come from the character and structure of the environment within which the nervous system functions; that the environment

> itself conveys the critical and dominant messages by controlling the perceptions and attitudes of those who participate in it. (p. 17)

The medium – that is to say, the atmosphere in which the classroom or program operates – actually becomes the message. Postman and Weingartner go on to say that "the critical content of any learning experience is the method or process through which the learning occurs" (p. 19). If they are correct in making this assertion, and this researcher believes that they are, then it becomes imperative to give attention to the methods and processes engendered in teacher education programs as well as those recommended in the literature of teacher education reform, knowing that the ideology which gave rise to those approaches in the first place will likely translate into the classroom activities of the pre-service teachers who assume them as undergraduates and who consequently incorporate them into their own pedagogical repertoire.

The link between *where we learn* and *how we teach* becomes an important one to consider. According to Griffen (1999), a strong case can easily be made that teachers eventually teach in the ways and manners in which they themselves were taught:

> A number of scholars, pre-eminently Daniel Lortie and John Goodlad, have concluded that we teach the way we were taught.... After all, those of us who teach have successfully moved through thousands of hours of observations of teachers at work in the classrooms where we were students. These cumulative experiences must be considered as a major source of our understandings of what teaching is and, in many cases, should be. Following the logic that experience shapes behavior, many of us become imitators of the dominant teaching patterns we have encountered over a period of twelve or thirteen years in schools. (p. 14)

The argument might also be forwarded, following Griffen's logic, that the final examples of teaching experienced by prospective teachers, especially the practices exemplified by those in a teacher education program, might be among the most powerful and influential images of pedagogy for those pre-service teachers. Perhaps extending his thoughts along those same lines, Griffen (1999) goes on to suggest that teacher education programs should be designed in order to "push back against the authority of prospective teachers' experiential learning" (p. 14). Whether or not Dewey's supposed influence actually makes it into the curriculum of the teacher education program becomes, then, an important consideration in creating a viable program aimed at the professional preparation of teachers.

One cannot easily establish the link between John Dewey and teacher education reform utilizing a direct, frontal approach. Rather, the road one must travel in making those connections, or perhaps in discovering the fact that they don't actually exist, becomes necessarily circuitous. The fact that Dewey seldom wrote directly on the topic of teacher education makes the task more problematic; perhaps the most notable and specific exception remains a pamphlet entitled "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education," a short treatise derived from a speech delivered in 1904 to the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education. His views on the subject of education for teachers, then, must most often be deduced from his prolific efforts aimed at clarifying his view of education, in general. Further complicating the effort may, in fact, be Dewey's own writing style. Oliver Wendell Holmes once remarked that Dewey wrote "as God would have spoken had He been inarticulate but keenly desirous to tell you how it was" (qtd. in Westbrook, p. xiii). Dewey's work can occasionally be conflicting, complex, and opaque

– a reasonable state of affairs given the highly complicated nature of the schools, teachers, and learners about which he was writing.

All of these factors, taken together, create a unique opportunity to bring into alignment two seemingly disparate arenas of educational studies: the philosophy of John Dewey and the contemporary push to reform teacher education programs. Ozmon and Craver (1992) admonish their readers to utilize the tools of philosophical inquiry in order to "examine critically the intellectual disputes of the time and to suggest alternative arguments or ways of viewing things" (p. xvi). The confluence of John Dewey and the contemporary teacher education reform movement will result in the exploration of a crossroads at which the critical examination called for by Ozmon and Craver can take place. Finally, this study will afford the opportunity to look at two areas of both professional and personal interest and to note new connections where they exist, to point out places in the literature where they do not, and to speculate about what these connections – direct or otherwise – actually mean for the students and teachers who will one day face each other for the first time in elementary and secondary classrooms across the nation. This study provides a time and a place in which this researcher can both bring about a synthesis of past and present issues and concerns, and create a juncture between the *theoretical* assumptions of an acknowledged titan of the field and the everyday concerns of *practice* as they relate to teacher education programs in the United States.

For the purposes of this study, then, John Dewey will be used as a lens through which to examine four specific voices of the teacher education reform movement: the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Corporation, John Goodlad, and NCATE. That is to say, I will utilize Dewey's philosophical framework in order to focus a critical examination of

the ideas underpinning the reform efforts aimed at teacher education in the last two decades of the twentieth century. After investigating Dewey's statements and beliefs about sound pedagogy, I will hold the various reform agendas up to his ideas and ideals as a benchmark of quality, as a standard and a framework upon which an educational program marked by integrity and soundness might actually be built. Floden and Buchmann (1989) offer support for such an approach when, in reference to a short speech delivered by John Dewey on the subject of teacher education, they note that "Dewey's critique of a narrow, performance-oriented preparation for teachers...dates back to the beginning of the century and can be readily applied to current practices and policies" (p. 4). Ultimately, I hope to discover whether or not the reformers have taken the time and invested the energy necessary to heed the advice of figures such as Marsalis, Floden, and Buchmann – to see whether or not the reformers turned to their own profession's *past* in order to determine the best direction for their *future*.

Method of Study: A Philosophical Approach

The purposes and goals which drive this study will best be met through a qualitative, philosophical approach. Bringing together two seemingly disparate topics (the philosophical assumptions of John Dewey and the modern teacher education reform movement) demands an approach both *broad* enough to encompass the wide range of writings which will need to be addressed and *flexible* enough to allow for guided speculation and conjecture when it comes to making connections which might not have previously been noted. Giarelli and Chambliss (1995) posit that the overarching purpose of philosophical inquiry is to both focus thought and to facilitate the formulation of questions for reflection (p. 33). These represent worthy goals which ought to be

introduced into any study of education, but which are too often sacrificed to the constraints of time and a perceived need to always remain rigidly pragmatic. As Peshkin (1993) notes, many research plans have been abandoned or dramatically altered because they did not adhere precisely to the "blessed trinity" which dictates that inquiry must be driven by theory, test a hypothesis, or produce generalizible results (p. 23). Rigorous attention to *ideas*, ironically, can meet with rancor and suspicion in much of the educational literature. A philosophical approach, then, will allow this researcher to overlay John Dewey's ideas upon a contemporary problem and perhaps to provide a new perspective on the problem and challenge of educating teachers.

A philosophical inquiry requires a sophisticated and wide reading of the relevant literature, giving attention to every angle and perspective which can be brought to bear on the topic: the history of teacher education reform, the current reform literature, Dewey's work on the nature of reform, his views on education generally, and any specific ideas which Dewey records which relate directly to the education of teachers. This landscape is both far ranging and quite open to interpretation. Explicitness and comprehensibility must be intentionally sought through an approach which will allow that to happen in a fluid, emergent manner. Such a goal calls for a qualitative stance which values the occasionally conflicting and circuitous search for meaning. Postman and Weingartner (1969) recognize the fact that, very often in educational research, the search for meaning becomes obscured beneath a traditionally quantitative call for such qualities as replication and validity . In reference to many other books on education, they claim that "Almost all of them deal with qualitative problems in quantitative terms, and, in doing so, miss the point" (p. xv). This study does not call for a statistically significant number of

transcribed interviews, it does not demand countless hours of observation and the attendant notes, and it does not require surveys to be conducted on randomly selected participants. Instead, it demands a careful consideration of the literature available and requires the time to search for places where connections might be observed and considered. It calls for time to think. In *Les Miserables*, Victor Hugo states that "Philosophy is the microscope of thought." A rigorous, philosophical approach will – like Hugo's microscope – help bring focus and clarity to this study.

In essence, the topic of any philosophical study is a set of ideas – specifically, the quest to understand when and if a distinct series of issues converge, mix, juxtapose, and conflict with one another. However, it should be understood that a philosophical inquiry must attend not only to the facts of the matter at hand, but it must also take into account the experiences of the investigator – that is, a philosophical approach to any subject necessarily regards the researcher's own background and ideology as germane to the investigation. Giarelli and Chambliss (1995) suggest that Aristotle views the role of rigorous thinking (the philosophical mindset) not as that of arbitrating between feeling and fact, but as connecting feeling and fact in the creation of knowledge (p. 31). As a result, the study will allow this researcher the opportunity to recollect and reflect on personal experiences as a teacher and as a student, and to then meld that background with what the investigation of the literature reveals. The result ought to yield a synthesis of new ideas and new questions for further study. Like Aristotle, Dewey (1910) notes the important role played in philosophical inquiry by both reflection and new insight. To better illustrate his contention, he considers the options before a man faced with a fork in the road while traveling through an unfamiliar region:

> There are but two alternatives: he must either blindly and arbitrarily take his course, trusting to luck for the outcome, or he must discover grounds for the conclusion that a given road is right. Any attempt to decide the matter by thinking will involve inquiry into other facts, whether brought out by memory, or by further observation, or by both. The perplexed wayfarer must carefully scrutinize what is before him and he must cudgel his memory. (p. 10)

For both Aristotle and Dewey, then, certain occasions clearly call for a philosophical, reflective approach to dealing with a problem; rigorous consideration of the facts, coupled with conscientious reflection of one's own experiences, provides the answers necessary to deal with the question at hand.

Giarelli and Chambliss (1995) acknowledge the bridge between experience and analysis which philosophical inquiry provides, while providing a helpful model to consider when conceptualizing the distinct facets of a philosophical approach to any subject: "It mediates between immediate experience and experiment and promotes the intelligent development of values. It does this through a concern with clarity, context, and consciousness, among other things" (p. 34). That is to say, they call for the inquirer to attend to each of those concerns within the study, and in the process, they suggest a series of benchmarks by which to judge the completeness of a philosophical inquiry. By calling for clarity, they highlight the absolute necessity of both linguistic and logical clarity. Concepts must be analyzed for specific meanings, and a certain degree of focus must be achieved in order to move from an unanalyzed whole to an analyzed part. By calling for context, they highlight the need to reconstruct the larger picture out of which the inquiry developed in the first place. "The philosopher seeks to restore and awaken a

sense of the qualitative whole," they write, "from which inquiries develop and to which their results must return" (p. 34). And finally, by calling for consciousness they highlight the desirability of the inquirer grasping and acknowledging the complexity out of which the problem under examination originally arose. For Giarelli and Chambliss, no philosophical inquiry can be complete without proper attention being paid to each of these related facets of the study.

The argument might be made that all forms of inquiry, that all intellectual pursuits which boast better understanding as a chief aim, share elements of the philosophical approach. In fact, Floden and Buchmann (1989) remind their readers that "No sharp boundary separates philosophical inquiry in teacher education from other forms of inquiry" (p. 1). However, they go on to assert that a philosophical approach will require the researcher to attend to a number of specific tasks. First, a philosophical inquiry must analyze the language and concepts utilized in a given set of texts. Second, the assumptions which underlie and the logic which bolsters a particular argument, policy, or practice must be examined. And finally, the philosophical approach necessitates an historical examination of the topic under scrutiny. Floden and Buchmann (1989) recognize in the past a key to better ascertaining the possibilities for the future:

> Like all inquiry, philosophical inquiry often works by recognizing the similarities between problems or ideas and exploring how previous understandings might shed light on a current question or situation. Particular situations may be new, but ways to think them through may be strongly suggested by earlier discussions or texts. (p. 4)

These ideas seem to echo the call by Giarelli and Chambliss for clarity, context, and consciousness in philosophical studies.

Although the philosophical inquiry lacks the regimented structure and consistent blueprint of more quantitative methods, one should resist the temptation to assume that no standards exist by which to judge such a study. Eisner (1994) patterned three standards for evaluating educational criticism on a critical matrix related to the arts; that is to say, he supports the idea that educational works, like works of art, should be evaluated and judged on the criteria of connoisseurship, structural corroboration, and referential adequacy. As a personal quality or skill, *connoisseurship* acts subtly to allow an individual to look, to see, and to appreciate the phenomena at hand (p. 215). As with the detective who weaves together seemingly disassociated bits and pieces of evidence into a coherent whole, the researcher who brings *structural corroboration* to his work deftly works with fragmented and disjointed ideas and ultimately establishes smaller links and larger bridges which create a whole – which allow the reader to experience a gestalt upon working through the presentation in its entirety (p. 237). And, finally, Eisner defines *referential adequacy* as "the process of testing the criticism against the phenomena it seeks to describe, interpret, and evaluate. Referential adequacy is the empirical check of critical disclosure" (p. 240-41). That is to say, the reader's own experiences with and beliefs about the topic at hand will play a crucial role in determining, for that reader, whether or not the inquiry and the analysis ought to be considered valid research.

Taken all together, these ideals provide a framework within which to evaluate philosophical, critical research which cannot rely upon statistical formulas and models in

order to establish their validity as scholarly works worthy of the reader's attention. Eisner (1994) suggests that the structural corroboration and the referential adequacy are the "two major procedures with which to determine the validity of educational criticism" (p. 240). He believes that, in regard to good research, the writer's love of and interest in the topic at hand should be genuine and evident, that the researcher has experienced the area under study and knows it well, and that the author produces a study in which all of the disparate parts eventually come together in a cohesive, if not seamless, whole.

Whether or not he invokes the actual term, Eisner seeks to lay out a framework upon which a particular research project might begin to build its own case for *validity*, though he clearly does not see the need to apply the term in a traditional, quantitative sense. And although the concept of validity operates under a number of different guises when it comes to qualitative research, it ultimately asserts itself in the form of a call for correctness, for truthfulness, for trustworthiness. With a quantitative research design, the researcher may well establish validity by exposing the findings to a number of statistical formulas and models, seeking to locate a positivistic link between the aims of the study and the reported results. However, the issue becomes muddled somewhat in qualitative research. Maxwell (1992) suggests that rather than emphasize the traditional view of validity as it relates to qualitative research, one might better be served by considering the concept of *understanding* (p. 281). Eisner (1994) also picks up on this idea by noting that what may ultimately be taken from a given piece of research depends greatly upon what the reader brings to the experience of reading and reflecting upon the study's premise, findings, and conclusions (p. 239). In fact, while addressing the roles and responsibilities

of the educational critic, Eisner emphasizes the concept of *usefulness* as an important benchmark to consider when judging the quality of any research:

> If the talk or writing is useful, we should be able to experience the object or situation in a new, more adequate way. We use the critic's work as a set of cues that enable us to perceive what has been neglected. (p. 239)

While typical treatments of validity look in only one direction – toward the research itself – in a quest to satisfy the call for trustworthiness and truthfulness, Maxwell and Eisner introduce another factor into the validity equation: the reader. Both elevate the role of the reader within the ongoing debate about validity, and extend to the reader an invitation to help make the research valid by making it useful through his own connections to the research and his capacity to make sense and make use of the findings. Hammersly and Atkinson (1983) subscribe to the tenet that "data in themselves cannot be valid or invalid; what is at issue are the inferences drawn from them" (p. 191). In the case of all research, conclusions and inferences will inevitably be drawn not only by the researcher, but also by the attentive reader. According to Giarelli (1995), "If there is anything we have learned from our modern fixation on knowledge it is that all knowing, scientific or otherwise, involves interpretation" (p. 23). And as Peshkin (1993) notes, "Many types of good results are the fruits of qualitative research. Its generative potential is immense" (p. 28). Both Eisner and Maxwell might very well agree that the reader, in addition to the researcher, must actively involve himself or herself in the effort to create new ideas and to establish original links with the ideas he encounters in the research. No matter how rigorous the protocol followed in executing a particular research design, the ultimate challenge for making the findings valid may rest with the reader, who must put the study

to some *use*. As a result, the issue of validity depends in some measure on the inclination and capacity of the reader to make sense of and make use of the findings presented. The philosophical study, then, should do everything possible to afford the reader the opportunity to recognize heretofore unseen connections and to see the topics under scrutiny in a new light and, perhaps, to be moved to action.

Without question, the landscape of a philosophical inquiry is necessarily broad, and the particulars are certainly open to varying interpretations. Hard data and statistical facts which find their way into the study might well be the exception rather than the rule. Eisner (1994) readily acknowledges that criticism and analysis of any kind remains open to various interpretations and can easily be approached from a number of different, valid directions:

> The need for unanimity among critics is not characteristic of criticism, because it is recognized that complex phenomena – works of literature, painting, film, and the like – have several layers of meaning and that the greatest works seem inexhaustible in the meanings one can secure from them. What is sought is not the creation of one final definitive criticism of a work; rather, the goal is to have our perception and understanding expanded by the criticism we read. (p. 240).

Still, Eisner does not subscribe to the notion that one critique is as good as another and he does not hold to the idea that all critiques stand on equal footing just as a result of their having been posited. These benchmarks of connoissuership, referential adequacy, and structural corroboration which Eisner proposes should be useful tools for the reader wanting to evaluate the effectiveness, trustworthiness, and – most of all - the *usefulness* of a philosophical approach to an educational problem or issue.

While the fluidity and mutability of the philosophical study may be seen by some as an inherent weakness which belies structural flaws of such an approach, others point to those same characteristics as strengths. Schubert (1991) acknowledges the force and potency of the philosophical essay while acknowledging its dissimilarity to more traditionally accepted forms of inquiry: "It is a form of writing quite unlike the research report which summarizes the product of empirical inquiry. In contrast, the essay lets the reader travel the undulating trek of thought and feeling that the essayist travels. This, of course, means that every essay will be of a different method; in fact, the essay symbolizes the essayist in search of method" (p. 65). Koetting also recognizes the organic nature of philosophy, and reminds his readers that the philosophical pursuit is natural to our everyday life, and in some form or another becomes a part of our daily pursuits:

> We do philosophy (theorize) when, for whatever reason, we are aroused to wonder about how events and experiences are interpreted and should be interpreted. We do philosophize when we can no longer tolerate the splits and fragmentations in our pictures of the world, when we desire some kind of wholeness and integration, some coherence which is our own.... This is private work. This happens on a personal level as we work through the dailiness of everyday life. It becomes public when we struggle with the realities of classroom life. (p. 364)

And so while the philosophical approach may not have the same features of other forms of educational inquiry, it nonetheless rests at the heart of all educational studies. The philosophical dissertation, then, represents an *overt* and *intentional* effort to make public the process of contextualizing, clarifying, and reflecting.

Perhaps the greatest benefit of "going public" with one's musings and analysis of contemporary educational problems may be realized in the researcher's quest to make the familiar *strange*. We who live in the United States find ourselves continually surrounded by the signs and symbols of the nation's commitment to universal education; the familiar look of an elementary school playground or the austere brick edifice of a high school can be encountered in some easily recognizable form in nearly every town in America. Going to school represents perhaps the only shared experience which cuts across all cultural and social lines which otherwise tend to divide us in the United States. The process may be so familiar that it becomes invisible because of a collective habitual perception; we can easily cease to really "see" schools with any sort of a critical, questioning eye. Koetting notes the phenomenon when he claims that we can quickly lose sight of the problems which plague the very schools in our own neighborhood and that "The importance of philosophical inquiry in education is exactly at this point: philosophical inquiry can illuminate, inform, call into question, etc., the taken for granted notions that we have. Philosophical inquiry and analysis can help conceptual clarification, as well as inform our praxis, and vice versa" (p. 364). Like shining a light into a forgotten and neglected corner of one's own home, the philosophical study has the potential to illuminate old problems which have become so ingrained in our daily lives that they unfortunately fail to merit the attention they quietly demand and deserve.

John Dewey and the Philosophical Inquiry

John Dewey (1920) understands all of this, and chooses the philosophical essay as the vehicle to carry his own ideas as well as to clarify the proposals and practices of others. As a public philosopher, he recognizes the valuable role philosophy can play in

the daily lives of all people, and claims that – rather than an activity reserved for the elite of the academy – philosophy must be treated as a civic enterprise with the aim of clarifying "men's ideas as to the social and moral of their own day. Its aim is to become so far as is humanly possible an organ for dealing with these conflicts" (p. 26). Anticipating the same language which calls for philosophy to aid in the clarification and contextualizing of contemporary issues, Dewey (1938) opens *Experience & Education* by extending this discussion of the purposes and power of a philosophical mindset in thinking about educational problems:

> This formulation of the business of the philosophy of education does not mean that the latter should attempt to bring about a compromise between opposed schools of thought, to find a *via media*, nor yet make an eclectic combination of points picked out hither and yon from all schools. It means the necessity of the introduction of a new order of conceptions leading to new modes of practice.... Whatever value is possessed by the essay presented in this little volume resides in its attempt to call attention to the larger and deeper issues of Education so as to suggest their proper frame of reference. (p. 5-6)

Dewey's decision to utilize the philosophical mindset, then, may be properly traced to his desire to clearly represent the larger picture in framing whatever issue he wanted to study, to clarify any confounding concepts or ideas in the process, and to inform his own practice in the classroom. From Dewey's perspective, the quiet and solitary work of the philosopher ultimately must manifest itself in a very public set of circumstances in which one alters and adjusts his or her own conduct as it relates to the lives of students. Following a necessarily circuitous and fluid path, the philosophical approach eventually

ought to lead to a potential shift in perspective and ultimately to action. In short, I subscribe to applying a philosophical approach to the topic of teacher education reform because I believe it is the path Dewey himself would have favored.

Design of the Study

Through a detailed and critical look both at the major literature of teacher education reform and the writings of John Dewey, I hope to synthesize all of the goals of a philosophical study within the context of this dissertation. I will devote the second chapter of this study to the challenging task of encapsulating the work and ideas of John Dewey which relate to the education of teachers. This overview of Dewey's philosophy will develop both indirectly through an examination of what others have written about his work and, of course, through a direct canvassing of Dewey in his own words. In the course of attending to John Dewey's thoughts on the subject of education generally and teacher preparation specifically, I hope to honor Floden and Buchmann's (1989) admonition to recognize those voices which have preceded our own in an effort to see a "new" problem in light of a previous understanding of experience. Investigating and researching Dewey's work should bring the degree of focus and specificity required of a philosophical inquiry to the daunting task of exploring the vast and varied literature of teacher education reform.

In the third chapter of the study, I will address Giarelli and Chambliss' recommendation to represent the context, both ideologically and historically, of the problem under study. The chapter will open with a detailed account of the roots of teacher education in the United States and the role it has played in the development of our common school system. Situating the current debate within a larger historical context –

and, in fact, examining the early teacher education programs as they were experienced at the time John Dewey was writing and teaching – will allow the reader to assume a broader perspective from which to view and judge the contemporary attempts to ameliorate all that supposedly ails teacher preparation in the United States. As Lucas (1997) reminds us, attempts at reconstruction and revolution without the benefit of even the briefest of historical glances inevitably leads to a skewed viewpoint and a flawed understanding of one's own present:

> A great deal of contemporary literature on teacher education...seems curiously uninformed and unencumbered by any awareness of past precedent. This cheerful historical amnesia helps explain perhaps why every minor innovation nowadays tends to be hailed as wholly "new" and "original," why so many reform measures are "revolutionary," and why any given proposal for change is likely to be represented – in that most overworked of phrases – as a "paradigm shift" in thinking. (p. xiii)

In the course of this historical overview, I will remind – or perhaps inform the reader for the first time – that the teacher education programs of today represent a paradox in that they simultaneously look quite different from their normal school ancestors and yet must contend with many of the exact same issues and problems as those faced by the earliest vehicles for teacher preparation. It may be helpful and informative to recall that as recently as the 1920s, only one in twenty elementary school teachers had any schooling at all beyond the secondary level. And it will be germane to the discussion to understand that at the turn of the century more than half of the states regularly granted teaching licenses to those who could pass only the most basic of subject matter tests. Although the

basic structure and design of teacher education programs have undergone numerous fundamental changes since the turn of the century, many underlying concerns and rudimentary questions which plagued normal schools in the late nineteenth century still dominate the landscape of teacher education reform literature today. While much has changed, much has remained quite the same.

In addition to placing the current reform movement within a broad historical and social context, I will also attend to Giarelli and Chambliss' concern regarding clarity. Recognizing the fact that the voices involved in the movement to reform teacher education are many and varied, I will examine four of the most important and, perhaps, most influential of those voices, paying particular attention to the concerns of logical and linguistic clarity. In the course of attending to the work of the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Corporation, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, and John Goodlad, I will not only summarize and analyze their main recommendations, but I will also assess the very language used in order to forward their arguments and their agendas.

In the fourth chapter, this study will shift its focus to the points at which the philosophy of John Dewey intersects with the literature of the teacher education reform movement as well as the points at which the two never meet. Thus, the theoretical framework laid out by Dewey will inform my interpretation of the practical recommendations made in by those engaged in pushing the reform agendas for the preparation of our nation's new teaching force. And, perhaps, the reform literature will allow for a more detailed explication of Dewey's work in ways and from directions not often previously seen. Using Dewey's work to examine teacher education, and vice versa,

will allow for greater focus and clarity to be brought to the study of both areas, while at the same time enlarging the ideological landscape each shares with the other. As Kneller (1964) notes, philosophy is "both natural and necessary to man, because the human mind is forever seeking a world view or some comprehensive framework through which our insights into reality may be explained" (p. 5). The subject of the fourth chapter will be both the crossroads and the points of departure which serve to connect and separate Dewey and contemporary teacher education reform. The goal of Chapter Four becomes the creation and development of a new critical framework through which to better understand both topics in light of one another.

The fifth and final chapter of this study will consist of my attempts to make sense of all the literature on teacher education reform and the work of John Dewey germane to the discussion, in light of my own insight and experience as a student, as a teacher, and as a teacher educator. As noted earlier, Dewey views philosophy as a process which could be used in the quest to solve conflicts, to resolve the problems which inevitably present themselves and which, to his way of thinking, provides the very avenues we must travel if we intend to change and grow. In the same way that Dewey's wayward traveler reflected on both known facts and past experience in order to choose a particular path, the final chapter of this study will represent this researcher's efforts to answer the original question which initially drove this inquiry, to deal with the complications and questions which will no doubt arise as the process of inquiry continues, and to propose new questions which cannot be dealt with in the context of this study, but that might provide a continuing line of inquiry for another day. Writing about the fluid nature of a philosophical study, Schubert (1991) comments that it represents a unique style of research:

> It is a method of inquiry, one that allows the reader to follow along the often convoluted journey that leads to greater illumination. Perhaps traveling such a journey allows the reader to embark on his or her own byways and even pursue other journeys at the same time. In a sense, then, the essay is a process of inquiry that transcends the problem of reducing the human experience to an objectified commodity, a snare of all formal systems of inquiry. The essay, a fluid and less formal form, retains the vitality of lived experience by creating method of inquiry within its presentation. (p. 69-70)

Without question, the journey metaphor – so common to the literature of education – connotes an emergent and developing nature of philosophical inquiry. The ideas and questions which eventually compose the contents of the final chapter, then, will ultimately depend on the paths and byways which this study will ultimately take this researcher.

The Holmes Group: Introduction

The Holmes Group originally grew out of a series of meetings held first in the mid-80s and attended by a small group of education deans concerned with the perceived problem of generally low quality among teacher education programs around the country. According to the Holmes Group (1995), the difficulties threatened to be too overwhelming and challenging to handle with such a small congress of members. As a result, that initial gathering of deans decided that a long-term commitment would be required, and they settled on the idea of establishing a consortium dedicated to "nothing less than the transformation of teaching from an occupation into a genuine profession that would serve the educational needs of children" (p. 1). The consortium members further

divided this overarching aim into two goals: the simultaneous reform of teacher education and the reform of schooling, in general. Though separate and distinct in their own rights, these twin goals formed the basis for an action agenda which the Holmes Group (now the Holmes Partnership) set forth in a number of documents, most notably *Tomorrow's Teachers*, published in 1986, *and Tomorrow's Schools of Education*, released in 1995. Lucas (1997) posits that the former ranks among the most comprehensive and controversial of the reform initiatives which swept through the educational community in the mid-1980s (p. 90). Any complete and comprehensive inquiry into teacher education reform must recognize the efforts and contributions of the Holmes Group.

The Carnegie Forum: Introduction

The other report mentioned by Lucas as a most significant and influential piece in the movement to reconfigure and revise teacher preparation is *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. Developed by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, this report impacted the educational community at nearly the same time as the work of the Holmes Group and shares a number similarities with the Holmes recommendations, as well. Nothing less than a radical restructuring of the teaching profession would satisfy the program called for by the Carnegie Forum, with the overall goal being the uniting of educational issues and economic concerns for the assurance of America's competitive advantage in a shifting, growing global marketplace.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education: Introduction

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education has provided a voice concerned with the preparation of teachers since 1954, longer than any of the other voices which will ultimately be addressed in the context of this study. For over fifty

years, NCATE has developed, recommended, and reconsidered standards and procedures aimed specifically at strengthening the fundamental design and the specific content of teacher education programs at colleges and universities around the country. Gardner, Scannell, and Wisniewski (1996) claim that the main reason for the group's success in impacting teacher preparation rests in their "involving the primary stakeholders in teacher education: teacher educators, teachers, chief state school officers, members of state boards of education, subject-matter specialists, and representatives of the public" (p. 622). Just as the support base which NCATE has established is broad and varied, so, too, is the reform agenda it sanctions. The goals the organization hopes to achieve reach into every facet of teacher education. Darling-Hammond (1996) notes that NCATE leads a national effort to implement important initiatives aimed at creating performance-based standards which would be tied to teacher licensing, more advanced and authentic evaluation procedures for teachers, and national standards for teacher education programs, licensing, and certification (p. 6). Although not every teacher education program seeks or receives accreditation from NCATE, the organization exerts its influence on many college and university campuses around the country. Yinger (1999) claims that in March 1998, 540 of the nearly 1,200 institutions involved in teacher preparation have been granted the accreditation offered by NCATE. He goes on to note that the organization currently centers its reform agenda around four distinct, though related, categories:

> (1) design of professional education (e.g., conceptual framework, curriculum design, quality of instruction, quality of field experiences); (2) candidates in professional education (e.g., qualifications, diversity, assessment of competency);

> (3) professional education faculty (e.g., qualifications, diversity, assignments, professional development); and (4) the unit for professional education (e.g., governance, resources). (p. 102)

Because of the comprehensive nature of the reform agenda it proffers and supports, and because of the network of professionals which the organization has created in the course of developing that agenda, NCATE must be considered a major voice in the movement to restructure teacher education programs.

John Goodlad: Introduction

In a decade marked by reports offered up by private foundations and consortiums and government-appointed panels, John Goodlad stands out as a singular name for a number of reasons. His research into the everyday life of common schools received national attention with the publication of *A Place Called School* in 1984. However, Goodlad later turned his attention on the places where teachers learn their art and science: teacher education programs. Published in 1990, *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools* draws attention to programs marked by fragmentation, narrow conceptions of the purpose of schooling in a democratic society, and a lack of reflection which, if present, might otherwise prompt students to address the larger issues which will face them as educators. According to Smylie, Bay, and Tozer (1999), Goodlad's work stands as perhaps the most comprehensive and critical assessment of teacher education programs in the United States:

> This analysis portrays preservice teacher education as an enterprise characterized by poorly conceived collages of courses, lack of a clear mission (beyond entitling

graduates to state credentials), and a concentration on developing discrete skills and techniques.

(p. 47)

Goodlad's examination of America's teacher education programs, an examination not limited to simply *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*, stands as both a descriptive and prescriptive approach to highlighting the problems facing those charged with the task of preparing our future teachers and to forwarding possible roads to travel toward their resolution.

The Researcher

Whatever comes *of* a philosophical study must ultimately come *through* the researcher. The research presented here will be just as extensive and just as limited as my own experiences and my own ability to sense and articulate the connections which exist between and among the myriad issues which will come to light in the course of my study. As Glesne (1999) reminds us, "Your research is autobiographical in that some aspect of yourself is mirrored in the work you choose to pursue. Figuring out where your interests lie leads you to a greater understanding of your core values and beliefs" (p. 198). While I hope to illuminate the juncture points between Dewey and teacher education reform, I find myself at a personal and professional crossroads of sorts which relates in very specific and direct ways to those very issues.

Just nine years ago, I graduated from Oklahoma State University with a B.S. degree in secondary education; I worked my way through the teacher education program, taking the required course sequence of foundations, technical preparation (which actually included training on a *ditto machine*), methods, and field experiences. Following that, I

accepted my first teaching job at Stillwater High School and for seven years taught various courses within the English department. Seven years, hundreds of students, four student teachers, a master's degree in curriculum and instruction, three all-night proms, and an infinite number of local education association committee meetings later, I took a leave of absence from my teaching position at the high school in order to fulfill the residency requirement for my doctoral program in curriculum studies. While on campus, taking course work both through the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences, I also taught a field experience class and a language arts methods class. I enjoyed the opportunity to observe student teachers working in both very small and very large high schools around central Oklahoma. At this point, I am looking forward to starting my work in higher education at Emporia State University, teaching and researching as an English education specialist. In less than ten years, I have experienced the whole range of teacher education and have run the entire pedagogical gauntlet in the process; I have spent time as a student, as a student teacher, as a classroom teacher, as a cooperating teacher, as a graduate student, as a teacher in a college of education, and as an observer in the field. My time spent as a student speaks to the theoretical facets of education, while my time spent as a teacher speak to the practical aspects of the education. And, of course, the two conveniently inform one another, as theory and practice ultimately blend one into the other.

While I write the bulk of this study, however, I will be spending my time in a completely different way – a way which I anticipate will in many ways speak to and inform my understanding of John Dewey. While writing this dissertation, I will be at home with my baby daughter, taking care of her during the day, catching the odd moment

to read during her naps and quiet times (presuming there are any of those), and writing during the evenings and on the weekends. If ever there were a situation outside of education which dovetails with the philosophy of John Dewey, it might be raising one's first child. Dewey believed in experiential learning, and I've discovered that no textbooks exist which can prepare one for the road ahead when it comes to parenting. Dewey advocated the need for problems to be overcome in order to ensure genuine and effective growth, and I've learned that taking care of a newborn presents more than its share of hurdles to be overcome through inspiration taken from equal parts creativity and desperation. Dewey understood the fundamental role that social interaction plays in the process of education, and I've discovered that a key element of raising a young child is the art of communication, a fact made particularly challenging given that my baby and I don't speak the same language just yet. And Dewey recognized that authentic learning can best take place when the lines which separate the teacher from the learner were blurred (thought not eliminated), and I've noticed that anyone observing me with my daughter might rightly wonder about who fulfills the role of student and who fulfills the role of teacher; we represent a combination of both, I imagine. All of this is to say that I already acknowledge the fact that Dewey's philosophy finds application outside of the common school classroom. His ideas and beliefs about living and learning seem as germane in my own home today as they do in the classroom I last taught in nearly a year ago at Stillwater High School.

Summation

So I arrive at the start of this dissertation situated at a crossroads. My past has been located in the culture of the high school classroom. My present seems split between

the academic life of a graduate student and the experiential, experimental world of staying at home with a baby. And my professional future revolves around plans to teach and to write within the field of teacher education. This study figures neatly into each of those paths by affording me an opportunity to draw all three of them together into some coherent whole. Kneller (1964) posits that "Throughout the many complexities of experience we tend to seek some pattern that will enable us to understand the sum of things of which we, as individuals, are only a part. Without such a pattern human experience in the long run would be meaningless" (p. 1). As stated early in this chapter, the topic of this study is that of *ideas* and of the *quest to make meaning* from the confluence of my own experience, the literature under scrutiny, and my capacity to formulate questions, recognize connections, and articulate a new understanding of contemporary teacher education and the educational philosophy of John Dewey.

CHAPTER TWO

JOHN DEWEY: THE DRIVE TOWARD RECONCILIATION AND PROGRESS

Biographical Sketch

Born in Vermont in 1859, just two years before the beginning of the Civil War, John Dewey grew up in an era of potential for both extraordinary destruction and growth in the United States. And after growing up in the social, political, and cultural turmoil which marked the years leading into and out of the Civil War, Dewey emerged as a great American educator and philosopher dedicated to an ideal of education as a powerful, workable, practical tool for the improvement of one's self and of the larger culture, a tool perfectly suited for the figurative transformation of man and the literal reconstruction of society. A philosopher committed to the idea of the unity of knowledge across all subject areas, Dewey thought and wrote prolifically in many fields and in numerous areas, including art, philosophy, science, democracy, and – most notably – education. Archambault (1964) notes that Dewey focused on the learning process as the nexus within which he sought to bring together "all aspects of intellectual activity, and to illustrate, often in great detail, how all phases of activity merge in the philosophical activity which is education" (p. xv). As a result, the school serves as the locus of much of his thought and the focal point for the great weight of his writing.

Like so many of philosophy's giant figures who came before him, John Dewey labored to bring a certain degree of unity to a fragmented world. He diligently searched for a Hegelian synthesis which aimed to connect the two distinct schools of thought

which dominated the landscape of pedagogical discourse (Westbrook, p. 14). That is to say, he engaged in a quest to bring together both the *theory* and the *practice* of education. As Archambault (1964) suggests, his basic philosophy demonstrates the drive to "eradicate dualisms and 'either-ors,' and to merge concepts traditionally kept distinct" (p. xiv). To that end, Dewey subscribes to the notion that theory and practice must not be artificially divided out of a matter of convenience or efficiency, and argues that the pedagogue of integrity must possess a command of both the principles which underlie the processes of education and the skills required to live and grow in community of learners.

In a short essay titled "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education," Dewey makes a direct statement on the fundamental need to bring both principles and practice together in the education of teachers. However, much of Dewey's position regarding the best of what it means to be a teacher and a learner must be mined out of his countless articles, chapters, and books on pedagogy. And although Dewey dealt with innumerable topics while attempting to illustrate the necessity of merging the art and the science of teaching, his literature came to be dominated by a number of crucial motifs: the relationship of *schools and democracy*, the central role of *community*, the value of *growth* as an educational ideal, the weight and significance of the *present*, the role of *subject matter*, the important purpose served by *problems and dissonance* in the learning process, and the necessity of *reflective thought*. Woven within each of these motifs common to much of Dewey's educational thought are his more generalized principles relative to the role of teachers, the responsibilities of schools, and the place of education within a democratic society. Collectively, these themes came to dominate the landscape of his thinking and his writing, appearing again and again in various incarnations throughout his

work, while melding one into the other and emerging finally as the focus of Dewey's pedagogy: the *experiential curriculum.*

Dewey's Direct Statement on the Preparation of Teachers: "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education"

Although Dewey's work concerned with education in general is expansive and varied, his discussion of teacher preparation specifically is comparatively narrow. One of his most direct statements regarding the proper training for a future educator came in the form of a treatise titled "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education." Originally published in 1904 in The Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, this short essay appeared at a time when a considerable controversy began to stir regarding the question of the right and proper way to train teachers. Rury (1986) notes that Dewey wrote the piece during a time when the focal point of the teacher education curriculum centered upon the technical matter of preparing young men and women to "take charge of large groups of children" (p. 57). The conventional wisdom of the day held up as crucial the tenets of control, technique, and method. Normal schools paid scant attention to questions of pedagogical principles and learning theory; the focus fell almost completely on the preparation of a proficient classroom manager. Dewey, as expected, notes the weakness inherent in any program of study not based on the development of principles and wrote "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education" to respond to current trends and the accepted contemporary practice. His efforts produce a concise treatment of a complicated subject, and reflected his tendency to seek synthesis and harmony in supposedly diametrical ideas; in this particular case, he brings both

theory and practice together for the purpose of developing intellectual strong and autonomous teachers.

Dewey (1904) opens the essay by contrasting two different approaches to the development and preparation of teachers: the apprenticeship model and the laboratory model. The former, he claims, aims at developing and equipping the classroom teacher for immediate duty, at developing a product with little delay. The goal exists as both an immediate and an ultimate end at the same time, and the approach is imminently practical. The latter, Dewey notes in contrast, offers its immediate goal of supplying "the intellectual method and material of good workmanship, instead of making on the spot, as it were, an efficient workman" (p. 10). In this case, the immediate goal works in service of an ultimate aim: a principled professional capable of future growth. Speaking of the laboratory model in general terms, Dewey suggests that a professional school best serves its students when it provides them with intellectual tools necessary for autonomous growth and reflective practice:

> It aims, in a word, at control of the intellectual methods required for personal and independent mastery of practical skill, rather than at turning out at once masters of the craft. This arrangement necessarily involves considerable postponement of skill in the routine and technique of the profession, until the student, after graduation, enters upon the pursuit of his calling. (p. 11)

Before the techniques may be mastered and prior to the tricks of the trade being worked into one's professional repertoire, Dewey claims that one must first take effort and time in establishing a substructure of scientific foundations. The *theory* must necessarily and properly precede the *practice*.

Given the state of teacher preparation as Dewey experienced it in 1904, he believed that the proper focus of the normal school programs had been misplaced. The pre-service teachers had been pushed in the direction of technique and skills, while Dewey believed they should be giving that attention to principles and reflective practice. That is to say, Dewey laments the contemporary state of affairs which clearly privileged classroom management issues over the intellectual responsibility of the new teacher (p. 13). While Dewey acknowledges the importance of mastering the skills and techniques of dealing with routine classroom issues, he also feels that the inexperienced teachers could not divide their attention profitably between learning how to put their own knowledge to it best educational use and figuring out how to manage a classroom of students. As he often did, Dewey expresses his belief by invoking an analogous circumstance to the pedagogical issue at hand:

> There is a technique of teaching, just as there is a technique of piano-playing. The technique, if it is to be educationally effective, is dependent upon principles. But it is possible for a student to acquire outward form of method without capacity to put it to genuinely educative use. (p. 13)

Perhaps thinking of the technically proficient musician who plays with a lack of passion or with an understanding of the music which goes no further than the correct recognition and execution of the notes, Dewey notes the danger inherent in the teacher skilled in classroom management, but who has little idea as to how one goes about the process of teaching or what might actually be important to learn.

Like technical proficiency, the mastery of subject matter also stood as another area to emphasize in term of designing a teacher education program. Some educators

supported a rigorous grounding in one's discipline as the key to unlocking skill and, ultimately, success as a classroom teacher. Predictably, Dewey refuses to cast the debate in dichotomous terms; rather, he acknowledges the relative merit of both the technical knowledge of subject matter and the art of pedagogy. Noting that "scholarship per se may be a most effective tool for training and turning out good teachers," (p. 21) he leaves the door open to suggest that subject matter certainly counts, but doesn't count for everything:

> The present divorce between scholarship and method is as harmful upon one side as upon the other. . . . But the only way in which this divorce can be broken down is by so presenting all subject-matter, for whatever ultimate, practical, or professional purpose, that it shall be apprehended as an objective embodiment of methods of mind in its search for, and transactions with, the truth of things. (p. 24)

Solid methodological technique without knowledge of what to study is educationally empty. Likewise, the mere acquisition of information and the piling up of fact upon fact is educationally dead. Dewey argues that the schism which existed between pedagogical concerns and subject-matter proficiency would have to be bridged before genuine, reflective education could take place.

As Dewey saw it, being placed at the front of a classroom as quickly as possible served as a poor alternative to spending time as a student studying and mastering one's discipline prior to ever facing a classroom of students. For the teacher too quickly thrust into a teaching situation, the danger rests in the tendency to fix one's energy solely in external attention, in placing too much focus on the surface milieu of the classroom,

while neglecting the more important, less easily discerned educational issues at hand (p. 14). Dewey's concern relative to this notion of "external attention" centers around his view that such a teacher will inevitably develop habits based on empirical, rather than scientific, sanction. [Dewey (1938) notes that the scientific method is the only "authentic means at our command for getting at the significance of our everyday experiences of the world in which we live." He goes on to submit that the scientific method "provides a working pattern of the way in which and the conditions under which experiences are used to lead ever onward and outward" (p. 88). More generally, Dewey claims that the scientific or experimental method attaches great significance to ideas as ideas, tests those ideas by the consequences which they produce, and systematically keeps track of those ideas, activities, and consequences (p. 86-7). In this way, the scientific or experimental method stands as the superior method of inquiry into pedagogical issues.] "The student adjusts his actual methods of teaching, not to the principles which he is acquiring," laments Dewey, "but to what he sees succeed and fail in an empirical way from moment to moment" (p. 14). Always one to champion the ideal of taking the necessary time to reflect on the educational process, Dewey fears that developing immediate skills in the management of a classroom will ultimately cost the teacher the skills and capacities to grow in the future (p. 15). He believes, then, that the instantaneous satisfaction of getting in front of a class and managing its behavior must be deferred in favor of developing a conceptual, philosophical, and principled framework upon which one understands the process of education and proceeds to developed his or her own approach to teaching.

This framework, of course, must be complemented with something beyond ideals about teaching and learning. To Dewey's way of thinking, then, the debate comes full

circle and returns to the topic of subject matter. In short, Dewey calls for a synthesis of both mastery of one's discipline and what he calls *mind activity*. According to Dewey, the student who emphasizes the stuff of education and yet fails to recognize the import of his or her own principles regarding teaching and learning "may continue to improve in the mechanics of school management, but he can not grow as a teacher, an inspirer and director of soul-life" (p. 15). In the course of invoking such language as *inspirer* and *director of soul-life*, Dewey tips his hand and underscores his belief in the absolute necessity of a program for the preparation of teachers characterized both by depth and breadth, one which gives time and attention to the interrelated issues of philosophical principles, classroom management, and subject matter expertise. To privilege one significantly over the others results in an incomplete, unbalanced, and inadequate teacher.

To be a complete pedagogue, Dewey suggested, one must emerge and grow as an intellectually independent educator. While criticizing the laziness which marked so many teachers and resulted in their capriciously following the latest educational fad or trend, he called for a corps of educators willing and able to blaze new paths forged upon a bedrock of principles and scientific foundations:

> The tendency of educational development to proceed by reaction from one thing to another, to adopt for one year, or for a term of seven years, this or that new study or method of teaching, and then as abruptly to swing over to some new educational gospel, is a result which would be impossible if teachers were adequately moved by their own independent intelligence.... If teachers were possessed by the spirit of an abiding student of education, this spirit would find

> some way of breaking through the mesh and coil of circumstance and would find expression for itself. (p. 16)

Dewey's language suggests a critical stance and emancipatory posture which calls for teachers capable not simply of reproducing the status quo, but of effecting change both in their students, their profession, and themselves. He goes on to conclude "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education" by advancing the idea that teacher education programs must necessarily have educational leadership as a part of their offices, and that those same programs must not simply churn out teachers capable of doing better those tasks which must be done in schools, but who possess the ability to change the very conception of what is meant by a meaningful education (p. 30). By creating a learning environment which encourages pre-service teachers to wrestle with the problems of what to teach, how to teach it, and why it should be taught in the first place, Dewey believes new teachers could be developed with the potential to create their own pedagogical paths and who would inevitably help their own students enjoy the benefits afforded by an integrated, sound education.

Schools and Democracy

Dewey clearly sees the absolute necessity of a teaching corps made up of individuals capable of autonomous, creative practice. In fact, public education in the United States has long been associated with notions of self-governance, with the ideals of a population willing and able to manage itself. Our nation long ago pinned its hopes for political enfranchisement and freedom for the citizenry at large on the activities which take place inside the classrooms of our schools; visions of a participatory form of government drove some of the earliest efforts to provide universal education for every

citizen. Anyon (1997) suggests that this democratic vision of schools remains important and powerful even in the contemporary school reform movement, and points out that such an image has a foundation and early expression in the work and writing of Dewey, as well as the progressive school of reformers around the turn of the century (p. 12). Dewey did indeed take a profound interest in the power of schools to effect the democratic life, establishing his Laboratory School at the University of Chicago as the focal point of his efforts. Providing Dewey a place in which to analyze the interplay of ideas such as teaching, learning, autonomy, and community life, his lab school operated above all else as "an experiment in education for democracy" (Westbrook, 1991, p. 104). Stated another way, the real world of the Dewey School, as it came to be known, provided a critical intersection at which he could examine and critique both the points of conflict and moments of resonance which developed when the theory of the democratic life met the practice of the classroom in a real and genuinely problematic set of circumstances – that is to say, in the classroom.

Although Dewey uses broad brush stokes in painting his definition of democracy, he delineates specific roles and responsibilities for the schools in a democratic society. In order to grow into effective membership in any democratic community, Dewey suggests, the students must study science, history, and art; they must be well grounded in the fundamentals of inquiry and communication; and they must, above all else, develop habits of industry, perseverance, and serviceableness. Additionally, the student prepared to participate in the democratic life has to learn the skills necessary to both follow and lead (Westbrook, 1991, p. 94). For Dewey, then, the school's critical role in the establishment of democracy as an ideal rests in assisting students in developing the

character necessary for self-actualization – a process defined by Dewey as using personal gifts and talents for the benefit and well-being of the community. In order for any of this to happen, the democratic school must allow students to live and learn in a genuine atmosphere of social learning, of community (p. 105). If all these conditions could be met, and if the students took advantage of circumstances which would allow for personal growth while encouraging a social mindset, Dewey's vision of a democratic life could be fulfilled. Ideally, both the society at large and the individual specifically would be better off for the effort, and mutual progress for both would be achieved.

On the surface, the link between schools and democracy might seem to rest entirely upon the need for an informed, educated electorate. Dewey (1916) acknowledges this most obvious connection when he notes that "The superficial explanation is that a government resting upon popular suffrage cannot be successful unless those who elect and who obey their governors are educated" (p. 87). In characterizing the concern for an educated electorate as "superficial," however, Dewey clearly leaves the door wide open for a further explication of the critical link between schools and ideals of democracy, and in doing so he tacitly suggests that a greater reason for attending to the connection must exist. He goes on to expand the commonly held definition of *democracy*, one which centers around political systems and forms of governance, and moves his conception of the term into the realm of community life and shared goals among diverse groups of individuals:

> A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer

> to his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men from perceiving the full import of their activity. (p. 87)

Clearly, Dewey moves well beyond any picture of a nation of informed, educated voters making the best choice possible at the polls. His vision of democracy encompasses, rather, a nation of individuals willing and able to co-exist in an autonomous state of mutual respect and peace. Peters (1977) notes that Dewey views democracy "mainly as a way of life; he was not particularly interested in the institutional arrangements necessary to support it" (p. 103). Dewey sees the democratic life as one which exists because of a people which values the social life and participates fully in a very real execution of community.

Always quick to warn of the danger inherent in dichotomous thinking, Dewey worries about the tendency to see living freely and living as a part of a community as mutually exclusive. Brumbaugh and Lawrence (1963) point out that a typically American political conception of liberty has emerged as "a negative conception of freedom that readily generates an attitude of 'I'll get mine first'" (p. 149). They go on to suggest that Dewey's idea of a full education, in contrast, includes the belief that one must share, to some degree, in the common aims, goals, and policies of one's community. And so, he takes the proposition of democracy – a concept understandably associated with such ideas as freedom and individuality – and incorporates into it the concept of community, of social life. Westbrook (1991) asserts that Dewey believed all members of a democracy were "entitled to an education that would enable them to make the best of themselves as

active participants in the life of their community" (p. 94). For Dewey, then, the individual finds self-realization within the larger context of a social life. And in subscribing to such a proposition, he maintains his inclination to reconcile seemingly opposed ideas into a coherent whole.

Perhaps Dewey found such reconciliation possible because of his tendency to expand upon commonly held notions. In this case, his take on democracy encompasses much more than the conventional wisdom might have accommodated; his understanding of democracy moves well beyond the simplistic view of a political system which gives voice to the individual: "For Dewey, the demonstration that democracy as a form of government was the most effective means of organizing consensus and preserving stability was not enough, for to evaluate it simply in these instrumental terms...was to miss the more fundamental significance of democracy as an end, as an ethical ideal" (Westbrook, 1991, p. 41). Westbrook (1991) goes on to claim that Dewey understands democracy as "a way of life" which has its roots in the very nature of human beings (p. 533-34). By moving the concept of democracy beyond that of political machinery and into the realm of human nature, Dewey finds a place for the autonomous individual to live and grow within the community at large.

Dewey's apprehension of democracy as a social process can be seen in his very early writing, in the opening phrase of his *Pedagogic Creed*. Dewey (1897) begins by asserting that "All education proceeds by the participation of the individual in the social consciousness of the race" (p. 427). By alluding to the social and participatory nature inherent in true education, Dewey inextricably ties the ideal of democracy to the reality of the classroom, and thus makes democratic living – that life in which each individual

pursues his own talents and gifts while at the same time remaining acutely aware of the needs and abilities of others – an essential element in his pedagogical framework.

The Central Role of Community

Dewey's ideas concerning democracy in the schools cannot be disassociated from his beliefs regarding community. In his view, the former cannot and will not evolve and mature without the latter; democracy requires community, and community fosters democracy. The only possible avenue for an individual to travel on the path toward self-realization wound its way through society, through some form of shared community life. Dewey believes that schools must be created in the image of a miniature community, an embryonic society in which the students would find themselves obliged to live a life in contact with others (Kliebard, 1987, p. 80). Westbrook (1991) makes this connection between democracy and community even more explicit when he notes that Dewey subscribes to the notion that, in order for students to experience democracy and model the concomitant lifestyle, schools must provide the forum and the circumstances for children to live and to participate and to contribute in real ways to the community which exists both within and without the walls of the school building (p. 106). Once again, Dewey expands a commonly restricted idea (in this case, the school) and extends its possibilities in order to accommodate his own beliefs about how things ought to be in the education of a young person. In one of the earliest statements of his educational philosophy, as recorded in *My Pedagogic Creed*, Dewey (1897) states his conviction that the "child should be stimulated and controlled in his work through the life of the community" (p. 431). One more time, he raises his central curricular question within the confines of a single statement; that is, he wrestles with the belief that the school must somehow

maintain the delicate balance between the student as an individual and the student as a member of the larger community.

Before he catalogued the various benefits educationally to living and learning in a community setting, Dewey (1916) attends to the very concept of *community* and, in doing so, characteristically stretches the commonly held conception. He addresses the issue of what actually constitutes a community by noting the fact that simply living in proximity with others does not necessarily mean a social, and thereby potentially educative, situation exists:

> If, however, they were all cognizant of the common end and all interested in it so that they regulated their specific activity in view of it, then they would form a community. But this would involve communication. Each would have to know what the other was about and would have to have some way of keeping the other informed as to his own purpose and progress. Consensus demands communication. (p. 5)

For Dewey (1938), mere physical immediacy fell short of a defining characteristic for community. Rather, in order to exist at all, a community must foster and maintain interaction, common goals, and – above all else – communication (p. 6). Baker (1966) suggests that Dewey's pedagogy holds as a given that schooling must occur in a social setting and that the individuals living in the society must engage in "common enterprises" in order to be considered a community (p. 134.) Proximity cannot define a community of individuals; for Dewey, the membership must share both a common vision and open lines of communication.

The social life emerges as critical not because it exists as an end unto itself, but because of its unique power to educate, to engender circumstances conducive to learning. As Dewey (1916) states, "the very process of living together educates" (p. 6). The catalyst which enables the students who live and work together to actually learn, however, works precisely because people who strive together toward common goals must interact; they must share ideas and extend themselves in order to see things from another's perspective. In order to live and learn together, they must communicate. In the process of trying to convey something of a personal experience to another person, Dewey (1916) claims that the student necessarily learns from the attempt to make a connection with someone else:

> The experience has to be formulated in order to be communicated. To formulate requires getting outside of it, seeing it as another would see it, considering what points of contact it has with the life of another so that it may be got into such form that he can appreciate its meaning.... All communication is like art. It may be fairly said, therefore, that any social arrangement that remains vitally social, or vitally shared, is educative to those who participate in it. (p. 6)

As Dewey (1916) notes, "Not only is social life identical with communication, but all communication (and hence all genuine social life) is educative" (p. 5). In holding up community life as an absolute imperative in his curricular scheme, Dewey suggests a syllogism which contends that social life inevitably necessitates the mutual exchange of ideas, and that exchange leads to learning. To neglect any step along the way runs the risk of derailing the natural workings of the education process. "Much of present education fails," Dewey (1897) said, "because it neglects this fundamental principle of

the school as a form of community life" (p. 423). The effective teacher, therefore, finds no other viable alternative to creating a genuine community within the classroom. Failing in this effort results, unfortunately and ultimately, in a lifeless and disconnected education far removed from the real world in which the students actually live.

Dewey and his teaching staff attempted to put this theory of community life and communication into practice at the Chicago Lab School. Opened in January 1896, the Lab School boasted only one teacher, one assistant, and sixteen pupils, aged six to nine. When Dewey resigned eight years later in 1904, the school had 23 teachers, 10 assistants, and 140 students. Tanner (1997) notes that the ideal upon which Dewey's school rested was that of a "simplified society" in which the students gained both social insight and experience, as well as intellectual and manual skills (p. 23). Not only were the students immersed in a community atmosphere, but the school itself existed within the larger educational community, as visiting days were held each Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. In this way, every individual involved with the school (students, teachers, assistants, and visitors alike) engaged in the communal quest to solve problems and overcome difficulties in a spirit of cooperation and collaboration.

The community spirit of the Lab School worked itself out within the context of Dewey's own particular take on democracy. Dewey views democratic living within a conceptual framework which holds that genuine democracy brings diverse people together, thereby fostering a sense of community and enriching the experiences of individuals by giving them space to develop their own unique talents (Tanner, 1997, p. 6). Moreover, a "spirit of service" permeated the milieu of the school, according to Dewey's design. Tanner (1997) suggests that Dewey's intent for the school involved bringing

people into situations in which they must work closely together, thereby contributing to a "common purpose" for the greater good (p. 4). In this way, the spirit of community impacted and influenced the daily life Dewey's Lab School, thrusting students and teachers alike into situations which required both communication and cooperation, and which ultimately afforded the possibility of progress and growth for both the society at large and the individual.

Zhixin Su (1996) writes of another attempt to bridge the school and community gap, this effort made by one of Dewey's former students at Columbia University. In the 1920s, Tao Xingzhi began his attempts to reform Chinese normal schools by implementing the ideas and philosophies he learned while studying under the tutelage of John Dewey. In 1927, Tao established the Morning Village Normal School. In this rural teaching school, he distilled the American pragmatism of Dewey and developed a workable system for training future teachers in China, a system which turned greatly upon the belief in blurring the lines which separate school and community. Out of the Morning Village Normal School grew a network of projects and institutions which intimately linked the school with the society: a network of village schools which connected hundreds of rural families, a management system for local hospitals, and even a self-defense league designed to train villagers how to protect themselves from bandits. According to Su (1996), "For a while at Morning Village, the school and society were effectively joined for the purposes of educating everyone in a democratic community" (p. 127). The pre-service teachers at Morning Village moved quickly into the local community to schools in order to complete much of their course work while solving real problems faced by their neighbors. The learning moved out of the traditional, established

classrooms and into the community. And the students all assumed real roles within their communities and participated in the lives of their villages. Su (1996) notes that both Dewey and Tao shared the conviction that a school and its students must be closely tied into life of the community, and that the students who take such active roles possess the power to effect genuine social reform (p. 132).

Indeed, Dewey believes that schools should exist in order to act as catalysts for change and social progress. At the same time, he subscribes to the notion that schools must provide the ways and means of maintaining a social continuity. Once again, Dewey finds himself needing to reconcile two positions which might be interpreted as contradictory or even untenable. Writing about schools and changing society, Dewey (1897) claims that "education is the fundamental method of social progress and reform" (p. 437). On the other hand, he assigns schools the responsibility of maintaining the social connections which bind together the fabric of our culture. Claiming that society continues to exist through a "process of transmission" just as all forms of biological life, Dewey (1916) notes that the transfer of ideas occurs through communication from the older to the younger members of the community:

> Without this communication of ideals, hopes, expectations, standards, opinion, from those members of society who are passing out of the group life to those who are coming into it, social life could not survive. (p. 3)

For Dewey, schools contend with the need to bind society together in a common bond while at the same time prepare students capable of effecting change, of nudging their community in a new direction. "In the ideal school," Dewey (1897) mused, "we have the reconciliation of the individualistic and the institutional ideals" (p. 438). Striking the

balance between the two, then, emerges as a central and critical element to Dewey's thinking about schools. And for this reason, his vision of schools as part and parcel of the community at large necessitates the possibility of classrooms filled with individuals pursuing self-realization within the context of common social goals, of students fulfilling their individual potentiality while renewing and furthering the democratic communities in which they live and learn.

The Value of Growth as an Educational Ideal

Dewey's belief in community, in social renewal and growth, never lessened his focus on the individual's natural need and tendency to evolve. His vision of schools, though rooted in an image of social and democratic living, calls for students who blazed their own trails and moved in directions of their own choosing. Dewey (1916) recognizes the danger inherent in blindly, unthinkingly following a course mired in custom and tradition. He goes on to note that the real advantage offered by immaturity rests in its capacity to "emancipate the young" from the need to live in the past, and that the business of education is "rather to liberate the young from reviving and retraversing the past than to lead them to a recapitulation of it" (p. 73). While Dewey gives due attention to history in an effort to better understand present circumstances, at the same time he warns of the loss of freedom and the restrictions which necessarily accompany an unthinking homage to what has come before, to a mere imitation of one's cultural and social inheritance.

In defining exactly what he means by growth in educational terms, Dewey (1938) addresses the objection which holds that growth may take on many different directions, and thus should not be held up as a universal goal. He holds forth the possibility of a man who begins his career as a burglar and works hard at becoming more expert at his craft.

Educationally speaking, Dewey contends that the question must be resolved by deciding whether or not the growth being considered moves in a direction which promotes or hinders further growth in general terms:

> Does this form of growth create conditions for further growth, or does it set up conditions that shut off the person who has grown in this particular direction from the occasions, stimuli, and opportunities for continuing growth in new directions? What is the effect of growth in a special direction upon the attitudes and habits which alone open up avenues for development in other lines? I shall leave you to answer these questions, saying simply that when and *only* when development in a particular line conduces to continuing growth does it answer to the criterion of education as growing. (p. 36)

Growth begets growth, and learning begets further learning. Dewey (1910) describes this particular interpretation of the natural course of events by noting "There is no end to this spiral process: foreign subject matter transformed through thinking into a familiar possession becomes a resource for judging and assimilating additional foreign subject-matter" (p. 223). In order for Dewey to give credence to any notion of growth as genuinely educative, it must prove itself able to open up more doors to future learning, to serve as an intellectual catalyst.

In *The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education*, Dewey notes his concern for teacher education programs which produce educators greatly proficient in the mechanical side of teaching, but who lack the intellectual skills to continue growing and changing over the course of their careers. His fear centers around the conviction that pre-service teachers who find themselves thrown quickly into a teaching situation – well before they

develop the essential facility necessary to reflect and improve upon their own practice *on their own*, will simply resort to mimicking the techniques of their mentor teachers. Soares (1998) contends that "John Dewey long ago warned against placing teacher trainees in apprenticeship experiences because they would be tempted to imitate and replicate the practices found in their placements rather than reflect on the practices they observed" (p. 219). Indeed, Dewey (1904) contests the very idea of early field experiences because of his belief that technical skills may be achieved in such a setting, but only at the high cost of one's ability to grow beyond the basic, technical issues of craft (p. 15). Clearly privileging the capacity for future growth over immediate skills, Dewey concedes that a new educator might very well continue to improve in the "mechanics of school management, but he can not grow as a teacher, an inspirer and director of soul-life" (p. 15). He does not value the ability to master simply the basic proficiency of managing a classroom because that path does not lead to an increased aptitude or likelihood to improve practice, to grow in other avenues relative to and necessary to good pedagogy.

Though Dewey concludes that the power of growth, as an ideal, rests in the promise of unfolding development, his philosophy does not depend entirely upon such a guarantee for the future. In fact, he subscribes very much to the notion of growth for its own sake. While Dewey credits Froebel as the force in modern educational theory responsible for acknowledging the idea of growth as an ideal, he also criticizes him for placing an undue emphasis on the product of learning. "He failed to see that growing is growth," wrote Dewey (1916), "developing is development..." (p. 58). Thus, Dewey makes explicit his critique of placing excessive stress on the end products of learning

which supposedly imply that growth has, indeed, taken place. Rather, he argues that the growth itself is the main event in any student's genuine learning. "Growth is regarded as *having* an end," laments Dewey (1916), "instead of *being* an end" (p. 50). Dewey submits that authentic learning cannot take place when products, or preconceived ends, dominate the direction of a classroom's activity. That is to say, free growth becomes impossible when a finished product is envisioned ahead of time by the teacher. In such a case, the direction must be considered purely external, and therefore unnatural. Specific end products, then, must be abandoned as educational goals in favor of a general unfolding of powers which will allow students to extend their own learning in a number of directions based at least partly on their own interests.

Though Dewey returns again and again, in very specific terms, to the nature of growth, he also attends to this concept within the larger context of his definitions of education. "Education is thus a fostering, a nurturing, a cultivating process," writes Dewey (1916). "All of these words mean that it implies attention to the conditions of growth" (p. 10). As evidenced in his word choice, his descriptions of education often contain quite organic language, language presumably intended to imply ideas of natural development and of process. On an even more technical note, however, Dewey (1916) does not completely abandon language which points to his concern for cultivating the abilities one must have in order to live and learn effectively and autonomously: "We thus reach a technical definition of education: It is that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" (p. 76). As usual, Dewey describes the process of

learning with one eye on the value inherent in the present moment, and with the other turned toward the hope and promise of future growth.

Dewey's own definition of education eliminates even the possibility of evaluating the quality of one's education as it happens or even just after it has occurred; his conception of genuine learning requires the passage of time in order to determine whether or not the student ever realized his or her potential for growth. Moreover, each new understanding will open up additional doors and fresh avenues for the exploration of one's world; every learning experience should afford students an opportunity to take the intellectual inheritance from their own community, capitalize upon and develop native interests and strengths, and move forward from that point, at their own paces and in their own directions. If the educational process as Dewey (1931) envisions it occurs the way it should, the learner will take from each new experience a modified conceptual and intellectual framework which will then serve as the foundation upon which to add more knowledge and through which to achieve a greater understanding: "If a student does not take into subsequent life an enduring concern for some field of knowledge and art, lying outside his immediate profession preoccupations, schooling for him has been a failure, no matter how good a 'student' he was" (p. 425). Geiger (1958) notes that Dewey's conception of growth "was introduced as illustrative of the fusion of ends and means.... Growth in education, as in life itself, cannot be a means to any ultimate end except more growth" (p. 199). For Dewey, the act of growing *is* growth, and stands as an absolutely essential element of the genuine educational process.

The Weight and Significance of the Present

Dewey's understanding of growth as an educational goal, ironically, does not necessarily place primary emphasis on future development. Rather, his particular formulation recognizes that growing is both process *and* product; his handle on the concept inextricably links the possibility of future unfolding with the present reality of an open, curious mind willing to extend itself. Thus, Dewey's belief in the continuity of past, present, and future completes itself, and situates its most critical element in the here and now. That is, his educational philosophy privileges the present moment over an unsure and opaque future; rather than constantly looking ahead, his view of learning values the immaturity and potentiality of children who live very much in the moment.

In *The Child and The Curriculum*, Dewey (1902) takes up the question of the disparate ways in which children and adults typically view the world and, particularly, the myriad ways in which they assimilate new information. He suggests that adults tend to approach their world in a removed and distant fashion, abstracting the bits and pieces of knowledge into disconnected, unnatural categories. In fact, this process becomes so pervasive in the adult mind that it "cannot realize the amount of separating and reformulating which the facts of direct experience have to undergo before they can appear as a 'study,' or branch of learning" (p. 341). Dewey contrasts the adult's approach to learning with that of the child, whose view and experiencing of the world remains much more on the surface, much more immediate: "The child lives in a somewhat narrow world of personal contacts. Things hardly come within his experience unless they touch, intimately and obviously, his own well-being, or that of his family and friends. His world is a world of persons with their personal interests, rather than a realm of facts and laws"

(p. 340). This thesis emerges as a critical point in Dewey's thinking about schools, then, because it suggests something about the absolute, undeniable power of the present moment and place in the lives and learning of children. As Brumbaugh and Lawrence (1963) warn, a direct correlation exists between a greater level of abstraction as it relates the material under study and a greater level of boredom on the part of the students. Educators, then, must attend to the immediate world of the students, or run the risk of disconnecting them from the source and direction of their capacity to make meaning.

For Dewey, the antithesis of an education centered on the present is the education predicated upon some notion of preparation for the future. Time and time again, he returns to this motif of preparation as a dubious premise on which to base an education; book after book and essay after essay contain references to the trouble one buys into when planning an educational experience with both eyes focused on the years ahead, consequently ignoring the present moment. Contrasting his idea of education as a continuous process of growth with the reality of school as a mere readying for the years ahead, Dewey (1916) notes that simply shaping and molding children for the responsibilities and privileges of adult life results in the unfortunate act of placing the students on some sort of "waiting list" which does not recognize them as full members of society (p. 54). Furthermore, when educators disregard the possibilities of the present in favor of preparation for the future, children lose a certain degree of natural motivation for learning; as a result, the teachers must rely upon such motives as pleasure and pain in order to stimulate the learning process (p. 55). In addition to fronting the process of education with reward and punishment, Dewey (1910) claims that the eventual result of such an approach also has even greater potential liabilities:

> Such enrichment of the present for its own sake is the just heritage of childhood and the best insurer of future growth. The child forced into premature concern with economic remote results may develop a surprising sharpening of wits in a particular direction, but this precocious specialization is always paid for by later apathy and dullness. (p. 219)

Fearing the possibilities of forcing children to learn while banking of some promissory note assuring future returns, Dewey recommends an education which meets students when and where they live, in the moment at hand.

As much as Dewey points to the strengths inherent in children's tendency to live in the present, he also points out the weakness in anyone's capacity to accurately predict the very future which serves as the basis for the educational plan for so many students. "To get ready for something one knows not what nor why," Dewey (1916) submits, "is to throw away the leverage that exists, and to seek for motive power in a vague chance" (p. 55). Nearly two decades before writing those words, Dewey (1897) describes a similar concern with education as preparation, a recurring concern based on his lack of confidence in accurately predicting just what type of future will actually come to pass: "With the advent of democracy and modern industrial conditions, it is impossible to foretell definitely just what civilization will be twenty years from now. Hence it is impossible to prepare the child for any precise set of conditions" (p. 429). The only preparation possible, as Dewey sees it, is the preparation which affords the students every chance to grow autonomously, to give them command of themselves and their capacities to learn.

Fortunately, Dewey's conception of the child allows for one to actually view the immature student as one possessing innate powers which can be tapped into by the skilled teacher. "Children proverbially live in the present;" Dewey (1916) tells us, "that is not only a fact not to be evaded, but it is an excellence" (p. 55). The adult learner set firmly in his ways and confident in his understanding of the world presents little in the way of possible growth, as Dewey assesses the situation. The child, however, who approaches each experience and each problem with both eyes and mind wide open possesses the natural advantage to learn and to grow:

> Our tendency to take immaturity as mere lack, and growth as something which fills up the gap between immature and the mature is due to regarding childhood *comparatively*, instead of intrinsically.... Taken absolutely, instead of comparatively, immaturity designates a positive force or ability, -- the power to *grow*. (p. 42)

Thus, Dewey's view holds that the child possesses an inherent worth unrelated to what he or she may eventually become, and it follows then that any curriculum which honors the present moment in which the student lives possesses a concomitant intrinsic value, as well.

For any educator looking for direction, Dewey's admonitions regarding the power of the present suggest a focus on the students as they live and learn in the here and now. An approach which begins with a pre-planned curriculum, with an eye toward some discrete body of knowledge separated and abstracted from the lives of the students, hides a flaw which dooms the process to failure. Dewey (1938) no doubt believes in the *relative* importance of preparation, as evidenced by his holding growth up as an

educational ideal; he simply views the notion of education merely as preparation in a light unlike many others:

> When preparation is made the controlling end, then the potentialities of the present are sacrificed to a suppositious future. When this happens, the actual preparation for the future is missed or distorted. . . . We always live at the time we live and not at some other time, and only by extracting at each present time the full meaning of each present experience are we prepared for doing the same thing in the future. This is the only preparation which in the long run amounts to anything. (p. 49)

In this way, Dewey completes the circle which, in his educational philosophy, links the present with our pasts and our futures; in these connections and correlations, he sees the continuity of our experiences, our education, and our lives.

The Role of Subject Matter

In light of his focus on the present moment in the process of learning, Dewey naturally acknowledges his responsibility in responding to questions about what one should, then, actually *do* with the time they have in school. The inescapable curriculum question demands to be answered: In order to be a genuinely educated person, what must the student learn? With what shall the teacher fill up all these "present moments" in the classroom? When Dewey lived and taught, as today, educators placed a heavy premium on specific bodies of knowledge to be transferred from the teacher to the student. The process offered a very linear, very prescriptive model; and as one might reasonably expect, Dewey rejects such an approach. Writing in *Democracy and Education*, Dewey (1916) critiques the educational philosophy which holds that "The 'furniture' of the mind

is the mind. Mind is wholly a matter of 'contents'" (p. 70). While he certainly does not completely eschew the merits of "possessing" a certain body of knowledge, Dewey places the role of subject matter in a larger context within the educational process, and emphasizes the role of what one does with information over and above the amount of knowledge one manages to "warehouse" in the mind.

Very often Dewey assumes a critical stance regarding the basic tenets of what he termed *traditional* education; while the "Old School" educational practices presented a very broad and general mark for his critiques, the customary treatment of subject matter as supreme offered a much more specific target. While discussing the traditional view of learning, Dewey (1938) maintains that "Learning here means acquisition of what is already incorporated in books and in the heads of the elders" (p. 19). He goes on to charge that such acquisition results in learning that is "essentially static" and in teaching that which is seen as "a finished product." The great problem for Dewey rests in the fact that such an approach divests the students of any agency in their own learning; the power resides solely in the traditional authority figures in the school – the teachers and the texts. "Doubtless the undue prominence in education of the ideal of amassing information," writes Dewey (1910), "has its source in the prominence of the learning of other persons" (p. 197). Too great a focus on the accumulation of information relegates the students to a liminal status, standing mute and passive on the sidelines of their own education.

This "Old School" approach to and reverence for subject matter presented a real problem for Dewey, inasmuch as it drew attention from the active role he saw as necessary for any student. Archambault (1964) characterizes Dewey's conception of traditional education as being composed of subjects "derived from the past, and

consisting of a logically organized series of facts, ideas, propositions and theories, usually arranged in an order of increasing degrees of complexity" (p. xxv). Dewey finds himself in the position of needing to honor the idea of knowing things without making the mere acquisition of facts the end of education; to cope with such a conundrum, he characteristically broadens his own understanding of what the concept of *subject matter* entailed. Archambault (1964) continues by describing Dewey's expanded notion of what comprises subject matter: "What emerges from the Dewey analysis is a dynamic conception of subject matter, or the content of instruction, as consisting not only in the sentences, ideas and propositions presented, but the *way* in which they are presented by the teacher, and the *way* in which they are treated by the pupil" (p. xxvi). In this way, Dewey enlarges the possibilities inherent in the role subject matter plays in the educational process. He effectively makes possible the reconciliation of the child and the curriculum, two ideas quite often viewed as completely separated from one another.

In creating this space for acknowledging the role of the teacher and the responsibilities of the students, Dewey necessarily reduces the emphasis placed on the simple acquisition of knowledge and on the command of one's discipline. The aim of an education must move beyond just mastering a particular body of knowledge. Dewey (1910) counters the common assumption that one's studying ever has an end by noting that such an approach tends to "foster superficial, at the expense of significant, thought" (p. 37). Rather than treat the accumulation of knowledge as an end, he subscribes to a conception which places subject matter in a supportive role, with the larger goal being the cultivation of rigorous habits of the mind. Dewey (1910) continues by contending that "there is all the difference in the world whether the acquisition of information is treated

as an end in itself, or is made an integral portion of the training of thought" (p. 52). Dewey's posture toward subject matter in no way deprives it of significance; instead, he merely shifts it from the end, *as* an end, in the overall educational process, and repositions it someplace else along the continuum.

Dewey most directly addresses the relative position of subject matter along the educational continuum in *The Child and the Curriculum*. Arguing that teachers must "abandon the notion of subject-matter as something fixed and ready-made in itself, outside the child's experience," Dewey (1902) begins his thesis which maintains that the student and the curriculum exist as part and parcel of the same continuum. He continues by comparing the two points which define a straight line to his contention that the present standpoint of the student and the "facts and truths of studies" combine to define instruction (p. 344). In this way Dewey reconciles the commonly accepted fissure which served to separate the student and the study and which generally abstracted what was to be learned from the learner. However, in conceptually resolving the split between child and curriculum, he generated a substantive problem for teachers. Dewey (1902) maintains that the great dilemma for the educator comes in creating experiences which will assist the student in recognizing the very real link between themselves and the subject matter: "Hence, what concerns him, as teacher, is the ways in which that subject may become a part of experience; what there is in the child's present that is usable with reference to it; how such elements are to be used.... He is concerned, not with subject-matter as such, but with the subject-matter as a related factor in a total and growing experience" (p. 352). While Dewey believes that the child and curriculum naturally co-exist along the same educational continuum, he also contends that the teacher holds the

ultimate responsibility for making that connection explicit to the students involved in the educational process.

When teachers refuse or fail to make efforts toward establishing the link between the students' experiences and the "facts and truths of studies," several pitfalls inevitably arise. Lazy intellectual skills and poor habits of the mind result, according to Dewey (1931), when teachers present subject matter as settled, dead material studied solely for the purpose of acquisition. "Does not the presentation in doses and chunks of a ready-made subject-matter," he asks, "inevitably conduce to passivity?" (p. 424). The student's mind conditioned to see information as disconnected and inert finds very little reason or occasion to experience learning as an active process, as an endeavor in which he or she plays an integral role. Dewey (1938) addresses the pedagogical misstep of teaching subject matter in isolation by suggesting that such information ends up sealed in a "water-tight compartment" and can only be utilized if the same conditions under which it was learned are recreated – an unlikely occurrence, at best (p. 48). And finally, he further broadens the issue of subject matter by pointing out the trouble inherent in separating subjects one from another. Dewey (1931) suggests that "A pupil can say that he has 'had' a subject, because the subject has been treated as if it were complete in itself, beginning and terminating within the limits fixed in advance" (p. 425). Instead, Dewey subscribes to a reorganization of subject matter which uses it for the purpose of leading the student out into further studies and which might be best used to solve problems real and relevant to the life experience of the students.

Contrary to the ideals imbedded in the general position of the Humanists, Dewey does not subscribe to the notion that certain bits and pieces of knowledge were somehow

essential for the educated mind. In fact, he claims that no subject exists which, outside of its relation to the growth of the learner, has some inherent educational value. Dewey (1938) states, "There is no such thing as educational value in the abstract. The notion that . . . acquaintance with certain facts and truths possess educational value in and of themselves is the reason why traditional education reduced the material of education so largely to a diet of predigested material" (p. 46). Having said that, however, he stops well short of dismissing an educator's role in directing curricular matters, attending seriously to the question of what subject matter should be taught. In fact, while claiming that no subject is inherently educational, Dewey (1910) also claims that any subject is "intellectual" inasmuch as it succeeds in effecting growth in the individual (p. 46). He continues by submitting that subject matter must be approached by the teacher as that which offers the potential for reflective inquiry, not as "intellectual pabulum to be accepted and swallowed just as supplied" (p. 198). Moving, then, through the educational process from his ideals on growth to those of reflection, Dewey arrives at the crux of the matter: the relation of subject matter to thought. Axtelle and Burnett (1970) point out that even though critics often arrive at the conclusion that Dewey relegated subject matter to a "secondary or tertiary role, he in fact does not" (p. 266). Rather, subject matter emerges as a fundamental and essential *tool* to be used during the process of solving problems, of arriving at new places of thought. Concluding this treatment of the proper place and use of subject matter, Dewey (1910) emphasizes that the task of any teacher rests not in mastering a body of knowledge, but in "adjusting a subject-matter to the nurture of thought" (p. 204). In this way, Dewey comes to view subject matter not as an end unto itself, but rather as a means unto a number of greater aims: as a tool for

solving problems, as a springboard for reflection, as a door to further studies, and as a catalyst for thought.

Dewey's educational philosophy refuses the possibility of creating the comprehensive list of essential bits and pieces of knowledge; the thought of creating a curriculum outside of the specific experiences and lives of the students runs counter to his beliefs concerning the place of subject matter. As Brumbaugh and Lawrence (1963) state, Dewey won't allow for the prospect of an "eternally good curriculum" (p. 145). Dewey refuses to look over his shoulder for some stable body of knowledge upon which to base a student's education; likewise, he will not peer into the future hoping to discern the road to travel in hopes of preparing students for a specific path ahead. Rather, he looks to utilize the present moment in hopes of assuring future growth. Supporting his concept of coincident learning, Dewey (1938) offers an alternative to those who would judge a successful education based primarily on the student's capacity to retain and recall, under contrived circumstances, an accepted body of facts: "Collateral learning in the way of formation of enduring attitudes, of likes and dislikes, may be and often is much more important than the spelling lesson or lesson in geography or history that is learned. For these attitudes are fundamentally what count in the future." He concludes by stating, "The most important attitude that can be formed is that of desire to go on learning" (p. 48). Rather than focus on the subject matter itself, Dewey hopes to put the facts of study to a practical, pragmatic use; he hopes to use the knowledge as a framework upon which to continue the process of building and developing one's intellectual habits.

So it is that subject matter, the nuts and bolts of formal schooling which many people view as the end and aim, finds itself repositioned along the educational

continuum. Dewey redefines its importance and its role, while deposing the accumulation of knowledge as the chief academic goal in favor of the ideal of continued growth. Commenting on imagination's superiority over knowledge, Einstein (1936) voices his belief that "Knowledge is dead; the school, however, serves the living" (p. 30). In a similar vein, Dewey (1938) wonders at what cost educators continue to emphasize the acquisition of facts and figures, and what price is to be paid in exchange for the blind focus placed upon the accumulation of class after class, subject after subject, which eventually culminates in a graduation which ostensibly marks the end of the process:

> What avail is it to win prescribed amounts of information about geography and history, to win ability to read and write, if in the process the individual loses his own soul: loses his appreciation of things worth while, of the values to which these things are relative; if he loses desire to apply what he has learned and, above all, loses the ability to extract meaning from his future experiences as they occur? (p. 49)

For Dewey, the responsibility of avoiding such a pitfall rests with the teacher, who must create a classroom environment which utilizes the past in a way which honors the present lives of the students, all with an eye toward the possibilities and promises which depend upon future growth. Education, then, should have no end outside of itself.

Problems and Dissonance in the Learning Process

Despite the repeated warnings from Dewey, many students have undoubtedly experienced school as little more than a closed process, as an information exchange which begins and ends with the teacher. In such cases, the subject matter serves as the ultimate goal, and the educative process devolves into a concern for the *acquisition* of as

much factual knowledge as possible, without regard or concern for productive *utilization*. Dewey's stance, which repositions the subject matter and removes it from such a position of absolute authority, leaves a void in the daily life of many classrooms. Without the prescribed stock and store of information to cover, educators must necessarily look someplace else for the impetus which drives their classroom activity. For Dewey, the catalyst for genuine learning and for critical thought rests with the idea of allowing a reasonable degree of conflict to enter the classroom. He suggests that the proper type and degree of cognitive dissonance moves students to wrestle with issues, to seek solutions, and to pursue resolution. Dewey refuses to see difficulties as roadblocks to forward progress, but rather as essential benchmarks one must pass in order to grow. In regard to the daily emphasis in the ideal classroom, he supports the utilization of a problem's kinetic energy and immediacy in lieu of the absolute domination of idle, lifeless subject matter.

A genuine problem to solve or a difficulty to overcome presents Dewey with a learning opportunity solidly grounded in the present moment, an attribute which holds great currency for him. Dewey (1916) notes that "The present, in short, generates the problems which lead us to search the past for suggestion" (p. 76). Thus, problems enable the astute learner a chance to connect his or her past and future with the needs of today. In terms of curriculum planning, then, the placement of problems at the heart of the learning process eliminates the possibility of delivering pre-planned or canned programs to students. As Archambault (1964) describes Dewey's analysis, "To try to specify, in exact detail, the precise knowledge that a student is to achieve, is to consider ends as remote, distinct, and separate from practical contingencies and the dynamic purposes of

pupils" (p. xxiii). Because he has faith in the fact that problems and stumbling points arise naturally from one's interaction with the environment, Dewey's educational philosophy utilizes the power inherent in those moments in order to initiate occasions to learn and grow.

Problems do not *necessarily* occur, of course, when one grapples with distant and removed issues or when one traverses only through familiar territory. Dewey (1938) recognizes a state of affairs in which few problems connect in genuine ways with the students expected to solve them and submits his thesis of the absolute necessity in affording students the chance to encounter new and potentially troubling areas of study which pertain to their own experiences, backgrounds, and interests:

> Unless a given experience leads out into a field previously unfamiliar no problems arise, while problems are the stimulus to thinking. That the conditions found in present experience should be used as sources of problems is a characteristic which differentiates education based upon experience from traditional education. For in the latter, problems were set from outside. Nonetheless, growth depends upon the presence of difficulty to be overcome by the exercise of intelligence. (p. 79)

This conception does not necessarily allow that any problem will lead to growth or that all difficulties are equally educative. In fact, Dewey (1938) continues to note that the educator must be certain that all problems meet certain criteria in order to be effective. As mentioned, the problems must grow out of the present conditions of the moment at hand. In addition, the students must have the skills and capacity to deal effectively with the issues which arise. And finally, the dilemmas must create in the students an "active quest" for new information and the creation of novel ideas (p. 79). While students must

wrestle with the unknown, the educators must work to insure that conditions and situations exist which prompt such encounters with the uncomfortable and the unfamiliar.

Problems, then, rest at the very heart of Dewey's pedagogy. Baker (1966) claims that "problem solving must be the medium for learning" in Dewey's conception of formal schooling. No other option exists (p. 133). Rather than emphasize facts and figures which arise outside of the interest and experience of the learners, he places dilemmas which arise out of their own discoveries and development at the forefront of the learning process. Problems prompt active responses in those who attempt to resolve them and place the learners in a situation in which information and knowledge must be put to actual use, not simply absorbed. The mere *possession* of someone else's knowledge, then, distinguishes itself from the profitable *utilization* of one's own wisdom. Dewey subscribes to the notion that until students take an active role in recognizing and resolving their own problems, their minds will never be freed (Westbrook, pg. 103). Ironically, only by burdening the students with difficulties can the limits of their potential be completely realized.

The Necessity of Reflective Thought

To claim that Dewey's pedagogy begins and ends with encountering problems would be a gross simplification, as he supports one more move beyond the mere wrestling with dilemmas. His approach to learning demands that the student not only face difficulty, but also that he or she take time to think about the process, to reflect on the events which result in learning. Dewey (1910) recognizes the challenge and adversity inherent in mentally struggling with the complications which arise in the course of

solving problems. However, he also defends this attendant cognitive dissonance which must be a part of a genuinely educative process:

> Reflective thinking is always more or less troublesome because it involves overcoming the inertia that inclines one to accept suggestions at their face value; it involves willingness to endure a condition of mental unrest and disturbance. Reflective thinking, in short, means judgment suspended during further inquiry; and suspense is likely to be somewhat painful. (p. 13)

This way of viewing reflective thought, then, makes it a part of the very process of solving problems and overcoming adversity. Brumbaugh and Lawrence (1963) claim Dewey approaches reflective thinking as a means unto the end of bringing coherency and harmony to an otherwise chaotic and obscure situation (p. 141). Reflection, thus, emerges as an essential element of Dewey's pedagogy and as part and parcel of the authentic learning experience.

Dewey's most direct statement concerning the very nature of reflective thought might be found in *How We Think*, a book written specifically to explore the topic. Dewey (1910) claims that "Active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of grounds that support it, and the further conclusions to which it tends, constitutes reflective thought" (p. 6). He continues to describe two "subprocesses" which help explain the concept further. Every reflective operation is characterized by a state of confusion or doubt and involves an active investigation aimed at bringing more facts to light which should serve to either "corroborate or to nullify" a held belief (p. 9). For the educator, Dewey (1938) also provides another essential component of the reflective process: time. He recommends that all students should enjoy

brief periods of time reserved for quiet reflection as long as that time is preceded by periods of overt and purposeful activity (p. 63). In providing students with the time and space necessary to reflect upon their actions, Dewey believes that the learning process *completes* itself only insofar as it sets the stage for further growth and development.

In touting the necessity of reflective thought, Dewey makes explicit the recursive nature of his conception of the learning process. And in this way, his approach to education serves as a guard against the possibility of a routine, inert mental life. In *The Child and the Curriculum*, Dewey (1902) sternly warns of the possibility, if not the likelihood, that students can acclimate themselves easily to "routine or mechanical procedure" if conditions exist which preclude any independent activity or thought (p. 355). Reflective thought provides the only means of avoidance available to students who wish to discover their own dilemmas, solve their own problems, and actively consider their own learning. Dewey (1910) makes his case explicit when he states that "Thought affords the sole method of escape from purely impulsive or purely routine action" (p. 14). In order for students to avoid the pitfalls of acting only according to their own capricious whims or those of others, then, they must act on their inclinations to think reflectively on their own learning processes.

Unfortunately, the very same conditions and circumstances imposed upon so many students in school are those which, according to Dewey, kill the very impetus toward reflective thinking. So much of formal schooling focuses upon the mere acquisition of information, and Dewey (1910) counters such an approach by observing that "Fact, whether narrow or extensive, and conclusions, whether many or few, do not constitute, even when combined, reflective thought" (p. 39). Rather, the organization of

such disconnected bits of information into coherent thoughts arranged in reference to one another affords the student the chance to learn and grow. Furthermore, the tendency of formal schooling to become mechanical and automatic – often for the purpose of increased efficiency – strikes at the very ability to become a reflective thinker. Dewey (1910) continues his argument by illustrating the danger inherent in the "drill and kill" approach to learning experienced by so many students:

> Sheer imitation, dictation of steps to be taken, mechanical drill, may give results most quickly and yet strengthen traits likely to be fatal to reflective power. The pupil is enjoined to do this and that specific thing, with no knowledge of any reason except that by doing so he gets his result most speedily; his mistakes are pointed out and corrected for him; he is kept at pure repetition of certain acts till they become automatic. (p. 51)

Though the result may appear to be a smoothly operating classroom, such an approach to teaching and learning only results in students incapable of or unwilling to think for themselves. The students lose the power of reflective thinking, opting instead to allow the authority figure in their educational lives to assume the responsibility of thinking for them. Passivity replaces activity in such a situation, and the entire process loses is educative potential by robbing the students of the opportunity, time, and encouragement to think reflectively and, thus, for themselves.

Dewey's overall conception of the very aims and purposes of education is inextricably tied into this notion of reflective thinking. The former cannot be achieved without the utilization of the latter. Making a categorical connection between the two, Archambault (1964) stresses that the aim of education in Dewey's pedagogy is the

"development of reflective, creative, responsible thought" (p. xviii). In his own words, Dewey (1916) concludes that the educational process is one of "continual reorganizing, reconstructing, transforming" (p. 50). In other words, the educational process emerges as one recursive in nature, one that never actually has an end outside itself. And the power which drives this never-ending cycle of learning and growth resides in one's capacity for and inclination toward reflective thought.

Experience and Education

All of the educational ideals which Dewey holds forth as essential rest upon his theory of experience, upon his belief that the authentic educative process must emerge from, intersect with, and lead back into genuine life experiences. His ideas about growth, community, problem solving, and reflective thinking all crisscross within the conviction that the happenings of life hold out the most effective power which enables individuals to learn. In 1938, Dewey published a tiny volume entitled *Experience & Education* in hopes of providing a concise, compact presentation of a pedagogy built upon a framework of experience. The title itself suggests the explicit linkage between the processes of living and learning which Dewey sees as imperative. Dewey (1938) opens the final chapter of the book, the final word on his theory of experience, by underscoring an assumption which rests at the heart of his argument: "In what I have said I have taken for granted the soundness of the principle that education in order to accomplish its ends both for the individual learner and for society must be based upon experience – which is always the actual life-experience of some individual" (p. 89). In this way, Dewey situates the individual at the center of a very specific educational process, one which cannot be devised and executed prior to the introduction of that student. That is to say, the

conventional trappings of formal education – subject matter, disciplines, lesson plans, goals, objectives – should properly revolve around the life experiences of the student, in contrast with a more typical arrangement in which the students revolve around them.

Dewey's belief in the primacy of experience in the learning process should not prompt one, however, to assume that any experience becomes valuable or educative in his scheme. To hold that all genuine education comes via experiences, Dewey (1938) warns, is not to then grant that all experiences are "genuinely or equally" valuable. He continues to note that experience and education should not, and cannot, be "directly equated with one another" (p. 25). He takes up the same argument in *Progressive Education and the Science of Education* (1928) when he submits that simply adopting a view in which mere activity of any sort stands as pedagogy results in something other than education. Dewey claims that "Bare doing, no matter how active, is not enough. An activity or project must, of course, be within the range of the experience of pupils and connected with their needs – which is very far from being identical with any likes or desires which they can consciously express" (p. 177). Anticipating a misreading which would take this claim as support for simply engaging in thoughtless activity or giving in to every whim and wish of the students, Dewey presents a serious challenge to the classroom teacher: He demands that the educator find ways to link the students' pasts and presents with their futures, to connect the student and the curriculum through experience.

The proper handling of experience as a framework upon which to build an education rests in Dewey's idea of continuity. For a learning experience to be truly beneficial, it must link up with past experiences and then lead to others. Dewey (1938) sets forth the challenge in education by noting that every experience "lives on" in

consequent experiences, and that the educator must select the activities for the present which "live fruitfully and creatively in subsequent experiences" (p. 27-28). Continuing on, Dewey defines continuity of experience by claiming that "every experience both takes up something from those which have gone before and modifies in some way the quality of those which come after" (p. 35). The danger in formal schooling arises when the content, subject matter, goals, and objectives become abstracted and far removed from the life experiences of the learners. Olafson (1977) contends that Dewey's formulation of his theory of experience refuses the possibility that knowledge and action should ever be separated by some false intellectual dichotomy (p. 179). Only when knowledge and experience link up does Dewey allow for the possibility of authentic learning.

Dewey holds the belief that all branches of learning, all the disparate bits and pieces of seemingly random information students find themselves faced with from time to time, can trace their origins to some actual problem in the experience of some individual or of some community. Thus, educators must necessarily reestablish this connections with real human experience which has been broken over the course of time. Dewey addresses this task in *The Child and the Curriculum* (1902) through his call to psychologize subject matter, to turn it over and translate it into the "immediate and individual experiencing within which it has its origin and significance" (p. 351). The tendency in most formal schooling situations, according to Dewey (1910), is rather to link the subject matter of the classroom to prior school lessons as opposed to connecting it to that which the students have experienced outside of their life at school. Such an approach runs the very serious risk of failure, as he continues by adding "Instruction in subject-matter that does not fit into any problem already stirring in the student's own

experience...is worse than useless for intellectual purposes" (p. 199). The new builds upon the old, and the process of growth continues, ad infinitum. Growth is thus assured, and education demonstrates its perennial nature.

Dewey's hope for a theory of experience put into practice would manifest itself in his tendency to blur the lines which serve to separate the knower and the known, the child and the curriculum. Kliebard (1987) argues that Dewey saw in his theory of experience the means to bridge the gap between two opposed curricular camps, one of which viewed the child as the starting point of educational practices and another which pointed toward the supremacy of subject matter:

> What Dewey was constructing, essentially, was a continuum of experience, and it was the function of the course of study to move along that line from one defining point, the immediate, chaotic, but integral experience of the child, to the other defining point, the logically organized, abstract, and classified experience of the mature adult. (p. 84)

Dewey centered his pedagogy around the idea of gaining control of one's world through the development of knowledge and the use of intelligence by attending to the very happenings which constitute the life experiences of the students.

For Dewey, the theory of experience provides an umbrella under which so many of his other concerns might be explored. His conception of *democracy* requires that students participate in the active pursuit of common goals with others. His belief in the necessity of *community* demands that students learn in a social situation. His attitude toward *growth* sees the students as moving from one intellectual station to the other, constantly developing the skills and means to keep moving forward. His focus on the

present encourages students and teachers to value the moment at hand without undue stress on the past or too much concern with preparation for the future. His stance on *subject matter* calls for students and teachers to actively connect the content of the classroom with the reality of their lives. His focus on *problem solving* challenges students to seek and to solve the difficulties which naturally arise in the course of living. And his attention to the powers of *reflective thought* entreats students to take the time necessary to connect their past, their present, and their future into some coherent whole. In short, Dewey charges students and teachers alike with the formidable task of taking their lives in school and their lives outside of school (that is to say, the sum total of their *experiences*), blending one into the other, and effectively blurring the line between living and learning.

Teachers, Schools, and Education

In order to appreciate all that Dewey's work might offer in terms of an examination of teacher education, it becomes necessary to move beyond the works he wrote specifically addressing the field of professional education. Because Dewey's work was predicated upon a number of educational principles with broad application across all types and levels of education, one must attend to his more general ideas about learning and learners, those works in which Dewey did not directly address concerns such as the education of teachers. Dewey weaves within much of his work a number of general positions relative to the role of teachers, the responsibilities of schools, and the place of education in a democratic society. Dewey never intended to provide readers with a blueprint which, if meticulously carried out, would result in an ideal pedagogical scheme. However, by carefully attending to Dewey's treatment of teachers, schools, and

education, one might ascertain a better, more comprehensive grasp on the broad theory present in all of Dewey's educational thought and which can then be applied to the specific, contemporary concern of teacher education.

Dewey never intended to author a comprehensive educational system which could be replicated in school districts across the nation; he never entertained hopes of hitting upon an eternally valid curriculum. Archambault (1964) notes, however, that Dewey fought against a general state of vagueness which he thought plagued the educational milieu of his day (p. xxiii). Although critics often make a similar charge against Dewey's own work, Archambault goes on to counter such claims by noting that the ideal of *growth* as an educational goal stands as a necessarily open-ended, flexible aim. He views Dewey's pedagogy as one which avoids specific curricular recommendations because the exact aims of education "cannot be legislated," as they depend upon myriad variables specific to a particular time and a unique place (p. xxiii). The aims must not be settled upon in advance of actually meeting the students and teachers, lest they run the risk of being removed and abstract; rather they must be articulated only in the context of an actual classroom experience.

Dewey gives little credence to the practice, then, of designing an educational scheme which exists independently of the students who will presumably experience it in the classroom. In *Democracy and Education* (1916), he addresses this issue by declaring that education, as a construct, suggests no aims in and of itself, claiming that "Only persons, parents, and teachers, etc., have aims, not an abstract idea like education. And consequently their purposes are indefinitely varied, differing with different children, changing as children grow and with the growth of experience on the part of the one who

teaches" (p. 107). In this way, even Dewey keeps his treatment of education as a construct necessarily general in its basic tenor. As Peters (1977) notes, Dewey confines himself to generalities because he recognizes that "details of implementation must vary with individuals" (p. 108). For all of his discussion centering upon broad educational concepts, Dewey occasionally turns his attention to the nuts and bolts of formal schooling: the needed qualities in teachers, the culture of schools, and the ideal of education. Even so, he refrains from writing *prescriptively*, opting instead to write *descriptively*, to use broad brush strokes in creating a picture of what educators, schools, and learning could be and do.

At times, Dewey speaks of the various roles of teachers in starkly pragmatic terms, touching upon the basic characteristics and qualities required for the job. At other times, he describes the classroom educators in terms which might accurately be described as solemn or venerable. On the pedestrian and practical side, Peters (1977) describes Dewey's view of the teacher's role as that of a "representative and agent" of the interests of the students, as one manages the power structure of the classroom only to serve the greater interests of the learners (p. 109). Axtelle and Burnett (1970) suggest that Dewey also sees the teacher as one who must be an expert in subject matter as well as an authority in the "characteristic needs and capacities of the students" (p. 266). The teacher, as envisioned by Dewey, must possess a complete mastery of the subject matter, must have the requisite skills to manage a classroom of learners while not emerging as the dominant directive force, and must demonstrate a keen insight into the psychology, needs, interests, and capabilities of each student. Archambault (1964) uses terms such as "guide, stimulus, and catalyst" to describe the teacher's role in affording the students an

opportunity to make their own connections and ideas. He continues by cataloguing a number of requirements Dewey placed upon anyone wishing to teach:

> He must have a broad range of general knowledge on which to draw in developing units of instruction for his pupils. He must have a sound grounding in educational theory so that he understands the philosophical, psychological and sociological foundations of education. He must be able to see the reciprocal relation between theory and practice.... (p. xxviii)

This extensive and challenging job description for educators, as seen by Dewey, places incredible demands and responsibilities upon the teacher, not only over the course of an entire career, but also on a daily basis.

Dewey also describes an even larger role for the teacher, one which extends beyond simply being a masterful manager and coordinator of everyday activities in the classroom. He conceives of the teacher as one who stands in a unique position to impact the future direction of the students' lives, as one who stands in a singular relationship to young people and holds the possibility of helping them change their world. Archambault (1964) characterizes Dewey's stance by saying that the teacher's role is to be "the chief agent for the liberation of the student" (p. xxviii). Such emancipatory language suggests, in this instance, Dewey's association with the Progressives who viewed education as means of social melioration, as the key for unlocking progress for the individual student and the community at large. Dewey lays the foundation for such a view of teachers very early in his career; he concludes *My Pedagogic Creed* (1897) by stating "every teacher should realize the dignity of his calling; that he is a social servant set apart for the maintenance of proper social order and the securing of the right social growth" (p. 439).

Thus, Dewey's conception of a pedagogue's role extends well beyond any basic, custodial sense, and certainly past the notion of some distributor of arcane and isolated knowledge. Rather, he sees the teacher as one who shoulders a critical degree of responsibility for addressing the problematic twin aims of maintaining a proper social order while simultaneously encouraging the liberation and growth of the individual students.

While the teacher as an individual carries much of the burden for creating opportunities for the growth and progress of students, the school as an institution must assume the assignment of ensuring those same goals for the society at large. Axtelle and Burnett (1970) describe Dewey's vision of American schools as the "main engines" which drive the society forward in terms of democracy and development. More than any other institution in the country, the schools wield the power to effect a "refinement and elevation" of the individual to achieve as much as possible by encouraging the following: intellectual power, moral responsibility, aesthetic expression, artistic sensitivity, proficiency in everyday affairs, and a ruling integrity of character (p. 264-265). As he did with teachers, Dewey catalogues an extensive and challenging list of aims which should ideally be met by the schools.

Dewey's plan to achieve these expansive aims revolves around his conception of school as a miniature society in which the students live and learn in authentic ways, as opposed to a more traditional approach which removes the information and activities of formal schooling from the context of students' experiences. In Article II of *My Pedagogic Creed* (1897), Dewey explicates his conceptual framework of what he believes schools should be and achieve. Arguing that existing life can become too complex or confusing in its multiplicity of activities and expectations, Dewey contends that a school

must "simplify existing social life; should reduce it, as it were, to an embryonic form" (p. 430). He does not maintain that teachers should initiate abstracted, contrived learning situations; rather, he calls for a simplification of life which will protect young learners from becoming either overwhelmed or over-stimulated. Dewey continues by expressing his belief that much of formal education fails because it neglects the "fundamental principle of the school as a form of community life" (p. 431). Thus, schools must exist and work as both a simplification and an extension of the students' lives, or else run the risk of becoming irrelevant and miseducative. Dewey (1916) sums up his overall goal of formal schooling in this way: "The inclination to learn from life itself and to make the conditions of life such that all will learn in the process of living is the finest product of schooling" (p. 51). The school as an institution, then, will only achieve such an aim if and when the myriad lines which serve to separate the life of the school from the life of the community are successfully eliminated. Once such lines are gone, Dewey sees a path open to a true and useful education.

Dewey approaches the concept of a true and useful education in characteristically general terms, avoiding highly prescriptive statements which might be taken as dogma rather than used for guidance. In explaining his ideas concerning the means and ends of mental training in *How We Think* (1910), Dewey identifies the aim of education as the development of a "disciplined mind" (p. 63). In an early chapter focused on the need for training thought, Dewey anticipates his call for a disciplined mind by identifying various aspects of what he views as the business of education:

> . . . it is its business to cultivate deep-seated and effective habits of discriminating tested beliefs from mere assertions, guesses, and opinions; to develop a lively,

> sincere, and open-minded preference for conclusions that are properly grounded, and to ingrain into the individual's working habits methods of inquiry and reasoning appropriate to the various problems that present themselves. (p. 27-28)

Such goals aim at cultivating autonomous and independent thinkers, capable of avoiding the hazard of falling prey to ideological whims and fads. Though Dewey acknowledges the fact that some might regard the term *disciplined mind* in a negative light, he goes on to clarify further by noting his belief that a disciplined mind is "identified with freedom in its true sense" and that such a thinker lives and learns as one capable of independent thinking and "emancipated from the leading strings of others" (p. 64). In this way, Dewey arrives at a position which holds the business of education, broadly conceived, to be the development of disciplined thinkers, free to grow and advance in their own learning.

In addition to Dewey's description of educational aims which focus on dynamic facets such as growth and freedom, he also offers a more scientific definition. While discussing various historical and contemporary conceptions of "proper" goals for the education process, Dewey (1916) settles upon a technical definition of education: "It is that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" (p. 76). Within this concise statement, Dewey manages to tacitly invoke a number of the motifs which run consistently through his theories of learning and teaching; this technical definition touches on such ideals as experience, autonomy, and constructed knowledge. Perhaps more than any other characteristic, however, Dewey concerns himself and this statement with the aim of growth, of the capacity for learners to transform themselves as

individuals, to use what they understand as a springboard to further and deeper understandings, and ultimately to direct the course of their own education, of their own *experiencing* of the world.

While Dewey approaches the aims of education in terms broad and fluid enough to allow for flexibility and to avoid dogmatism, he flatly refuses to state the ultimate end of the educational process. His organic conception of the world in general, and of learners specifically, denies him the option of envisioning a point at which education completes itself. Instead, Dewey conceives of the ends of education as constantly moving and changing with the times. Archambault (1964) notes that Dewey holds the position that the ends of education must be stated "in terms of processes rather than static states – the promotion of reflective behavior, the promotion of growth and health. Education, then, must be its own end" (p. xxi). Dewey (1897) describes the proper conception of education by stressing that "the process and the goal of education are one and the same thing" (p. 434). Thus, he chooses not to focus on the static, inert notion of an *education*, and opts instead to highlight the dynamic, changing, active process of *educating*.

Dewey's interest and devotion to education emerge out of his conviction that schools manifest the ideals he holds most dear and that schools maintain the power to effect societal change, to make life better for individuals. In schools he sees the awesome potential for independent thinking, the possibility of actual democratic living, and the capacity to better the human condition. And although Dewey certainly acknowledges the shortcomings and limitations of the educational process, he sees in the day-to-day life of a classroom filled with students an extraordinary confluence of the motives for human activity:

> Here are found sympathy and affection, the going out of emotions to the most appealing and the most rewarding object of love – a little child. Here is found also the flowering of the social and institutional motive, interest in the welfare of society and in its progress and reform by the surest and shortest means. Here, too, is found the intellectual and scientific motive, the interest in knowledge, in scholarship, in truth for its own sake, unhampered and unmixed with any alien ideal. Copartnership of these three motives – of affection, of social growth, and of scientific inquiry – must prove as nearly irresistible as anything human when they are once united. (qtd. in Axtelle and Burnett, 1970, p. 288-89)

Even in this vision of schooling Dewey seeks to reconcile the various facets which compose the world of education, to bring together the various motives which too often operate independently within the context of traditional learning. And so, in the prosaic and mild trappings of a classroom filled with young students and a well-meaning teacher, Dewey sees the power of democratic living which will inevitably change the world.

CHAPTER THREE

TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM

Historical Overview

According to Little (1989), the recent reform movement aimed at improving American public education would likely never have been the important issue it eventually became without a connected series of international events starting in the 1970s (p. 6). However, with an oil embargo, crippling inflation, rising unemployment, growing pressure on entitlement programs, and a shifting economy which began a move away from industry and toward high technology, the demands of a struggling American economy outpaced the capacity and readiness of the educational system to change with it. International comparisons suggested that American students lagged far behind their counterparts in other industrialized nations around the world. And business leaders began to voice concerns that their new employees were woefully unprepared to make a positive and immediate impact in the workplace. People began looking for someone or something to carry the burden of blame for the "sudden" downturn of our country's economic stature, and the educational system fell squarely in the nation's sights. In this way, social, cultural, and economic pressures came to bear on the nation's schools, as countless Americans turned to the educational system, looking for ways out of the confusion and turmoil which gripped the country.

When politicians and business leaders began to take a closer look at the schools, they were often less than impressed with what they saw. In the judgment of many, our nation's schools fell far short of the expectations and demands which had been placed

upon them; the schools were not believed to have the strength to serve as a *deus ex machina* which would eventually rescue the country from its dismal circumstances, and the students were judged not to have the requisite skills to move the nation once again toward prosperity. Looking further into the apparently critical state of American schools, an inextricable link quickly formed in the minds of many between an *educational system* perceived as weak and ineffectual by international standards and a *teaching corps* seen as incapable and unprepared.

In this way, then, the race to reform our schools, our students, and our teachers began in earnest, once again. If America's under-performing schools needed improvement, the argument held that those responsible for the day-to-day operation of those schools must also need correction. That is to say, teachers shouldered a great deal of the criticism aimed at the nation's educational woes. Little (1989) suggests that the teacher education programs in the United States began to undergo intense and unparalleled criticism and scrutiny in the mid-1980s (p. 5). It seemed as if everyone had an idea aimed at fixing the supposedly deplorable conditions in our schools. Braun (1989) notes that politicians, business leaders, public school teachers, and academics all voiced powerful, often conflicting ideas intended to repair the "damage" inflicted upon the nation's students – and that the resultant variety of proposals and reactions to those proposals seemed "almost staggering" (p. xv). Reform report followed reform report, and it soon became apparent that no easy way out of the educational confusion seemed likely to appear from the academic literature, the political rhetoric, or the schools themselves. However, the arduous and complex wheels of reform nonetheless began to turn in the 1980s and continued unabated into the following decade.

Calls for the reformation of the nation's schools did not, of course, exist as a purely late-20th century phenomenon. Since the earliest days of publicly funded efforts to educate the population, reformers have called for improvements and alterations to the extant system of the day. However, the history of education in the United States demonstrates amply the vast number and array of movements and trends which have periodically come into and then fallen out of favor with the public, with school administrators, and with teachers themselves. Lagemann (1994) notes that the entire history of the profession is "filled with periods of reform and experimentation that were short-lived" (p. 1). With so many competing voices vying for control of the school system's direction, reform movements can take on the character of pedagogical fashion or trend, with relatively few making more than a fleeting impact on the field as a whole or in actual classrooms. Lucas (1997) argues that efforts to significantly alter the status quo of American education typically follow a consistent, if somewhat ineffective, pattern:

> Education reform in America tends to be carried forward in the "evangelical" mode, with hyperbolic fervor and intensity more typically reserved for political campaigns and other less secular concerns. Perhaps the rhetoric has to be overblown "sometimes to the point of fatuity" simply to be heard amid a chorus of voices competing for public attention. But the argument also could be made that its self-assured stridency owes just as much to lack of historical perspective. (p. xiii)

In this instance, Lucas paints a picture of repetitious reform efforts marked by emotional pleas for change followed up with hastily laid plans which may unwittingly have a great

deal in common with past failures and which may hold out little promise of future successes.

Writing nearly a century before Lucas, Dewey (1897, 1902, 1916) also notes the cyclical patterns of educational reform which, even at the turn of the century, had already established themselves as the norm. Dewey warns that calls for educational change generally occur when someone begins to think that the schools have somehow fallen behind the times and, consequently, must change in some fundamental manner. However, once the public has gotten involved, the editorialists have debated the issues, and the desired changes have been implemented, someone else often hearkens to yesteryear, claiming that things are not as good as they used to be. Thus, the cycle continues unabated. Kliebard (1987) notes that Dewey believes educational reforms often fail because teachers play a minimal role in the process, because educational leaders often design curricular changes as independent and isolated from the overall educational scheme, and because school organizational and administrative structures rarely change. Kliebard continues by noting that for Dewey, then, the educational reform cycle consists of calls for change borne out of dissatisfaction followed by a public outcry to rescind the changes, ending eventually with a "return to the status quo" (p. 86). In this way, and with few exceptions, the history of educational reform – and thus the history of the field itself – simply repeats itself and reinvents itself, ad nauseam.

Perhaps the solution to the pervasive, persistent sense of deja vu which dominates the educational landscape rests in developing a greater awareness and appreciation of the field's past. To that end, Lucas (1997) observes that much of the contemporary literature on teacher education seems "curiously uninformed and unencumbered by any awareness

of past precedent." He goes on to claim that this "cheerful historical amnesia" helps explain why so many minor innovations are greeted in the educational community as *new* or *revolutionary* (p. xiii). Likewise, while commenting on the importance of being aware of current trends in mapping out educational reform measures, Borrowman (1965) follows that assertion up by indicating the absolute necessity of recognizing the capacity of the past to inform one's understanding of the current situation: "But the past also participates in our deliberations. It speaks subtly, and some of us are quite unaware of the cues by which it molds our thoughts and shapes our responses. But it molds and shapes nonetheless. We cannot choose whether to be conditioned by it or not; we choose only to be aware or unaware of its influence" (p. 52). Those unaware, knowingly or otherwise, of their own profession's past run the risk of simply reinventing their discipline, attempting futilely to effect those changes which have already been attempted and unwisely ignoring the lessons which await those who attend to their own histories. In the name of reform, then, they ironically traverse the same steps and missteps of their predecessors. Accordingly, this chapter, which will concern itself largely with the literature of four contemporary teacher education reform movements, begins by examining the development and evolution of the many ways in which teachers have historically learned their craft in the United States.

Teacher Education in the United States

Teacher education in the United States boasts a much shorter history than that of public education, in general. Americans have been going to school much longer than its teachers have been learning the art and science of pedagogy in formal, organized settings. In fact, Lucas (1997) claims that people living prior to the late-1800s would have found

any idea even remotely resembling modern teacher education both "unnecessary and unfathomable" (p. 3). He goes on to draw further contrast between days past and current circumstances by noting that very few teachers prior to the 1870s would have completed any more than a basic elementary school education and would likely have had no pedagogical training whatsoever.

In the Colonial era, the teaching corps comprised an exceedingly diverse range of individuals, including those who were barely literate themselves to those who could boast college degrees. Quite often in the earliest days of the United States, young divinity students chose to teach primarily in an effort to make ends meet while completing their own theological studies. "Otherwise," Lucas (1997) writes, "itinerant adventurers, drifters, young men seeking to avoid physical labor, chronic malcontents, and perhaps misfits were claimants to teaching posts" (p. 5). Obviously, standardized requirements did not exist for those hoping or simply needing to make teaching their often temporary vocation. Lucas (1997) continues to note that the "standards" set for those wanting to teach ranged from such arbitrary requirements as evidence of a good life to basic competence in reading and writing to a stated willingness to maintain rigorous discipline in the classroom. The education committee in Springfield, Massachusetts, even requested that prospective teachers be good menders of quill pens (p. 6). Such demands varied from community to community and depended upon the inclinations of those individuals running the local school house. In point of fact, the hiring and certification of teachers remained almost exclusively an issue of purely local concern (that is, local school committees) well into the nineteenth century (p. 8).

Because local committees handled the logistics of certifying and hiring their own teachers, little effort was extended to make the process more standardized or for fashioning a state-wide system for teacher training. Lucas (1997) suggests that conventional wisdom often held that teaching presented little in the way of intellectual challenge or complexity and, thus, didn't warrant any type of special preparation (p. 16). Historian Jurgen Herbst (1989) characterizes the commonly cavalier attitude regarding early-American educators by noting that "Teachers were cheap, easily and quickly replaced when necessary, and not expected to possess extraordinary capabilities or devotion. In the view of the ordinary school committee member, anyone could teach in a pinch..." (p. 21). Even amid such casual dismissal of the art and skill required for superior teaching, some individuals began to call for more formalized and organized training for those wanting to become teachers. As early as 1789 an editorialist for the *Massachusetts Magazine* called for every county in the state to train young men for the life of a school keeper. And in Pennsylvania, private academies began teacher preparation programs in the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries. Lucas (1997) admits that little enthusiasm greeted these efforts neither on the part of the general public nor that of the teachers (p. 16). However, the movement to formalize and organize the preparation of teachers was afoot in the United States.

Throughout most of the 1800s, the so-called teacher institutes provided the lion's share of what teacher preparation existed in the country. Based on ideas originated by Emma Willard and Henry Barnard, teacher institutes typically lasted six weeks, at which point the trainees would presumably be ready to teach. During the course of the institutes, prospective teachers would review all of the subject matter typically expected

in the local schools, study the fundamentals of teacher methodology, and participate in on-site visits. This three-tiered approach to teacher training characterized the teacher institutes of the nineteenth century and provided the pedagogical education for most of the teachers who availed themselves of the opportunity to prepare formally for the classroom.

For many years, the preparation and certification of teachers continued to operate under a highly localized and somewhat arbitrary system. However, the momentum of the common school movement lead by Horace Mann (who, incidentally, founded the first normal school in Massachusetts in 1839) also drove the move to establish normal schools for the preparation of a larger, better prepared teaching force. As the idea of universal education gained support in the United States in the mid-1800s, the concomitant need for more and more qualified teachers grew. As Lucas (1997) states, Mann and other common school supporters hoped that the education of all people would reduce class divisions and the associated tensions, maintain civic harmony, assimilate immigrants, encourage middle-class morality, inculcate the Protestant work ethic in the students, and effect greater economic prosperity for all (p. 11). Obviously, the teachers responsible for the accomplishment of these varied and challenging tasks, in addition to many others, would need special skills and abilities. Moreover, greater numbers of students would naturally result in the need for more teachers. As Borrowman (1965) notes, Mann did not believe that the current system of secondary schools, colleges, and teacher institutes could provide the teaching force which would be required of the growing common school movement (p. 21). In this way, the normal school movement originated and evolved as a companion to the country's burgeoning common school movement.

While the normal school movement gained momentum, it must be noted that other avenues for professional preparation still existed for pre-service teachers; private academies, Latin grammar schools, and public secondary high schools continued to provide the background required of educators at that time. In fact, early in the push to develop more normal schools, most teachers were simply recruited from hometown schools, moving straight from the local secondary school into the classroom. According to Borrowman (1965), the students attracted to those normal schools in existence in the early days of the movement often were those who found little opportunity for higher education or for advancement in other professions. Those who chose to attend declared their intent to teach (while many students simply attended with no expectation of teaching), passed an entry exam which covered the basic elementary school subject matter, and demonstrated good moral character (p. 21). As time passed, however, entry requirements became somewhat more rigorous. Clifford and Guthrie (1988) write that as public high schools doubled their enrollments every decade between the 1880s and 1930s, normal schools began to require a high school diploma for admittance (p. 60).

Even as normal schools increased in popularity and found themselves able to demand more from prospective students, they still met with resistance from vociferous critics who questioned their efficacy and usefulness. Given the lax admittance standards required of the early normal school movement, the short amount of time most students actually spent in matriculating through their programs, and a teacher shortage which more or less assured prospective teachers employment with or without a certificate from a normal school, perhaps they could not be expected to radically change the face of teaching under such circumstances. According to Altenbaugh and Underwood (1990),

most of the early normal schools were weak in the area of pedagogical theory, as ministers and politicians often founded those institutions rather than educators. As a result, these early attempts at teacher education often suffered from a narrow focus on morality, basic literacy, and a modest level of factual knowledge, while showing a limited interest in fostering creativity, imagination, or autonomous thought. Summing up, Altenbaugh and Underwood claim that "Character training therefore superseded intellectual concerns at the normal schools" (p. 140). Likewise, Borrowman (1965) submits that "little could be expected of the normal school. It was perhaps enough to hope that the student could be made a master of the elementary-school subjects, given a 'bag of tricks'...and provided with an opportunity to practice his art under supervision" (p. 23). Although this characterization remains far removed from the normal school ideal envisioned by Horace Mann as a place ably suited to prepare teachers for the arduous task ahead in the common schools, it at the least represented an initial step toward large-scale, formalized teacher preparation.

Despite continued questions regarding the mission of the normal schools, the institutions continued to grow in number and influence toward the end of the nineteenth century. In 1898, the National Education Association reported the existence of 166 state normal schools and 165 private normal schools. Clifford and Guthrie (1988) report that despite the fact that a number of teachers around the turn of the century continued to have no formal training in pedagogy, the normal schools came to dominate the scene regarding teacher preparation (p. 59). While normal schools prepared approximately 75% of the prospective teachers in training, secondary schools accommodated only 16% of those who hoped to teach through the offering of normal courses. Colleges and universities

handled even fewer students preparing to teach, accounting for about 8% of the total. However, this trend would quickly reverse itself, as the new century witnessed the evolution and transformation of the public normal schools into a vast system of state teachers' colleges.

Lucas (1997) notes that even as late as the 1880s universities showed little interest in training teachers; many university faculty presumed, as did many others, that a solid grounding in subject matter would serve any elementary or secondary teacher well (p. 40). However, before the end of the century, 114 colleges and universities out of approximately 400 offered teacher courses or programs of some sort. By 1900, Borrowman (1965) suggests, the normal school movement and the liberal arts college tradition began to merge in earnest at the university level (p. 26). For example, 127 public normal schools existed in 1900; twenty years later, that number decreased to 69; and by 1933, no more than 50 continued to operate in the United States. Conversely, no more than 12 teachers' colleges operated in 1913, while just 15 years later that number stood at 137. The tide turned decidedly against the single-purpose normal school, as such institutions began to find a new existence and reluctant acceptance in higher education. The typical progression of a normal school was from the original single-purpose institution to a teachers' college, and from that point a final step to the multi-purpose state college or university. Thus, the history of the normal school movement in the United States spanned just about one century, as the country's first attempt at systematically training teachers was slowly absorbed into the realm of higher education. By the 1940s, in fact, the very term "normal school" had all but fallen out of existence. In

its stead, prospective educators turned to the colleges and universities for their professional preparation.

The fact that the normal schools moved from their humble beginnings and landed ultimately on the campuses of colleges and universities around the country did not guarantee teacher education either acceptance or legitimacy, nor did it insulate the preparation of educators from further controversy. Rather, much of the controversy and conflict which originally plagued attempts to prepare teachers simply followed these programs as they evolved from private academies and normal schools to state colleges and university programs. Critics of formalized teacher education persisted in questioning the very need for pedagogical training, insisting instead that a solid foundation in the subject matter exists as the sole guarantor of a capable, successful teacher. As Lucas (1997) contends, "Mastery of a body of subject matter, acquired through the example afforded by rigorous and systematic instruction, many declared emphatically, was sufficient, as always, to confer the ability to impart that same knowledge to others" (p. 29). Embedded within that comment is the tacit suggestion that critics long held on to the belief that for generations good teachers flourished without the benefit of any professional training whatsoever. In fact, many educational traditionalists doubted the idea that education deserved to exist as a discipline unto itself at the university level, on the same level as the liberal arts and sciences. Little (1989) notes that educators struggled through much of the twentieth century in an effort to "shape an applied field of study into a traditional university discipline" (p. 10). Critics and proponents alike of teacher education called for a science of education – that is, an essential body of knowledge needed by all teachers – which would legitimize education's claim for status as a new-

comer on the university campus. However, Lucas (1997) maintains that many traditional academics felt that Education not only lacked any cogent or well-defined body of content, but that it was "unlikely to acquire one any time soon" (p. 41). Certainly, the related issues of pedagogy's status as an academic discipline and the shaky existence of a codified science of education both served ultimately to cast doubt on the very professional status of educators. Such issues developed and evolved as early as the early nineteenth century, at the same time as the very idea of formalized professional education for teachers; interestingly, these same issues persist today, unresolved and problematic, in the contemporary literature which seeks to reform and improve teacher education at the end of the twentieth century.

The Holmes Group

The Holmes Group developed from a small group of education deans who first met in 1985, drawn together by a commonly held concern regarding the low quality of teacher preparation in the United States. According to The Holmes Group (1995), the initial work focused upon weak accreditation arrangements and the low priority often associated with teacher education at major universities (p. *i*). Once the scope of the problems they faced became evident, the deans proposed a plan to further develop the consortium which eventually became the Holmes Group. Although the consortium would turn its attention to myriad facets of both teacher education and the field of teaching itself, it endeavored to see "nothing less than the transformation of teaching from an occupation into a genuine profession that would serve the educational needs of children" (p. *i*). Hoping to provide teachers with the attributes shared by other professions – characteristics such as the knowledge, prestige, autonomy, and earnings – the Holmes

Group eventually organized its efforts around two fundamental, and closely related, goals. It sought to effect the simultaneous reform of teacher education and of schooling in the United States.

The work of the education deans resulted in the publication in May 1986, of *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group*, a document which explicated their collective vision of good teaching, recognized the obstacles often impeding the progress of reform efforts in education, and recommended a full agenda of action aimed at fundamentally changing the face of education at the elementary and secondary levels as well as in higher education. After issuing invitations to over one hundred research universities to join their efforts, more than ninety accepted the offer. Thus, the Holmes Groups officially formed at a constituting conference in January 1987. Three years later, the consortium published its second report, *Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools*. In this volume, the education deans provide a blueprint for their vision of public elementary and secondary schools connected to a university-based teacher education program. The trilogy of reports from the Holmes Group concluded with the 1995 publication of *Tomorrow's Schools of Education*. Cognizant of the critical connection between the professional status of teachers and the education they receive, the Holmes Group turned its attention in this final report to their expectations and their hopes for improved professional education for teachers. In this way, the group provided a comprehensive, long-term reform agenda which attempts to connect explicitly the public schools, the teachers who work in those schools, and the universities which endeavor to prepare those teachers in the first place.

The Holmes Group prefaces *Tomorrow's Teachers* with a cataloguing of five overarching goals and objectives. Recognizing that these controlling ideals carry with them implications which reach far beyond the scope of the teacher education programs, the group thus makes a tacit acknowledgment that its reform agenda encompasses myriad facets of the teaching profession. First, the Holmes Group wishes to make the professional education of teachers "intellectually more solid" (p. 4). That is to say, it supports the proposition that teachers must possess a greater command of their academic subjects as well as pedagogy in order to teach successfully. Second, it plans to identify differences in the skills, knowledge, commitment, education, certification, and work of teachers. In order to effect a move toward genuine professionalism, the Holmes Group supports the plan to distinguish among novices, competent teachers, and high-level professional leaders. Third, the group subscribes to the creation of "professionally relevant and intellectually defensible" standards for entering the profession (p. 4). Fourth, it hopes to forge connections between public schools and member institutions which would facilitate systematic inquiry into practice with the ultimate aim of improving teaching. And finally, the Holmes Group plans to make schools better places for teachers. With reduced bureaucracy, greater autonomy, and more leadership opportunities for teachers, the group envisions a system of schools in which teachers can more easily and effectively work and learn as true professionals.

These five goals might best be encapsulated with the group's acknowledgment that in trying to improve teaching and teacher education, it cannot avoid trying to improve the profession in which teachers will eventually teach and learn:

> The quality of teachers will not be improved unless we improve the quality of their education – and we cannot accomplish this task without changing the universities, the credentialing systems, and the schools themselves. The functions of these institutions cannot be regarded as independent from one another. . . . The rewards and career opportunities for teachers; the standards, nature and substance of professional education; the quality and coherence of the liberal arts and subject matter fields; and the professional certification and licensing apparatus must all be changed together, in a mutually compatible fashion. (p. 23)

In this way, the group explicitly recognizes the connections which exist between and among the various aspects of the teaching profession, and consequently notes that mere tinkering or minor recommendations cannot accomplish the task at hand. This ambitious and far-reaching agenda sets the stage, then, for the specific recommendations and observations which follow in the three cardinal reports.

An acknowledgment of the changing nature of America's teaching force underpins the Holmes Group's recommendation for a differentiated career ladder for educators. In providing a brief retrospective of the history of teaching as a profession, the Holmes Group (1986) notes that the "amount and quality of preparation it required did little to encourage the view that one was making a serious commitment to a long-term career." The writers go on to characterize teaching as a "convenient, respectable, and relatively challenging employment" for individuals who did not plan to make education their life's work. In summation, the writers claim that "It was constructed as a job, rather than a profession" (p. 32). The writers provide this historical context in order to illustrate the need for a new career structure in education, as the 1970s and 1980s witnessed

dramatic changes in the makeup of the American workforce, changes which make necessary a reconfiguration of the ways in which teachers enter into and progress through the profession.

The Holmes Group recommends that the teaching field utilize a differentiated career ladder, a revised structure which would effectively recognize and reward differing levels of knowledge, skill, and preparedness on the part of the teachers. In response, then, to both the anticipation that schools will soon need to compete for professionals in ways they never have before and the recent phenomenon that they can no longer count on a "captive market" of talented women and minorities likely to find ample opportunities in other fields, the Holmes Group proposes a three-tiered profession which includes Instructors, Professional Teachers, and Career Teachers. With this arrangement, the Holmes group envisions a level of classroom teacher (the Instructor) who possesses subject matter specialization with only a modicum of pedagogical expertise. Further, the Instructor would act only under the direct supervision and guidance of a Professional Teacher and/or a Career Teacher. In order to provide opportunities for career advancement and further rewards in teaching, the proposal holds that education must create a market for professionally trained educators with advanced graduate credentials.

At the top of this redesigned career scheme, the Career Teachers possess the credentials and experience to operate at both the classroom level and the school level with complete autonomy. The group envisions these teachers as typically earning a doctorate in either an academic subject or a specialty area, thereby qualifying them to assume various leadership roles within their school settings. Possible roles include work in teacher preparation, curriculum development and improvement, testing and measurement,

conducting action research, and strengthening home-school relationships. The Professional Teacher operates at a level just below that of the Career Teacher. These teachers would be certified to act as autonomous classroom teachers, entitled to teach without supervision. Although they would operate within certain role requirements, the Professional Teacher would carry into the classroom expertise in not only a specific body of subject matter, but also of pedagogy. The group sees a teacher at this level as both an effective instructor and a child advocate. Finally, the lowest level of teacher in this particular scheme would be the Instructor. Allowed only to teach under the direct supervision and guidance of a Career Professional, the Instructor would only interact with students on the level that he or she best knows – that is, on the subject matter level. Because these Instructors have neither the credentials or commitment to the profession necessary to make it one's life work, they will not have the opportunity to determine curriculum, counsel with students or parents, set their own lesson plans, make school policy, or evaluate personnel or programs. Rather, these teachers would fulfill the distinct and limited role of subject matter expert. By adopting this particular career structure, the Holmes Group hopes to improve retention of outstanding teachers as well as attract more and better talent to the teaching profession by simultaneously creating and rewarding formal distinctions regarding the responsibilities and freedoms of classroom teachers.

The Holmes Group not only proposes to change the fundamental character of the teaching profession, but it also suggests a number of radical changes more directly related to the education of teachers at the university level. Turning to models such as the teaching hospitals in medicine and the experimental stations in agriculture, the group

supports the creation and development of Professional Development Schools. The PDC would function as a genuine public elementary or secondary school; however, it would operate with direct ties to a university's teacher education program, providing a place where school teachers, university faculty, and pre-service teachers could teach, learn, and research together in an authentic, dynamic locale. The Holmes Group (1995) envisions the Professional Development School as a place committed to the development of both experienced and novice teachers: "The PDS injects school-based and traditional research into teaching and learning in the context of school and education school renewal. It allows for educational theory to be examined under the strains and tensions of practice and readily discards those practices that don't bring improved results" (p. 80). The PDS stands as the group's effort to not only bring the theory and practice of teaching back into proximity, and therefore relevance, but also as an attempt to bridge the gap which exists between the public schools and the schools of education. As the Holmes Group notes (1995), the "absence of strong practical connections between the knowledge and skills taught in the classroom of the education school and their application in practice represents a central, glaring weakness" in most university-based teacher education programs (p. 81). To answer that concern, then, the PDS holds out hope for the Holmes Group that the fragmentation typical of so many teacher education programs might be eliminated by bringing the disparate facets of pre-service teacher training back together under one roof.

In a similar effort to create a sense of coherence within the field of professional education for teachers, the Holmes Group expresses the need for an established core of learning which should act as the foundation for the entire profession. In an effort to

connect every member of the teaching profession and to forge common ground, the Holmes Group (1995) emphasizes the necessity for a system in which "All [members of the profession] will have shared a core education that ensures they speak the same professional language, that a certain body of skills has been mastered by all, and that they cherish professional values that unite them, not divide them" (p. 67). While the reports do not contain specific recommendations regarding the exact nature of this proposed core, *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* articulates the five general elements as envisioned by the Holmes Group. First, all teachers must possess an understanding of both human development and of the ways in which young people learn. Although the authors acknowledge the fact that the eleventh grade chemistry teacher will require an understanding of learners distinct from that needed by a third grade teacher, they go on to claim that "all require, as a starting point, a broad, general understanding of human development and its implications for learning, and a deep knowledge of the core of their teaching subjects" (p. 70). On a related note, the authors depict the second element encompassing a thorough knowledge of subject matter, technology, and pedagogy for young people's learning. The third element of the core involves a teacher's capacity to organize instruction; that is to say, professional teachers must master instructional management techniques for their students' learning. The authors suggest that this concept involves the skill to connect, for example, curriculum planning, various instructional strategies, and classroom management. The penultimate element of the core comprises the skills necessary to inquire into, reflect upon, and research the ways in which young people learn. Moving beyond the prosaic, though necessary, skills to manage a classroom, the Holmes Group sees the need for teachers not only to know how to "cope

with recurring problems, but also how to reflect productively on their students, their actions, and their learning" (p. 73). And finally, the core knowledge base suggested by the Holmes Group includes specific skills in fostering professional collaboration in support of young people's learning. Noting that classroom teachers quite often work in an atmosphere marked by professional isolation, the group recommends that all pre-service teachers develop the skills necessary to foster collegiality and cooperation in the classroom on behalf of their students. Without question, these five elements do not present a comprehensive catalogue of every skill necessary to teach successfully. As the authors of *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* suggest, "The core is essential, but not all essential knowledge resides in the core" (p. 67). However, they do provide a picture of that which the Holmes Group recognizes as the fundamental starting place for starting one's professional growth.

Perhaps the most radical and far-reaching reform item on the Holmes Group agenda, and the one which has implications for all the others, is the group's entreaty to abolish the undergraduate education major at the university level. The group's reasoning holds that undergraduates should participate in pedagogical course work as undergraduates, work which would support and eventually lead into advance studies in education at the graduate level. Because students majoring in arts and sciences take four years to complete their liberal studies, the authors contend that teachers should take the same amount of time to complete their preparation specific to their subject area. The issue becomes one of ample time to complete the prescribed program. However, the Holmes Group (1986) claims that for too long the education major has done little more than dilute the academic expertise of pre-service teachers without the concomitant

improvement in pedagogical skills, all at the cost of time which could be spent learning one's subject deeply and well: "For elementary teachers, this degree has too often become a substitute for learning any subject deeply enough to teach it well. These teachers are certified to teach all things to all children. But few of them know much about anything, because they are required to know a little of everything" (p. 14). Subscribing to the tenet that a pre-service teacher must first establish a firm grounding in his/her chosen discipline, the group extols the virtue and prudence in a rigorous grounding in one's subject matter. The authors envision a plan of study which would allow future teachers to begin their professional course work as undergraduates, but that they would ultimately major in education during an extensive professional sequence which would commence during their fifth year of higher education.

While the Holmes Group calls for a solid foundation in one's academic discipline, it also recognizes that simply getting rid of the greater share of the education course work in an effort to devote more time to liberal arts study will not alone improve teaching. Rather, they emphasize that three steps must be taken in order to strengthen the experience pre-service teachers have in their academic disciplines. First, they call for future teachers to study the subjects they will teach with instructors who "model fine teaching and who understand the pedagogy of their material" (p. 16). Also, they maintain that academic courses should be organized so that "undergraduates can gain a sense of the intellectual structure and boundaries of their disciplines, rather than taking a series of disjointed, prematurely specialized fragments" (p. 16). And finally, they urge the development and implementation of coherent programs designed to support the advanced studies in pedagogy which will be required to solid professional preparation. Clearly,

such recommendations require a commitment on the part of both the liberal arts faculty and the education faculty to greater communication and cooperation in order to bring about these changes at the undergraduate level.

Attending to the Holmes Group's central conception of *good teaching* may do more than anything else in terms of understanding their vision of a quality, worthwhile teacher education program. According to the Holmes Group (1986), the fundamental precept of good teaching demands "competent teachers empowered to make principled judgments and decisions on their students' behalf" (p. 28). Additionally, good teaching requires both a thoughtful understanding of students, one's subject matter, the nature of schooling and learning, and the world at large. Good teaching involves the capacity to model critical thinking strategies as well as to exemplify a "penchant" for inquiry. Furthermore, good teaching involves the ability to encourage students' interaction with important knowledge and skill. As to the professional knowledge required for good teaching, the authors suggest that it includes "academic and clinical learning that prepares one to manage both mastery of content and the complex social relations of the classroom in a way that fosters student learning as well as an attachment to learning" (29). In summary, the Holmes Group holds that the *sine qua non* of teaching and schooling for the truly professional teacher remains, simply, student learning.

The Carnegie Forum on Education

In January 1985, the Trustees of Carnegie Corporation of New York acted to establish the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. An advisory council immediately recommended that the newly established Forum create a task force charged with the examination of the teaching profession. The resultant document, published in

1986, was titled *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. According to the Carnegie Forum (1986), four overarching purposes motivated the task force in producing their final document. They hoped to remind Americans of the prevailing global economic pressures assailing the country, to establish the primacy of education as the essential element in economic growth, equal opportunity, and a shared national vision, to reaffirm the teaching profession as the most likely avenue to establish new standards of excellence as the foundation of American education, and to highlight the current opportunity available to reform the nation's schools. According to the authors, "The Forum was created to draw America's attention to the link between economic growth and the skills and abilities of the people who contribute to that growth, and to help develop education policies to meet the economic challenges ahead" (p. iii).

In pursuing and achieving a new level of excellence in American education, the Carnegie Forum subscribes to two essential points: Success depends upon much more rigorous educational standards than have previously been sought, and the key to such success rests in creating a profession equal to the task. As educational policy must be dramatically altered in the quest to change the current fortunes of American education, the Forum opens its Executive Summary by outlining eight sweeping changes which must be addressed in our nation's schools. In short, it calls for the establishment of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Schools must be restructured in order to provide a professional environment for teaching. The teaching force itself must be restructured, including the introduction of a new category of educators. The Forum goes on to recommend that a bachelors degree be required for the professional study of teaching. Further, a new professional curriculum should be developed for graduate

schools of education, a curriculum which would ultimately lead to Master in Teaching degree. More minority teachers must be encouraged and recruited into the profession. Teacher productivity should be bolstered by tying incentives for teachers to school-wide student performance and by providing the necessary technology, services, and staff. And finally, the Forum calls for teachers' salaries and opportunities to be brought into line with those in other professions.

The improvement of teaching as a profession emerges as the dominant theme of *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. The authors argue that bettering the professional environment for teaching will result in improvements in the performances of educators (p. 58). On a related note, the Forum suggests that improvements in schools will be unlikely until the structure of incentives for teachers is reconfigured to produce rewards for student achievement. In short, the Forum envisions a new professional structure which relies less on the altruism of teachers and which provides both rewards for outstanding performance and real consequences for failure. According to the authors, measurement of remarkable performance should not be limited to such yardsticks as standardized tests; rather, measures such as rates of attendance, dropout statistics, job placement numbers, and college acceptance figures must also be recognized. In this way, student performance and teacher rewards function in concert, establishing a new way to look at providing incentives for better performance in the field of teaching.

Directly related to the issue of incentives for teachers is, of course, compensation. Recognizing that many teachers find themselves in their mid-thirties with very few prospects in regard to salary growth, the authors claim that half of all teachers leave the profession within seven years of entering the classroom. That being the case, the Forum

supports making salaries, benefits, and working conditions for teachers competitive with those of other professionals. Rather than simply throwing more money into education, the authors propose a restructured salary schedule, based on four main issues of job function, level of certification, seniority, and productivity. For the authors of the report, such steps would inevitably lead to a greater professionalization of the teaching field, in itself a key component to improving the overall lot of education in the United States.

Much of the Forum's call for reform centers upon its stance that teachers must be given more professional autonomy and that the nation's teachers must find the same opportunities for growth and advancement as do members of other professions. Arguing that teachers should be able to make or strongly influence the decisions made which most directly affect their work in the schools, the authors note that "teachers, working together, must be free to exercise their professional judgment" when it comes to achieving set goals (p. 58). They go on then to describe their conception of a new category of educator: the lead teacher. Selected from among the more experienced and respected teachers in the district, the lead teachers would be responsible for both guiding and influencing the activities of other teachers, thereby ensuring that the capacities of their colleagues are drawn upon as the "organization improves its performance" (p. 58). Moreover, these lead teachers could potentially assume complete control over the operation of the schools, assuming such duties as the supervision of other teachers and the development of curriculum.

One requirement made of the lead teacher would be the credential of national certification. According to the Forum, the entity responsible for administering such a certificate would be a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. Such an

organization would be responsible for both setting high standards for professional teaching competence and issuing credentials to those individuals who meet those standards. As envisioned by the Forum, this national board would issue two types of certificates: a Teacher's Certificate and an Advanced Teacher's Certificate. Claiming that the National Board would assess teachers based upon both research on teaching and learning as well as the experience of outstanding teachers, the Forum believes that assessment should emerge as an issue chiefly concerned with three areas. First, teachers should be assessed on their knowledge of their subject area; such a test would be administered upon graduation from college. Second, teachers should tested over the material commonly covered in professional education courses. And finally, the certification process would conclude with extensive observation made over a period of time.

The Forum supports major changes to the preparation and assessment of teachers not only at the point of graduation and beyond, but also at the undergraduate level. Claiming that "Four years of college education is not enough time to master the subjects to be taught and acquire the skills to teach them" (p. 73), the authors suggest that pre-service teacher devote their entire undergraduate experience to a very broad liberal education centered upon the subjects they will eventually teach in the common school classroom. The professional preparation of teachers will be moved entirely to the graduate level. Thus, the authors propose a Master in Teaching Degree Program. The authors note that such an advanced program would cultivate instructional and management abilities, develop the habit of reflecting on their own practice, and provide a strong basis for continual professional development. Describing the locale for such

programs as "clinical schools," the Forum notes that such institutions would fulfill a role analogous to teaching hospitals; such clinical schools would ultimately operate as public schools which work closely with schools of education. In this way, the Forum hopes to connect common education much more closely with higher education.

In fact, the report ends with a series of invitations which would presumably bring together all of the disparate groups involved, at different levels, with the educational system of the country. The authors invite teachers to support much higher standards for their profession. They encourage state policy leaders to convene panels for the purpose of examining the report in an effort to rethink the ways in which schools might best work. They also recommend that local communities value the type of teachers who achieve a level of national certification. They entreat those in higher education to reaffirm the importance of educating outstanding teachers, and they call for students to consider actively the prospect of a career in teaching. In this way, all are enjoined to participate in the work ahead by pooling both talent and resources in the effort to professionalize the field of teaching, improve the overall lot of education in the country, and once again ensure the economic force of the nation as it begins to compete in much more global marketplace.

John Goodlad

John Goodlad has published more than twenty-five books and multiple articles concerning his twin research interests of educational change and school improvement. In 1990, he published a trilogy of works which concentrated specifically on the state of professional teacher education in the United States. *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching*, *Places Where Teachers are Taught*, and *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools* all address to

varying degrees the current status of teacher education as well as ideas relative to its improvement. Four years later in 1994, Goodlad published *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools* in an effort to both clarify and extend his recommendations and observations made in the earlier three texts. The result is a body of work in which Goodlad articulates his own perception of ways in which teachers are taught in the United States as well as his vision of the path which must be followed if American schools are ultimately to be improved through the prerequisite improvement of the American teaching force.

After the publication of his comprehensive look at American schools entitled *A Place Called School*, Goodlad became convinced that the existing practices of teachers and administrators could not sustain the kind of change and renewal necessary to markedly improve the state of American education. Joining a number of other colleagues sharing similar concerns, Goodlad and others formed the Center for Educational Renewal and consequently began the pursuit of three initiatives. According to Goodlad (1994), the group set out to learn more about the "conditions and circumstances" surrounding the education of educators for our nation's schools. It also engaged in research relative to other professions in hope of learning that which might be applicable to the professional education of teachers. And finally, it sought to further its own agenda which held that the fundamental renewal of schooling would have its best chance for advancement if it is linked to the research activities of universities and the improvement of teacher education (p. 28-9). With these three original goals driving the research and writing which followed, Goodlad's organization engaged in extensive research in many settings across

the country with the ultimate goal of improving teacher education in the United States and, ultimately, the nation's schools.

Goodlad places his own ideas within the larger context of educational reform in the United States, including that which had gained so much momentum in the 1980s, as rising concerns over the nation's economic and technological viability came to dominate calls for improved schools. Goodlad (1991) notes that "Recommendations in reform reports on teacher education throughout the century have been repetitious and superficial" (p. 26). He goes on to specify that countless reports have called, at various times, for the following improvements: Eliminate simplistic methods courses, focus on the recruitment of only the best and brightest students, require four years of study in the arts and sciences, and develop a mentor program with practicing teachers. Goodlad also recognizes, however, that some segments of the population began to realize by the late 1980s that "the ritualistic repetition of unexamined 'commonsense' answers to the complex problem of educating teachers" made little sense (p. 27). Instead, he recommends that genuine improvement will only occur when one ceases to simply tinker with the edges of the current system and instead alters the face of education in radical and profound ways.

From Goodlad's perspective, however, the history of educational reform in the United States amounts to little more than mechanistic tinkering. Goodlad (1994) suggests that the public discourse relative to education often centers around the systematics of schooling and the mechanics of teaching, all to the detriment of any genuine attention to the educative role of schools (p. 35). Goodlad (1991) also stresses that teacher education programs continue to focus largely upon issues of technique; because so little energy is devoted to an adequate grounding in theory, he claims, "teaching is often reduced to

mechanical procedures" (p. 264). In contrast, he recommends that the reform of teacher education begin with less attention to the mechanical side of teaching and more attention to questions pertaining to what schooling should be all about. "Teacher education has much to do, then, with normative matters pertaining to the nature of education," Goodlad (1991) claims, "and what one's conception of education means for the conduct of schooling in a democratic society" (p. 48). To simply discuss the prospect of "fixing" bad teachers and of raising the standards trivializes the profession. Rather, Goodlad chooses to begin his own reform reports with broad discussion of the complex function of schooling and its role in the prosperity of our nation as well as in the lives of its citizens.

One way of recognizing the complexity of the process of teacher education is to note the fact that many programs often lack the coherence which leads to a professional education marked by integrity. To this end, Goodlad (1991) observes that a typical four-year teacher education program likely seeks to address four distinct sets of curricular emphases: general education, specialized subject matter, foundational studies in education, and both observation and practice in teaching. Unfortunately, four different groups of faculty often conduct the study of these four areas of concentration, with little communication or shared vision connecting the various faculty members (p. 160). Lamenting this typical state of affairs which characterizes teacher education programs, Goodlad (1994) maintains that a professional education program for teachers will only make a difference when all of the component parts become interconnected, thereby reducing the fragmentation which marks so many programs. Typically, such fragmentation can be ameliorated when a program boasts a set of agreed-upon beliefs, common goals, and intentionally designed "bridges" which connect those points in the

professional education sequence which often exist in isolation (p. 241). His goal, in many ways, represents a shift back to the normal school model in which general education, pedagogical issues, and specific subject matter were all dealt with in a single setting where the connections among those arenas appeared natural and clear.

In order to restore such a degree of coherence to teacher education, Goodlad (1994) recommends a five-year professional education program which will be both more coherent and less hurried than its traditional four-year counterpart (p. 160). His plan envisions a cohort group of students moving away from the university campus during their fifth year, a move which will integrate them into two partner schools where they will become "essentially junior members of the faculty" working and learning as integral facets of the schools in which they continue their studies (p. 191). While many traditional programs offer experiences for their students outside of the university setting, Goodlad envisions the partner schools as being staffed by both professors of education and of the arts and sciences, instructors with whom the pre-service teachers would have had contact earlier in their studies. In this way, he hopes to create a situation in which pre-service teachers continue to learn in an environment marked by integrity, connections, and coherence.

Anchoring Goodlad's plan to tighten up the typically loose connections which characterize various components of teacher education is his idea of the *center of pedagogy*, a new entity which, according to Goodlad (1994), exists "in some intermediate position between university and school district – part of both but creature of neither" (p. 12-3). He envisions a teacher education program which embraces elementary and

secondary schools, much in the same way that a school of medicine works within and around the context of a teaching hospital:

> A center of pedagogy is intended to bring to the fore the centrality and clarity of the teacher education mission in a democratic society. It is a setting that brings together and blends harmoniously and coherently the three essential ingredients of a teacher's education: general, liberal education; the study of educational practices; and the guided exercise of the art, science, and skill of teaching. (p. 2-3)

In this way, Goodlad plans for the conscious reconnection of the discrete facets which very often make up the traditional teacher education program.

In creating a conceptual framework upon which to design a center of pedagogy, Goodlad goes on to note that such a place would emphasize four functions in the education of teachers. The center of pedagogy should do everything in order to ensure pre-service teachers assume responsibility for the good stewardship of schools, enculturate students in a social and political democracy, provide access to knowledge for all of their students, and practice the art and science of teaching (p. 5). He goes on to note that a center of pedagogy exists as both "a concept and a setting. As a concept, it brings together simultaneously and integratively the commonly scattered pieces of the teacher education enterprise and embeds them in reflective attention to the art and science of teaching" (p. 10). Of course, one might argue that even the traditional arrangement for student teaching could ideally address each of these functions, but Goodlad points out that too often such arrangements only guarantee that pre-service teachers obtain their experience in circumstances marked by personal isolation and by fragmentation relative

to the rest of the program. Within the center of pedagogy, such connections could be made both explicit and meaningful.

Goodlad's plan for the educational renewal of teacher preparation programs does not begin and end with the center of pedagogy, however. Such a professional education sequence would be marked by at least seven major components, as envisioned by Goodlad (1994). A complete program would be initiated by a deliberate *recruitment* program which held up as its fundamental goal a diverse population of pre-service teachers. Also, such a program would include two years of *general studies* which would ensure the students an opportunity to acquire the literacy and critical-thinking skills generally agreed upon as necessary to the educated person. More specifically, this general education program would include course work covering the following six arenas of study: the world as a physical system, the world as a biological system, evaluative and belief systems, communication and expressive systems, the human species, and the global village (including social, political, and economic systems). Additionally, an *informal socialization process* will run throughout this two-year course of study, providing students with opportunities to organize themselves into cohort groups and attend seminars and lectures concerned with both the nature and profession of teaching.

At the end of this two-year introductory phase, Goodlad argues for a distinct point of entry into the course of study which would eventually lead to a professional preparation program. Accordingly, the next major component of his program would include *subject-matter specialization*. In addition to the continuation of general education requirements, students will begin to take course work specific to their teaching field, learning the subject matter with an eye toward both understanding the material and

recognizing how one might effectively teach such material while considering its pedagogical use. In conjunction with the subject matter specialization comes the *professional sequence*, classes which would begin in the junior year and continue on throughout the proposed fifth year. The conjunction of these two areas ultimately will lead to a bachelor's degree in some area of general studies and a professional bachelor's degree in either pedagogy or education. The sixth curricular component becomes an *internship program* which places each pre-service teacher in two partner schools, each for the equivalent of a semester. Working as junior members of the schools' faculty, the pre-service teachers will continue to work and learn in cohort groups, participating in seminars and course work while they participate in their internship. The final component is that of *feedback and follow-up*. Goodlad proposes to utilize the insights and reflections of pre-service teachers as they work through the professional education program and to maintain connections with them as they work through their entry year as a licensed teacher (p. 167-172). These seven curricular components stand as necessary to the program envisioned by Goodlad, a program characterized by connections between and among the various constituent elements.

Acknowledging the fact that simply proposing seven curricular components would never ensure a quality, coherent teacher education program, Goodlad (1994) and his colleagues have compiled a list of nineteen postulates against which to judge the relative health of any existing or proposed plan for teacher education. Choosing the word postulate due to its meaning "a carefully reasoned argument or set of presuppositions," Goodlad contends that each condition described must be met, in whatever manner feasible, in order to have a healthy and vital professional education program. Although

one does not necessarily need to attend to the postulates in any particular order, it should be noted that many of them overlap and connect with others in various ways and in numerous arenas:

> **Postulate One**: Programs for the education of the nation's educators must be viewed by institutions offering them as a major responsibility to society and be adequately supported and promoted and vigorously advanced by the institution's top leadership.
> **Postulate Two**: Programs for the education of educators must enjoy parity with other professional education programs, full legitimacy and institutional commitment, and rewards for faculty geared to the nature of the field.
> **Postulate Three**: Programs for the education of educators must be autonomous and secure in their borders, with clear organized identity, constancy of budget and personnel, and decision-making authority to that enjoyed by the major professional schools.
> **Postulate Four**: There must exist a clearly identifiable group of academic and clinical faculty members for whom teacher education is the top priority; the group must be responsible and accountable for selecting diverse groups of students and monitoring their progress, planning and maintaining the full scope and sequence of the curriculum, continuously evaluating and improving programs, and facilitating the entry of graduates into teaching careers.
> **Postulate Five**: The responsible group of academic and clinical faculty members described above must have a comprehensive understanding of the aims of education and the role of schools in our society and be fully committed to selecting and preparing teachers to assume the full range of educational responsibilities required.
> **Postulate Six**: The responsible group of academic and clinical faculty members must seek out and select for a predetermined number of student places in the program those candidates who reveal an initial commitment to the moral, ethical, and enculturating responsibilities to be assumed, and make clear to them that preparing for these responsibilities is central to this program.
> **Postulate Seven**: Programs for the education of educators, whether elementary or secondary, must carry the responsibility to ensure that all candidates progressing through them possess or acquire the literacy and critical-thinking abilities associated with the concept of an educated person.
> **Postulate Eight**: Programs for the education of educators must provide extensive opportunities for future teachers to move beyond being students of organized knowledge to become teachers who inquire into both knowledge and its teaching.
> **Postulate Nine**: Programs for the education of educators must be characterized by a socialization process through which candidates transcend their self-oriented student preoccupations to become more other-oriented in identifying a culture of teaching.

Postulate Ten: Programs for the education of educators must be characterized in all respects by the conditions for learning the future teachers are to establish in their own schools and classrooms.
Postulate Eleven: Programs for the education of educators must be conducted in such a way that future teachers inquire into the nature of teaching and schooling and assume that they will do so as a natural aspect of their careers.
Postulate Twelve: Programs for the education of educators must involve future teachers in the issues and dilemmas that emerge out of the never-ending tension between the rights and interests of individual parents and interest groups and the role of schools in transcending parochialism and advancing community in democratic schools.
Postulate Thirteen: Programs for the education of educators must be infused with understanding of and commitment to the moral obligation of teachers to ensure equitable access to and engagement in the best possible K-12 education for all children and youth.
Postulate Fourteen: Programs for the education of educators must involve future teachers not only in understanding schools as they are but in alternatives, the assumptions underlying alternatives, and how to effect needed changes in school organization, pupil grouping, curriculum, and more.
Postulate Fifteen: Programs for the education of educators must assure for each candidate the availability of a wide array of laboratory settings for simulation, observation, hands-on experiences, and exemplary schools for internships and residencies; they must admit no more students to their programs than can be assured these quality experiences.
Postulate Sixteen: Programs for the education of educators must engage future teachers in the problems and dilemmas arising out of the inevitable conflicts and incongruities between what is perceived to work in practice and the research and theory supporting other options.
Postulate Seventeen: Programs for the education of educators must establish linkages with graduates for purposes of both evaluating and revising these programs and easing the critical early years of transition into teaching.
Postulate Eighteen: Programs for the education of educators require a regulatory context with respect to licensing, certifying, and accrediting that ensures at all times the presence of the necessary conditions embraced by the seventeen preceding postulates.
Postulate Nineteen: Programs for the education of educators must compete in an arena that rewards efforts to continuously improve on the conditions embedded in all of the postulates and tolerates no shortcuts intended to ensure the supply of teachers. (p. 72-93)

These nineteen postulates, taken together and examined in light of one another, constitute a rubric by which teacher education programs and proposals may be judged and evaluated. Referring to the postulates as a sort of "philosophical screen" through which

to consider ideas related to the teaching of teachers, Goodlad offers the nineteen postulates as benchmarks indicating the necessary conditions which must exist in order to properly, coherently educate future teachers.

Goodlad (1991) claims that his intentions do not include providing a lock-step blueprint for teacher educators to follow. Rather, he hopes to "provide direction without confining the options" (p. 303). The postulates included in his list of essential conditions stand as reminders of perennial issues which have less in common with trends and more in common with hallmarks, with issues which will always be important without regard to conventional wisdom or the drift of contemporary thought. Goodlad (1994) stresses that he endeavors to provide a "broad framework" which concentrates attention on the need for quality instruction in the arts and sciences, pedagogical issues, time for essential themes to emerge within and throughout a professional program, integration of theory and practice, modeling of appropriate teaching styles on the part of the faculty, and the availability of quality sites for meaningful field experiences for all students (p. 132). At the same time he catalogues the points he sees as essential for the proper education of educators, Goodlad (1994) reminds his readers of the overarching, ultimate importance of the endeavor undertaken by those schools which teach teachers: "We are dealing here with the education of those who will join parents in ensuring that our young people become humane individuals and responsible citizens. Do universities take on any matters of greater importance?" (p. 55). And in the face of his own rhetorical question aimed at situating the relative importance of quality teacher education programs, Goodlad does not demand that any one program follow his recommendations like a set of schematics or a decree. Rather, he suggests that those interested in quality, meaningful teacher education

attend to his recommendations as one might a more descriptive road map which offers a nearly infinite number of routes which ultimately lead to the same destination – quality teachers which result in quality schools for democratic living.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

The decade of the 1980s and 1990s brought a virtual flood of reports highly critical of the state of education in the United States. While much of the criticism centered upon the perceived failings of the nation's public schools, a significant portion of the critique eventually fell upon the nation's teachers. The natural progression, then, led the critics to evaluate the professional preparation of teachers. Recommendations for more rigorous programs and higher standards for pre-service teachers came from numerous critics as the preparedness of teachers fell under the same scrutiny as did the educational system as a whole. According to Moore, Hopkins, and Tullis (1994) the contemporary call for excellence in education has resulted in a concomitant call for nationally recognized standards against which teacher education programs and schools may be judged. Further, they note the primary accrediting agency which has answered this call is the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (p. 27).

In a publication entitled *Quality Assurance for the Teaching Profession*, NCATE describes itself in the following terms: "NCATE is *the* accrediting organization for teacher preparation – it *is* the field." The organization itself goes on to state that "NCATE is a vital, nationwide group of education stakeholders working together to make a difference in the quality of teaching and teacher preparation today, tomorrow, and for the next century" (p. 3). Though other accrediting bodies have existed, no other currently

exerts such significant influence in the field of accrediting teacher education programs in the United States.

NCATE practiced as an accrediting body well before the advent of the most recent round of condemnation aimed at American education – criticism which has resulted in so much attention on the professional preparation of our nation's teachers. In 1951, representatives from several education organizations gathered for a conference on accreditation. Three years later, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education emerged from that conference as a national organization dedicated to the accreditation process for teacher education programs around the country. The original constituent groups which met at the 1951 conference included the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education, the AACTE, and the Council of Chief State School Officers. Since then, however, NCATE has comprised as many as thirty constituent members, including such organizations as the National Council of Teachers of English, the National Association of Secondary School Principles, the National School Board Association, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Gardner, Scannell, and Wisniewski (1996) claim that "The genius of NCATE lies in the fact that it represents all significant segments of the teacher education establishment" (p. 623). The individuals who actually conduct the on-site accreditation visits on behalf of NCATE are members of the constituent groups which make up the organization. In this way, NCATE endeavors to represent the concerns of numerous discrete organizations affiliated with the nation's schools.

Arthur E. Wise (interview with Hodge, 1991), president of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, issues a call for the nation to embrace a "system

of quality assurance for teacher education" which is based on standards falling into three categories: the accreditation of teacher education institutions, performance-based state licensing, and national board certification for qualified teachers (p. 5). Wise goes on to addresses the issue of accreditation when he suggests that the most critical action which could be taken to ensure the quality of teacher education programs is to arrive at a "national consensus" concerning the characteristics of good teacher education and then to implement those standards on a national level (p. 7). Wise claims that, with some sort of national accreditation program, teacher education institutions and programs are simply "left to the vagaries of state policies and to the kind of harm now being done to teacher education students and ultimately to students in P-12 education" (p. 8-9). Expanding on Wise's argument for the necessity of national accreditation, NCATE claims in its publication *Quality Assurance for the Teaching Profession* that the education profession needs to achieve some degree of nationally-recognized validation if it is to achieve the same level of trust which other professions such as law and medicine currently enjoy with the American public (p. 10). Wise (1993) summarizes his contention that national accreditation is essential for the nation's teacher education programs by arguing that "We have thus failed to implement such mechanisms as other fields have used to cement their goals and beliefs about quality control" (p. 8). In this way, the necessity of national accreditation such as NCATE offers rests in the argument that it provides the necessary elements of trust, consistency, and quality control currently lacking in the nation's professional teacher preparation programs.

In short, NCATE holds forth as a primary goal the professionalization of the teaching field. By adopting rigorous standards and regulating their implementation, Wise

(1995) subscribes to the notion that the efforts of NCATE will effect systemic reform and, consequently, elevate the professional status of teachers and teaching (p. 2). In articulating his vision for the collective futures of teachers, teaching, and teacher education, Wise (1993) denotes three characteristics he sees as fundamental for the teachers of tomorrow. First, he calls for educators who teach in such a way as to develop students with "authentic intellectual and practical skills relevant to the social and economic needs of all Americans in the twenty-first century" (p. 9). Additionally, he argues for teachers who know their subject matter, demonstrate professional knowledge, and understand pedagogical issues. Finally, he stresses that teachers must "share" in the decision-making processes which affect their field on the local, state, and national levels (p. 9). Wise, then, supports teacher education programs geared toward "outfitting" pre-service teachers with the skills and knowledge necessary for making this vision of the future a reality.

NCATE's goal of the professionalization of the teaching field includes specific recommendations regarding the characteristics necessary for the "new" professional educator. In its publication *Quality Assurance for the Teaching Profession*, NCATE argues that new teachers should be capable of working in teams, observing peers, and both studying and learning with fellow educators. In short, it emphasizes the absolute requisite for collegiality among teachers (p. 6). Moreover, the organization goes on to denote several more attributes which it holds up as necessary for this category of "new" professional in the field of education. First, the new professional teacher will possess a broad, liberal arts education. Further, this individual will also offer a specialization in a particular subject matter area. This professional teacher will also have the capacity to

base decisions and actions on a solid professional knowledge and will enter the field having experienced a number of diverse clinical experiences (p. 8). Finally, NCATE also offers a number of skills which the new professional teacher must be able to demonstrate in classroom practice:

> The new professional teacher is knowledgeable and current in the content to be taught; understands teaching methods and can apply them effectively; studies under a variety of master teachers during a program of clinical education; explains instructional choices based on research and best practice; reflects on practice and changes methods that are not working; applies effective methods of teaching for students of different backgrounds and who are at different stages of development; communicates and collaborates effectively with other teachers, parents, school staff and the larger community to enhance student learning; continually seeks professional growth; [and] nurtures the growth and development of each student in his or her charge, and creates meaningful learning experiences for those students. (p. 9)

In regard to knowledge bases necessary for pre-service teachers, Wise (1993) proposes that professional teachers ought to enter the classroom with both a full liberal education as well as a body of professional knowledge bases with which to approach their students (p. 9). For NCATE, then, the characteristics and skills essential for teaching suggest the necessity of professional, pedagogical, and subject matter knowledge combined with the practical skills to utilize this knowledge in a classroom setting.

As president of NCATE, Wise (1993) recommends that two policy changes relative to teacher education need to be adopted in order for his prospective view of the

future to ever come to pass. Wise advocates the position that *all* schools should be professionally accredited. Also, he adds that states should sponsor licensing procedures which will guarantee that minimum standards will be met by those calling themselves teachers (p. 10). Wise also calls for a common set of agreed-upon standards for what constitutes good teacher education, as he attributes education's lower standing among professions to a "failure to embrace a common set of standards" (p. 10). Although Wise addresses state licensing procedures and protocol, it should be noted that NCATE concerns itself primarily with the quality of teacher education programs rather than involving itself in state certification and licensing issues. However, it should also be noted that Wise (1995) proposes that a link should eventually exist between state licensing standards and the national professional standards for the preparation of teachers (p. 3). Sanders (1994) points out that NCATE positions itself in such a way as to be responsible for only one of three phases in the professional preparation of teachers. He suggests that NCATE addresses the pre-service preparation phase principally, while leaving the extended clinical training and continuing education phases to the state and school districts, respectively (p. 4-5).

Though it has existed as an organization for many decades, NCATE has undergone a number of changes and revisions, both minor and extensive, over the course of its history. The changes most germane to it role in contemporary teacher education reform have taken place, however, in two separate revisions which took place in 1987 and 1995. Wise and Leibbrand (1996) note that the centerpiece of the 1987 redesign revolved around the development of standards relating to the essential knowledge base for teachers. In this phase of the redesign, NCATE articulates its call for programs aimed at

pre-service teachers to be based on both current research as well as "best practice" (p. 203). Moore, Hopkins, and Tullis (1994) add that the 1987 redesign centered around five categories: Knowledge Base for Professional Education; Relationship to the World of Practice; Students; Faculty; and Governance and Resources (p. 29). In addition to these overarching categories, Moore, Hopkins, and Tullis further assess the 1987 redesign by pointing out eleven "key elements" which support the program changes:

1. Current research about effective teaching in education courses.
2. Strong background in liberal arts and general studies.
3. Rigorous academic studies in area of expertise.
4. Minimum of 10 weeks of student teaching.
5. Graduates followed into the first year of practice.
6. Practitioners assist in program development.
7. Testing to monitor basic skills.
8. 2.5 GPA required for admission to program.
9. Documentation of competencies upon program completion.
10. Ratio of faculty to students for clinical and field-based teaching experiences.
11. Total institution responsible for high quality of professional education. (p. 29)

These standards and key elements serve as the basis for the basic redesign and reconceptualization of NCATE in 1987.

Not quite a decade later, NCATE again underwent a revision process, although this time the accrediting organization focused on performance evaluations of pre-service teachers. That is, it began looking at new ways of determining and verifying whether or not per-service teachers were meeting specific expectations within teacher education programs. According to Wise and Leibbrand (1996), the revision undertaken in 1995 centered upon "performance, new forms of assessment, collaboration with the schools, technology, and diversity – all in the context of high-quality programs and continuous program evaluation" (p. 203). They go on to report that, as a result of the 1995 revision, NCATE supports the expansion of evaluation options germane to assuring high-caliber

teacher education programs, including the use of journals kept on both teaching and learning issues, student portfolios, observations and evaluations of the pre-service teacher, scores on tests of both content and pedagogical knowledge, and even the traditional grade point average of the students (p. 204). In this way, NCATE increases the options and avenues at its disposal as it examines teacher education programs through the process which eventually leads to the accreditation of the professional teacher education unit.

Although NCATE articulates a number of positions relevant to quality teacher education programming, the road to accreditation, of course, eventually travels through the basic standards. As a result of the reorganization which took place in the mid-1990s, NCATE (1994) denotes twenty standards which form the framework upon which the visitation teams base their evaluations and make their recommendation:.

> **Standard I.A: Conceptual Framework**
> The unit has high quality professional education programs that are derived from a conceptual framework(s) that is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.
> **Standard I.B: General Studies for Initial Teacher Preparation**
> The unit ensures that candidates have completed general studies courses and experiences in the liberal arts and sciences and have developed theoretical and practical knowledge.
> **Standard I.C: Content Studies for Initial Teacher Preparation**
> The unit ensures that candidates attain academic competence in the content that they plan to teach.
> **Standard I.D: Professional and Pedagogical Studies for Initial Teacher Preparation**
> The unit ensures that teacher candidates acquire and learn to apply the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills to become competent to work with all students.

Standard I.E: Integrative Studies for Initial Teacher Preparation
The unit ensures that teacher candidates can integrate general, content, and professional and pedagogical knowledge to create meaningful learning experiences for all students.
Standard I.F: Advanced Professional Studies
The unit ensures that candidates become more competent as teachers or develop competencies for other professional roles (e.g., school library media specialist, school psychologist, or principal).
Standard I.G: Quality of Instruction
Teaching in the unit is consistent with the conceptual framework(s), reflects knowledge derived from research and sound professional practice, and is of high quality.
Standard I.H: Quality of Field Experiences
The unit ensures that field experiences are consistent with the conceptual framework(s), are well-planned and sequenced, and are of high quality.
Standard I.I: Professional Community
The unit collaborates with higher education faculty, school personnel and other members of the professional community to design, deliver, and renew effective programs for the preparation of school personnel and to improve the quality of education in schools.
Standard II.A: Qualifications of Candidates
The unit recruits, admits, and retains candidates who demonstrate potential for professional success in schools.
Standard II.B: Composition of Candidates
The unit recruits, admits, and retains a diverse student body.
Standard II.C: Monitoring and Advising the Progress of Candidates
The unit systematically monitors and assesses the progress of candidates and ensures that they receive appropriate academic and professional advisement from admission through completion of their professional education programs.
Standard II.D: Ensuring the Competence of Candidates
The unit ensures that the candidate's competency to begin his or her professional role in schools is assessed prior to completion of the program and/or recommendation for licensure.
Standard III.A: Faculty Qualifications
The unit ensure that the professional education faculty are teacher scholars who are qualified for their assignments and actively engaged in the professional community.
Standard III.B: Composition of Faculty
The unit recruits, hires, and retains a diverse faculty
Standard III.C: Professional Assignments of Faculty
The unit ensures that policies and assignments allow faculty to be involved effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service.
Standard III.D: Professional Development of Faculty
The unit ensures that there are systematic and comprehensive activities to enhance the competence and intellectual vitality of the faculty.

> **Standard IV.A: Governance and Accountability of the Unit**
> The unit is clearly identified, operates as a professional community, and has the responsibility, authority, and personnel to develop, administer, evaluate, and revise all professional education programs.
> **Standard IV.B: Resources for Teaching and Scholarship**
> The unit has adequate resources to support teaching and scholarship by faculty and candidates.
> **Standard IV.C: Resources for Operating the Unit**
> The unit has sufficient facilities, equipment, and budgetary resources to fulfill its mission and offer quality programs. (p. 3-16)

It should be noted that each standard is followed by a number of indicators which further clarify what a program must do in order to satisfactorily meet each requirement.

In *Quality Assurance for the Teaching Profession*, NCATE claims that the heart of professional accreditation rests upon the four areas of standards which "emphasize prospective teacher performance in the context of solid preparation in professional and liberal arts studies" (p. 11). To summarize, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education focuses its attention on the following facets of professional preparation for educators: First, *the design of professional education* must emphasize teachers who have a strong liberal arts background coupled with the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in the primary or secondary classroom (p. 11). Next, *candidates* for professional education must be evaluated on their performance as pre-service teachers, utilizing portfolios, videos, and interviews as well as grades in order to assess their progress and competence (p. 11). Additionally, the *teacher education faculty* members should model effective teaching, sustain scholarly inquiry, seek professional development, and maintain their involvement in the world of practice (p. 11). Finally, the *governance and accountability* vehicles for the teacher education program must ensure that the resources necessary to meet the stated mission of the professional education unit

are available and accessible (p. 11). If and when these conditions and criteria are met, NCATE will formally accredit the teacher education program, indicating that the school, college, or department responsible for the preparation of classroom teachers has met or exceeded the expectations set forth in the standards.

Summation

Since the earliest days of the normal school movement, efforts aimed at the professional preparation of teachers have met with nearly constant criticism. In many cases, the steady stream of faultfinding has also been consistent, with critics complaining about and pointing to the same issues year after year. Calls for more rigorous subject matter preparation and less superfluous pedagogy, for example, have long dominated the teacher education reform literature. The contemporary reform agendas as articulated by the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum, John Goodlad, and NCATE represent some of the most recent and widely-read platforms which hold out promise for improved teacher education. While some of the reports return to familiar themes such as subject matter preparation and extended professional programs, they all seek to narrow the perceived gap between theory and practice with calls for educational entities such as Professional Development Schools, clinical settings, and Centers for Educational Renewal. Moreover, much of the contemporary teacher education reform literature attends to the task of improving the professional status of teachers and of teacher education programs within the higher education system. While the pathways to reform differ from report to report, each shares a commonly stated goal: the improvement of the professional preparation of American teachers and the concomitant enhancement of American schools.

CHAPTER FOUR

JOHN DEWEY AND CONTEMPORARY TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM

Points of Comparison and Contrast

At least two different angles must be considered and explored when attempting to explicate links which may or may not exist between the educational writings of John Dewey and contemporary efforts to reform teacher education. First, one must look for direct references to Dewey and his work made in the contemporary literature. Beyond that, however, one must also look for more tacit references in the reform reports, for ideas and positions in the contemporary work which Dewey advanced and championed in the first half of the twentieth century. Additionally, one might also properly consider negative references to Dewey's work; that is to say, references in the reform reports which reject or contradict the assertions made by Dewey may be just as informative as those which seem to support or echo Dewey. In comparing, then, the contemporary reform reports to the seminal work of Dewey, one should consider points of both positive comparison and negative departure, as well as those allusions made both overt and tacit.

In exploring the points of comparison between Dewey's work which speak to the education of teachers and that of contemporary reformers interested in changing the professional preparation of educators, I will initially follow the organizational structure of Chapter Two; the points of correlation and contradiction which exist between the work of Dewey and the reformers will center primarily upon the various treatments of issues such as the relationship of *schools and democracy*, the central role of *community*, the value of

growth as an educational ideal, the weight and significance of the *present*, the role of *subject matter*, the important purpose served by *problems and dissonance* in the learning process, and the necessity of *reflective thought*. Each issue will be introduced with a brief summary of Dewey's viewpoints before addressing the specifics of the contemporary reform literature. Additionally, a comparison of the respective positions of the Holmes Group, Carnegie Forum, NCATE, John Goodlad, and John Dewey regarding the central issue of the *role of education* as well as a discussion of the language of teacher education reform will conclude the chapter.

Schools and Democracy

The educational writings of John Dewey offer countless references to the fundamental relationship which exists between American schools and the nation's democratic ideals. Dewey (1916) dismisses as "superficial" the idea that the most critical link between schools and democracy is the necessary enlargement of an informed, critical electorate, leaving open the suggestion that such a connection must have importance beyond the ballot box (p. 87). He goes on to imply that his conception of democracy operates within the realm of such ideas as community life and the common goals shared by the individuals which make up a society. Boisvert (1998) argues that Dewey's vision of democracy cannot be fully appreciated or understood in a way which acknowledges only democracy's function as a system of governance:

> The role of schooling is usually considered to be that of assuring the presence of an educated electorate, one well prepared to make careful choices at the polling booth. But the Deweyan landscape is more topographically complex than this. An educated electorate which would continue a politics which reinforced the

> separations between, and the limitations on, social groups, is an electorate which is only in the incipient stages of building a democratic society. (p. 109)

Learning to be critical, informed participants in the electoral process, then, falls well short of Dewey's position on the character of a true democracy. Instead, he articulates a vision of democratic living which involves more complex issues such as shared interests, common goals, social conscience, and community life.

Pushing the definition of democracy, then, well beyond the conventional thinking limited to political institutional arrangements, Dewey sees democracy more as a way of life than anything else (Peters 1977, p. 103). For Dewey, the schoolhouse stands out as a place in which this democratic life could be lived, with students and teachers alike striving toward common causes and solving genuine problems in a spirit of cooperation and mutual support. Westbrook (1991) notes that Dewey sees the classroom as the locale in which young students can grow into effective membership in a democratic community; the school is not only the place to receive a grounding in the fundamentals of both communication and inquiry, but also the site at which students can develop the habits of industry, perseverance, and serviceableness (p. 94). In short, the properly organized classroom offers students the opportunity to improve not only themselves as individuals, but also to advance the society in which they live and learn. For Dewey, such lessons derive their significance not only from the prospects of the future, but even more so from the students' lives in the here and now. Ayers (1990) addresses the inextricable link which Dewey sees between school and society by pointing out the fact that education plays a role beyond that of simply preparing students to live in a democratic political system in the future:

> In this context, the democratic ideal loses all meaning without democratic schools that can create and recreate a democratic society. This idea goes beyond the notion of preparing children for future lives in society, and includes the notion of educating youngsters who can participate fully in collective life, youngsters who name things they consider to be unjust, inadequate, or deficient, and who create new directions and unique solutions. (p. 2)

Dewey's use of the word *democracy*, then, must be understood in its full and undiminished context, with a keen recognition of the various attendant issues which he attaches to the concept. His definition moves the role of schools and teachers well beyond the relatively simple task of producing savvy voters, moving it instead into the complex position of nurturing the growth of conscientious and moral human beings.

Although the Holmes Group fails to address the issue of democracy in any depth in its initial report, *Tomorrow's Teachers*, it attends much more to the issue in *Tomorrow's Schools of Education*. In the latter offering, not only does the Holmes Group emphasize the connection between schools and democracy, but it also pushes the definition of democracy beyond that of a mere political arrangement. Like Dewey, the Holmes Group (1995) claims that a genuinely democratic life sometimes depends upon subordinating "one's will for the good of the social contract" (p. 31). However, in the very next sentence, the value of democracy is tied back to a notion of economic advancement and success on the job. Whereas Dewey sees the importance of democratic living as immediate and present, the Holmes Group situates its significance wholly in the future, in some hope or belief that the cooperative skills one learns in the classroom will someday pay off in the workplace. To that end, the Holmes Group (1995) stresses that

"The schools, in their purest and ideal form, prepare young people to take their rightful place in American democracy, as old-fashioned as this may sound" (p. 40). Although both Dewey and the Holmes Group acknowledge a conceptualization of democracy as something beyond a particular brand of representative government which demands an informed and well-educated electorate, they differ in their respective understanding of the role of schools in promulgating a democratic life among students. For the Holmes Group, the promise of democracy depends upon the schools to prepare young individuals to one day participate in a democracy. For Dewey, the schools ought to be democratic places *in the present moment*, thereby guaranteeing a population not so much *prepared* to live the democratic life as already *accustomed* to doing so.

The Carnegie Corporation (1986) claims that "From the first days of the Republic, education has been recognized as the foundation of a democratic society for the nation and the individual alike" (p. 14). The group goes on to warn of the dangers inherent in an electorate which derives much of its collective knowledge from television, arguing that such a group is "too easily manipulated" (p. 15). Moreover, the organization charges schools with the task of providing a "deeper understanding necessary for a self-governing citizenry" and notes that schools must also provide access to a common heritage, both intellectual and cultural, if it hopes to successfully "bind its citizens together in a commonweal" (p. 15). Although the authors do not expand on the meaning or significance of any of these concepts, they do conclude by advocating the position that schools definitely must give citizens the skills necessary to make informed judgments concerning the complicated events and issues which dominate life in the industrial and technological economies of the late-twentieth century (p. 15). In line with its tendency to

link almost everything to the issue of economic concerns, the Carnegie Forum ties its belief in the importance of schools as democratic training grounds directly back to the health and well being of the nation's economy. Claiming that the cost of not meeting these stated requirements of schools in a democracy as the gradual erosion of our "democratic birthright" (p. 15), the authors draw a direct line between the health and wealth of the economy and the ability of schools to ensure future prosperity in the world market. Again, the reform literature assumes a position which upholds the fundamental importance of democracy, but does so in a way which situates that significance in the future more than the present – that is to say, by asserting the consequence of democracy in its capacity to ensure future prosperity above and beyond its potential to improve the quality of the present.

Whereas NCATE virtually ignores the issue of democracy in any political or social form, Goodlad attends to the need for democratic living in schools to a great degree. Like Dewey, Goodlad (1990) acknowledges that "There is more to a democracy...than a system of governance" (p. 48). In fact, his writings quite often turn to the essential role which schools must play in emphasizing classrooms as communities of learners and as places in which individuals strive to learn together cooperatively. Moreover, Goodlad (1994) overtly points to the critical connection which exists between the very nature of professional teacher education and the health of a democratic nation, as he envisions his centers of pedagogy as places which highlight the "centrality and the clarity of the teacher education mission in a democratic society" (p. 2). Goodlad (1990) also recognizes that the purposes of schools grew primarily out of concern for the welfare of our culture, and that those purposes have expanded to include the "whole process of

developing effective citizens, parents, workers, and individuals" (p. 48-9). He expands these purposes, however, and in doing so moves well beyond any conception which merely holds up schools as places which produce informed voters:

> Schools are major players in developing educated persons who acquire an understanding of truth, beauty, and justice against which to judge their own and our society's virtues and imperfections. Schools join with the home and other institutions in seeking to ensure that these individuals will be humane. This is a moral responsibility. (p. 49)

It should be recognized that these propositions come directly on the heels of Goodlad's assertion that there is much more to a democracy than a system of governance. In associating democratic living, then, with the idea that such characteristics ultimately lead to a capacity to improve and advance one's self as well as one's community, Goodlad aligns himself closely with the expanded vision of democracy articulated long ago by Dewey.

The Central Role of Community

Because Dewey conceives of democracy as a social process rather than simply a political mechanism, he necessarily addresses community concerns when he attends to the absolute need for democratic living; the two concepts cannot be separated in Deweyan philosophy. For Dewey, the concept of community occupies a place of fundamental importance in his conception of education. Dewey envisions schools as places which should not exist isolated and removed from the larger social context; rather the schools must operate as part of the community which surrounds them. Moreover, Dewey (1916) sees the necessity of schools becoming, in effect, miniature communities themselves (p.

5). Simply living in physical proximity does not stand as a sufficient condition in order to have community. Dewey (1916) maintains that people must be aware of and interested in some common goals, that they must be cognizant of a life in which they share a collective interest and stake (p. 5). Stated another way, Dewey (1938) sees some degree of communication and some level of shared goals as prerequisite for the presence of real community life (p. 6). Boisvert (1998) makes clear the comparison between Dewey's idea of democratic education and the fostering of community by noting education's role in creating the common bonds which connect individuals in a society:

> Education in democratic communities faces the task of enlarging the horizons of its participants, so that there are multiple opportunities for people from different social groups to share common interests. Education must attempt to foster the greatest amount of criss-crossing and zig-zagging of concerns among the populace. The greater the degree and breadth of shared interests, the closer is a society to the democratic model. (p. 109)

In this way, then, Dewey's vision of democratic living and community intersect and, in doing so, emphasize the critical role schools and teachers play in the strengthening of social bonds.

Educationally, Dewey believes that the creation of community is an absolutely essential element in order for people to learn. For Dewey, learning is predicated upon those common interests and ends which link individuals together in a social bond and ultimately facilitate the educational process. As Dewey (1916) argues, the "very process of living together" engenders learning (p. 6). Boisvert (1998) writes of the fundamental

connection between community and learning when summarizing the Deweyan view of social life:

> Since individuals always find themselves linked with others in a community, the search for truth is best conducted as a joint project. The thinker, sitting alone and contemplating, must be replaced by a community of inquirers who share in the task of uncovering, creating, and articulating truths. (p. 99)

Thus, a shared community life emerges in Dewey's work as a necessary condition of the learning process, and so becomes a fundamental imperative in his view of schools.

Because sharing common goals and interacting to solve problems requires communication, Dewey claims that we learn about ourselves and others when we must attempt to formulate our own experiences in ways which will make sense to others. Although Dewey (1916) does not suggest that all social life demands communication, he does submit that all communication is educative (p. 5). In Dewey's scheme, living in a community and striving collectively toward common goals require not only communication, but they also demand that problems be solved cooperatively. For these reasons, then, he places the utmost emphasis on the creation of genuine community within the schools and implores teachers to connect the classrooms as closely as possible to the larger communities in which they exist.

As with Dewey, the Holmes Group often turns to the issue of community when describing the circumstances necessary for quality education. Whether referring to common education or teacher education, community appears as a strong motif in much of the group's reform literature. In one of the more direct statements on the subject, the Holmes Group (1995) claims that "The ambitious kind of teaching and learning we hope

for will take place in a sustained way for large numbers of children only when classrooms and schools are thoughtfully organized as communities for learning" (p. vii). Similarly, the authors continue in the same vein by noting that classrooms operate most effectively when they function as a community (p. 72). Without question, the Holmes Group echoes Dewey's concern for the establishment of community as a necessary condition for genuine learning. However, the authors do very little in the way of explicating what they mean by their use of the term community or in regard to delineating their reasons for believing that learning in an environment characterized as a community is important in the first place. In other words, the Holmes Group makes essentially the same call for community which Dewey issues in his writing, but its readers are left to wonder as to the reasoning behind the argument.

The Holmes Group does call for one very specific recommendation which speaks to the issue of community, or the lack thereof, in many teacher education programs. In *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1995), the authors take note of the fact that many pre-service teachers matriculate through their professional education programs as individuals, rarely if ever feeling a part of a community of learners. As a result, the authors argue that tomorrow's school of education should arrange for students to work through the professional sequence of studies as members of cohort teams. That is to say, the Holmes Group urges teacher education programs to arrange for students to journey together "along a common path of professional learning and socialization that leads to lifelong personal and professional growth and development." The authors continue by noting that no students in a school of education should be denied the "support of a group of students who form their own small learning community" (p. 52). While one can easily see this

particular recommendation reconciling with the work of Dewey, the Holmes Group again fails to bolster its position with a detailed explanation of why such an arrangement should be in place. Holmes does not effectively connect the concepts of community and learning.

The fundamental need for community also appears in much of the work of John Goodlad. In summarizing the research of Zhixin Su, Goodlad (1991) argues that students in many teacher preparation programs fail to establish, either formally or informally, collegial interactions of any sort (p. 211). He concludes that much of the learning done by pre-service teachers as well as those established in the field is accomplished primarily on their own and in isolation. Following this line of thought leads Goodlad (1991) to lament the lack of cohesion and want of common principles which most pre-service teachers bring to their introduction to the field: "They come to teaching from diverse backgrounds of preparation, sharing little with respect to mission, goals, concepts, readings, and so on. Not deliberately socialized into teaching as members of cohort groups, they come through their preparation as individuals" (p. 265). Goodlad recognizes, just as Dewey and the Holmes Group, that the common ground and the collegiality must be essential elements in the teacher education program which hopes to tap into the power of community in preparing people to enter the classroom and teach.

In addition to calling for the intentional socialization (that is, the creation of community) with regard to the professional preparation of teachers, Goodlad follows Dewey's lead by articulating a number of reasons why establishing community is important in any educational setting. While discussing his findings relative to the elements commonly found in contemporary teacher education programs, Goodlad (1991)

laments that such preparation was lax in regard to "deliberately developing the skills of discourse, debate, analysis of conflicting views, compromise, and the like . . . " (p. 255). The communication skills Goodlad lists echo strongly the elements of discourse which Dewey suggests will be present if students are living in a learning environment marked by a genuine sense of community. While Dewey and Goodlad alike recognize the value in a classroom which welcomes mutual cooperation, Goodlad (1991) issues a cautionary note that "The whole school ethos – for teachers and students alike – is one of individual, competitive effort" (p. 208). Goodlad recommends, then, that the spirit of conflict and contention which characterizes the typical schooling experience be replaced with an ethos of cooperation and compromise. In this way, he calls for a shift toward learning for the individuals within a setting marked by its cohesion and collaboration; in short, he points to the inherent value of community.

In its *Standards*, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education calls for the professional education unit to operate as a "professional community" (p. 14). However, little follows that call which might shed additional light on what the authors mean by the term community or why it is worthy of pursuing as an educational element fundamental to quality teacher education. In contrast to the work of Dewey, the authors of the NCATE standards offer little in the way of explanation which might afford the reader a better understanding of what it means for a professional education unit to function as a community. It should be noted, however, that NCATE clarifies its position on community in work outside of the standards. In its *Handbook for Initial Accreditation Visits*, the authors claim that community revolves around the notion of a "shared vision" about teacher preparation (p. 11). This statement echoes Dewey's proposition which

holds that community exists, at least in part, when individuals share a common goal or vision. Further, Carter (1996) speaks on behalf of the council, however, when he notes that NCATE has learned over the years that learning "best thrives where it is supported by community" (p. 1). In clarifying further this idea, he continues by asserting that building community ought to occupy a fundamental place of importance in teacher preparation "due to its role in teaching tolerance, supporting difference, and rejecting discrimination" (p. 1). Although these attributes do not align precisely with Dewey's vision of community, they do begin to speak to the notion that building an educational community results in benefits to all learners individually as well as to the class collectively. In doing so, they echo Dewey's belief that community life fosters not only social progress, but also engenders personal development and growth at the same time.

The Value of Growth as an Educational Ideal

Whereas some may be inclined to view immaturity as a personality defect or a character trait to be overcome in the young, Dewey (1916) views it as an opportunity. More specifically, he views immaturity as the marker which suggests the potential for continued positive growth. In fact, continuous and steady growth stands as an educational imperative for Dewey and ranks as one of his ultimate goals for any individual. Hill (1984) suggests that Dewey's fundamental assertion holds that "the potential for growth and learning and wisdom of each individual will emerge under the proper conditions" (p. 310). This statement implies Dewey's stance that the teacher bears the responsibility for creating those proper conditions which lead, quite naturally and inevitably, to growth for each individual student. Moreover, Parkay (1992) points to Dewey's belief that professional teachers must recognize the significance of growth as an

educational ideal not only for their students but for themselves and, consequently, must move to "ever-increasing levels of excellence and competence" (p. 64). Clearly, Dewey presupposes that growth should not serve only as a goal for students while they work their way through school, but it must also become an aim for everybody through the course of living their lives.

In order for Dewey to consider any activity as genuinely educative, he contends that it must lead into growth which opens up the possibility for further intellectual and personal development. Important to note, however, is the fact that Dewey does not hold up the promise of growth as fundamental solely because of its capacity to positively impact one's future and, indeed, to affect the direction of one's future; rather, Dewey holds up growth as an educational ideal for its own sake, for its power in the present moment. Dewey (1916) submits with a cautionary note that "Growth is regarded as having an end instead of being an end" (p. 50). Dewey (1934) even references the continual process of growing as a benchmark in determining exactly what he means by the terms *education* and *educated person*:

> In the first place, it is a process of development, of growth. And it is the *process* and not merely the result that is important. A truly healthy person is not something fixed and completed. He is a person whole processes and activities go on in such a way that he will continue to be healthy. Similarly, an educated person is the person who has the power to go on and get more education. (p. 4)

Thus, Dewey contends that one could hardly overemphasize the capacity of a student to incessantly incorporate new ideas and knowledge into the stock and store of previous

experience, synthesizing the two into something completely new, while at the same time ensuring the continuation of the process – of future growth.

The Holmes Group (1995) also acknowledges the necessity of ensuring that teachers develop the capacity to grow in their professional knowledge over time. In explicating the concept behind Tomorrow's Schools of Education, the authors claim that "The TSE will provide opportunities for them [educators] to keep growing. Lifelong professional development will be every bit as much of a primary function of the TSE as initial credentialing" (p. 55). While placing the capacity to *continue* learning on the same plane as the ability to simply demonstrate what one has *already* learned, the Holmes Group's portrayal of growth remains circumscribed by a traditional model which holds that an outside entity (in this case, a school) holds the primary responsibility for initiating a teacher's continuing education. Similarly, NCATE proposes in *Quality Assurance for the Teaching Profession* that the new professional teacher "continually seeks professional growth and development" (p. 9). Without any further explanation, one might reasonably assume that the authors are thinking about such opportunities for professional development or growth which have long been available to teachers, generally through the efforts of local school districts. Although such a conception of growth certainly stands as a *necessary* element in the professional status of teachers, it is not a *sufficient* condition to meet the standard set by Dewey who called for individuals capable and willing to direct their own growth through the cultivation of mental traits and capacities such as curiosity, open-mindedness, and discipline.

Likewise, the Carnegie Forum makes a clear statement of its support for the idea that individuals must engage in lifelong learning. In describing the type of person who

will likely succeed in a knowledge-based economy, the Carnegie Forum (1986) emphasizes that "Such people will have the need and the ability to learn all the time, as the knowledge required to do their work twists and turns with new challenges and the progress of science and technology" (p. 20). Interestingly, the claim made here implies that the ability to learn "all the time" does not necessarily apply to all people; rather, only those who hope to compete in the economy which the authors foresee require the capacity to do so. Further, the authors draw a direct link between one's ability to initiate lifelong learning and the benefits to be enjoyed in the workplace. In this way, the similar premises held by the Carnegie Forum and by Dewey conflict in the reasoning which holds up growth as an ideal in the first place. While Carnegie attaches its significance to the ultimate end of economic competitiveness if not economic survival, Dewey simply urges the educational significance of growth as an end unto itself.

As an educational imperative, growth appears frequently in the work of Goodlad. In the eleventh of his nineteen postulates aimed at providing a broad framework for the evaluation and design of teacher education programs, Goodlad (1991) writes that such programs ought to be devised to ensure that pre-service teachers explore the nature of teaching and schooling and "assume that they will do so as a natural aspect of their careers" (p. 59). Goodlad's position aligns with Dewey's in that he acknowledges growth both as a matter for the individual as well as one which should permeate every aspect of one's professional life. Writing more specifically about programs designed for the preparation of teachers, Goodlad (1994) urges that the mission of such programs must not be simply a matter of preparation for the mechanics of the profession; instead, teacher education programs must develop in the students "the intellectual habits of reflection on

their calling and daily work that are the mark of a professional continuously engaged in self improvement" (p. 38). Again, Goodlad touches on a conceptualization of growth which dovetails easily with Dewey's own sense of the term by emphasizing both its natural and constant aspects as well as its dependence on the individual to initiate and direct his or her own growth, personally and professionally.

The Significance of the Present

Dewey's appreciation and respect for the potential inherent in immaturity leads naturally into his recognition and valuation of the present moment. Although he acknowledges a link between education and preparation for the future, Dewey consistently privileges the moment at hand over an uncertain and ambiguous future. His critique of devising an educational plan based upon speculation about skills and capacities which might be needed in the future runs throughout his work on schools and learning. Moreover, Dewey (1916) denounces the kind of education which merely aims to groom children for the responsibilities of adult life by noting that proceeding in such a way does little more than place those individuals in a sort of probationary social status (p. 54). Boisvert (1998) summarizes Dewey's position as it relates to education as preparation:

> Education is not preparation. Education, for Dewey, is important only so far as it is treated as an end in itself. Education treated as preparation for external and future ends represents one great failing of traditional pedagogical methods. (p. 97)

In Dewey's approach to learning, then, educators make a mistake upon adopting goals and objectives intended to be cashed in like a pedagogical promissory note at some later

date. Instead, his philosophical stance holds that education must be pursued for its own sake and on its own time frame. Thus, Dewey's educational scheme could not brook the acquisition of subject matter for the sole purpose of preparation for passing an examination. Rather, Dewey would have the students use the subject matter in order to solve a problem with immediate relevancy to the students' lives.

Dewey does not dismiss the importance of the future out of hand, although his thoughts often focus primarily upon the present. Rather, he subscribes to a position which holds that the only means of genuine and meaningful preparation available to us rests in our capacity to live productively and critically in the moment. Dewey (1938) points out the obvious when he reminds us that "We always live at the time we live and not at some other time, and only by extracting at each present time the full meaning of each present experience are we prepared for doing the same thing in the future" (p. 49). Thus, planning an educational program with an eye only to future remains an impoverished approach because it sacrifices the power of the present moment and fails to recognize that simple fact that we cannot ever know for sure what the future holds.

In *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1995), The Holmes Group devotes a section titled "Special Knowledge About the Knowledge Needs of Each Next Generation" to the topic of preparation and the curricular needs of students. The authors claim that schools must, above all else, provide students with an education that "prepares them for participation in a democracy, gives them the ability to reason and solve problems, and eventually, leads to a productive and rewarding life" (p. 31). Clearly, the Holmes Group places a heavy emphasis on the issue of preparation and certainly views the school as largely responsible for equipping students with the skills which lead to a fruitful future.

The authors explain that education faculty should draw upon "future projections" in order to evaluate and predict the likely learning needs for each successive generation of students (p. 31). Thus, the Holmes Group arrives at the following conclusion: "Knowledge about the knowledge needed by the next generation helps professional educators decide, each step of the way, what children should know" (p. 32). Such assertions run counter to Dewey's stated position on the vagaries associated with trying to predict the needs of the future; that is to say, the Holmes Group stresses the need to closely analyze and accurately predict the demands of tomorrow in the quest to establish a quality educational program for today. In contrast, Dewey places the emphasis squarely on the present, while he privileges the moment at hand over the supposed needs of the future.

Like the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum expresses a real need to look to the future in order to plot the proper educational path to take in the present moment. While acknowledging that some schools emphasize the mastery of routine skills and the rote memorization of information, the Carnegie Forum (1986) argues that schools must do more for their students by stressing an educational scheme aimed at developing higher-order thinking and reasoning skills. "But a much higher order of skills is required to prepare students for the unexpected, the non-routine world they will face in the future," claim the authors (p. 25). Whereas Dewey's own work certainly upholds the call supporting thinking skills which move beyond routine mental operations, his writing also rejects the kind of thinking that would suggest teachers can prepare students for the unexpected. Thus, the Carnegie Forum joins the Holmes group in pointing to the

necessity of looking to the future in planning an effective, worthwhile educational scheme.

Goodlad approaches the subject of preparation within the context of his research on teacher education programs. After studying a number of different professional education programs around the country, Goodlad (1991) declares that the "dominant program ethos . . . is preparation for the classroom" (p. 253). While such a statement resonates with what might logically be expected of a program aimed at pre-service teachers, Goodlad (1994) clarifies his position in his book on reforming teacher education titled *Educational Renewal.* Explaining that the mission of a teacher education program must move beyond simply preparing individuals in the mechanics of teaching, he continues by noting that "There may be little difference in the initial performance of one teacher trained only in the how-to-do-its of generic methods of teaching and another guided by basic principles. . . . But the fundamental differences will become apparent over time" (p. 38). In this way, Goodlad tacitly echoes the admonition made by Dewey – a warning against the temptation to articulate a certain and limited stock of skills which *may* or *may not* be sufficient to prepare one for all eventualities likely to occur in the future.

The work of NCATE does not address the issue of valuing the present in any way which might be construed as similar to the position Dewey assumes. Perhaps the most telling indication of NCATE's stance on preparation versus the present might be discerned in its stance on subject matter acquisition. Understandably, the accreditation organization calls for standards relative to pre-service teachers having a sufficient preparation in their content areas, in pedagogical knowledge, and other professional roles,

such as media specialists or counselors. In each case, the pre-service teachers are expected to master a certain skill or acquire a particular body of knowledge for use at some point in the future. While nobody would deny the importance of developing these skills for use in the classroom at some point, the NCATE standards do not allow for the pre-service teacher to grow and develop as a learner for his or her own sake. All skills and knowledge derive value from their capacity to make one a more effective teacher at a later date. In this way, the teacher emerges in the NCATE literature quite often as one who necessarily must possess a certain body of knowledge as opposed to one who actively generates and constructs knowledge as a natural part of living and teaching.

The Role of Subject Matter

True to his tendency toward ideological reconciliation, Dewey attempts to look at two sides of the debate concerning subject matter and its role in education. On the one hand, Dewey certainly recognizes the necessity of knowing a certain amount and quality of information; he calls for students to be well grounded in their discipline's knowledge and correct in their facts. However, he also refuses to let the significance of subject matter rest upon the passive foundation of mere mechanical acquisition. Instead, Dewey concludes that subject matter ought to be considered important not because of its inherent value as an intellectual commodity, but for it practical use in solving real problems. Tanner (1997) points out that Dewey holds a critical stance toward the traditional view of a school subject "as a set of facts and principles mastered through effort rather than interest..." (p. 20). Arguing that a simplistic focus on learning subject matter for its own sake divests the learners of real agency and places the authority for learning in the teachers and books, Dewey (1938) suggests that simply learning what others already

know engenders static learning and passivity in the students (p. 19). For Dewey, learning must be about more than simply filling one's mental storehouse with disassociated facts and fragmented figures.

Instead of accepting a more traditionally held view of subject matter as the end goal of one's learning, Dewey chooses to reposition subject matter along the educational continuum and to divest it of its firmly held position at the end of the process. That is to say, Dewey redefines what subject matter is and in what ways it might be used. First, he reconceptualizes subject matter, seeing it not only as the content of instruction, but also as the way in which the teacher presents the information and the way in which pupils treat that information (Archambault, 1964, p. xxvi). Moreover, Dewey (1910) reconfigures the educational continuum by moving subject matter from the position as an *end* to a more supportive role in which it is used as a *means* (p. 52). For example, Tanner (1997) reports that the teachers in Dewey's Lab School held that the answer to the problem of connecting students in a meaningful way with the material to be learned could be found in coordinating "experiences that reflect subject matter as the outcome of human activities and problems" (p. 151). Subject matter becomes, in Dewey's scheme, less of something to be acquired and placed in individual mental compartments and more of something to be used.

For Dewey (1938), subject matter has absolutely no inherent value, especially as it exists as bits and pieces of disconnected facts. He suffers no such idea as educational value in the abstract (p. 46). Specifically, Dewey sees subject matter as something to be used in order to solve genuine problems. And because Dewey recognizes the fact that nobody could possibly anticipate each and every problem which might arise over the

course of a lifetime, he necessarily rejects the idea that an eternally good curriculum could possibly exist. The value of a particular bit of knowledge rests not in its mere possession, but in its capacity to elevate one to solve an authentic, perplexing problem. Subject matter has another value for Dewey as well. Writing of the fundamental importance of collateral learning, Dewey (1938) points out that students have the potential to develop certain habits of the mind in the process of mastering a particular body of knowledge, admitting that those enduring attitudes "may be and often [are] much more important than the spelling lesson or lesson in geography or history that is learned" (p. 48). Collateral learning would include such traits as open-mindedness, curiosity, and the capacity to develop questions. In approaching subject matter from such an angle, then, Dewey both reconceptualizes and repositions subject matter; in doing so, he does not nullify its significance in any educational sense, but merely recasts it in a different light.

The Holmes Group focuses a great deal of attention on the importance and place of subject matter, as the topic appears frequently throughout its publications. To begin, the Holmes Group (1986) proposes that the most basic level of teacher licensing be that of the Instructor. According to the authors, the Instructors will be licensed to teach only those subjects that they "know well," a phrase defined as those subjects in which the teacher has an undergraduate major or minor (p. 10). Additionally, these Instructors will have to pass an exam, described by the authors as "sufficiently difficult so that many college graduates could not pass" (p. 11). With these credentials in hand, the Instructor would be permitted to teach in a classroom setting, although they would not operate independently. That is to say, they would be supervised by a Professional Teacher.

Although the Holmes Group recommends that this class of teacher must pass an exam on the "rudiments of pedagogy" (p. 11), this proposal runs counter to Dewey's contention that subject matter expertise does not guarantee that a teacher will successfully convey anything to the students. Rather, Dewey warns that the solid knowledge of the discipline must be accompanied by an equally concrete understanding of the pedagogy of the subject.

The authors of the Holmes Group most assuredly acknowledge the position which holds that an expert teacher must know more than just the subject, although they potentially undermine this assertion when they recommend placing teachers in classrooms (of whatever licensing level) who possess only a minimal, rudimentary handle on pedagogy. In characterizing the requirements of a Professional Teacher, for example, the Holmes Group (1986) notes that "One cannot be a good teacher of a subject unless one is a good student of that subject; teaching cannot be content-free. But to be a good teacher, it is not enough to know a subject well as a student. One must know its pedagogy" (p. 12). To this end, the authors recommend the elimination of generic undergraduate methods classes, pointing to the need for "subject matter-oriented studies of teaching and learning" (p. 17). Further clarifying its position, the Holmes Group (1995) calls for more experiences for pre-service teachers that help the students "integrate the disciplines so that they learn more about knowledge instead of merely about subjects" (p. 32). In this way, the Holmes Group aligns itself at least in part with Dewey's contention that subject matter as a concept involves more than simply the facts and figures which constitute the discipline, but also the *way* in which the discipline is approached and structured in the classroom.

The Carnegie Forum also concedes that teachers must bring more to the classroom than a solid grounding in their disciplines. In describing the exams the authors envision for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, the Carnegie Forum (1986) recommends that the tests should measure teachers' knowledge of their subjects, their understanding of general pedagogy, and their grasp of techniques required to teach specific bodies of subject matter (p. 66). The authors provide numerous charts making international comparisons on subject matter tests, highlighting deficiencies of American students relative to other students around the world. The effect of this approach could be to relegate subject matter to the level of a commodity, to little more than an index of some sort which must somehow be elevated through the efforts of teachers and students. If such comparative scores of subject matter acquisition for American students do not rise, the authors suggest that nothing less than the nation's way of life is a risk (p. 15). Thus, the Carnegie Forum departs radically from Dewey's position which holds that subject matter is useful inasmuch as it allows one to solve a problem of immediate importance; rather, the Carnegie Forum holds forth subject matter knowledge as the key to solving a perceived problem facing the nation as a whole; that is to say, subject matter expertise among the nation's school children can stem the rising tide of international competition in the global marketplace.

While commenting on the connection between common school curriculum and teacher education programs, Goodlad (1994) charges that a ubiquitous curriculum tends to make subject matter content the end of the educational process. Noting that students will inevitably be tested numerous times in regard to their acquisition of subject matter, Goodlad goes on to remind his reader that "Subject matter is what teachers are expected

to deliver. This is what teacher education is to prepare teachers for. So it has been, and so it is. But this is not what could and should be" (p. 136). In the process of pointing out his belief that subject matter must have significance beyond simply its capacity to be possessed, Goodlad assumes a stance similar to that of Dewey. For both, the acquisition of facts and figures and the concomitant testing cannot be the beginning and end of the educational process; rather, the subject matter must be used to propel the students into new areas of learning if it is to be considered of value.

Also like Dewey, Goodlad attends to the idea that teachers must be aware of more than just the facts associated with their discipline. Indeed, the expertise of the educator must extend to a comprehension of the pedagogy of the subject. To underscore this point, Goodlad (1994) cites research aimed at understanding why so many math, social studies, language, and science teachers have such a difficult time interesting their students as compared to those who teach the arts, vocational courses, and physical education. Few teachers in his study cited any problems with their own knowledge of the subject, a fact which Goodlad takes as a sign of "their innocence with respect to knowing their subjects from a pedagogical perspective" (p. 181). On another occasion, Goodlad (1991) proposes that all teachers learn their subject matter twice: "the first time in order that it be a part of their being, and the second time in order to teach it" (p. 52). In recommending that educators know their subjects in two entirely different ways, Goodlad follows the lead of Dewey in suggesting that the very definition of *subject matter knowledge* – at least as far as it pertains to teachers – be extended to include the idea of how that information is conveyed to others and what it means in one's life.

Although subject matter specialization does not occupy a position of central emphasis in the work of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, the organization addresses the issue in both its *Standards* and in other publications, as well. NCATE (1994) states in the list of program standards that the professional education unit must ensure that "teacher candidates attain academic competence in the content they plan to teach." The authors continue by noting the pre-service teachers must "complete a sequence of courses and/or experiences to develop an understanding of the structure, skills, core concepts, ideas, values, facts, methods of inquiry, and uses of technology for the content they plan to teach" (p. 4). NCATE does not indicate the rationale behind such a standard, leaving a reader to safely assume that the organization recognizes the fundamental necessity of subject matter expertise for a successful teacher. NCATE does, however, clarify its position relative to subject matter's place and role in *Quality Assurance for the Teaching Profession*. The authors urge all teachers to possess a strong liberal arts background coupled with the knowledge and skills necessary to encourage positive experiences in the classroom. NCATE holds that "Not only must the new professional teacher understand the mysteries of calculus, she must know how to impart that understanding to her students" (p. 11). Here again, the writers suggest a critical link exists between subject matter mastery and the way in which the teacher introduces the subject into the lives of his students. Although the organization does not explore the issue any further, and certainly not to the degree that Dewey pursues the topic, NCATE makes at the very least an acknowledgment that the issue of subject matter is certainly more problematic than simply transferring facts and figures from one person to another; rather, subject matter is seen in the larger context of good pedagogy.

Problems and Dissonance

For Dewey, problems must serve not only to confound, but to prompt students in actually using the subject matter they learn, to apply it to relevant and interesting dilemmas. Although it could sound antithetical to an educator wishing to proceed with a certain degree of tranquillity, Dewey calls for teachers to allow for conflict in the learning process. Fishman and McCarthy (1996) note that Dewey's educational philosophy makes explicit the need for teachers to allow students the opportunity to puzzle through and solve their own problems: "As Dewey puts it, solutions cannot be passed from teacher to student 'like bricks.' Rather, only when students experience perplexity and shape the problem in their own way can they supply the energy necessary for learning" (p. 3). More specifically, Dewey argues that the proper type and degree of cognitive discord introduced into the classroom prompts students to think through conundrums, look for paths toward resolution, and settle on workable solutions.

Dewey (1938) defines an effective problem as one which emerges out of immediate needs and concerns, one which students can solve within the context of their own skills and capacities, and one which creates in the students an "active quest" for new information and ultimately resolution (p. 79). In order to achieve this state of affairs in the classroom, Dewey (1938) submits that teachers must engender a learning environment which encourages students to venture into unfamiliar territory and experience new situations. Such quests to solve problems and gain new insights may be taken individually or even communally, as Tanner (1997) points to Dewey's own anthropology which suggests that community is made up of individuals who "share in steering the course of human destiny by solving problems" (p. 14). The ultimate purpose of seeking

and solving problems rests in the power of conflict to lead students into new and advanced realms of thought. To that end, Dewey maintains that "Unless a given experience leads out into a field previously unfamiliar no problems arise, while problems are the stimulus to thinking" (p. 79). Only in this way, Dewey holds, can authentic learning centered around the experiences and needs of the students proceed.

In describing its plan for effective teacher education, the Holmes Group (1995) also situates problems near the heart of professional preparation for educators. "Everyday concerns, not abstractions," suggest the authors, "provide points for educators to ponder and explore" (p. 73). It appears as if the Holmes Group emphasizes the fundamental need for opportunities to solve real, concrete dilemmas. However, the authors also suggest that students do not become effective problem-solvers because of natural ability or because they learn general techniques which apply to *all* problems. Instead, the Holmes Group subscribes to the idea that students become effective problem-solvers when they learn "distinct problem-solving strategies for different knowledge domains" (p. 30). Although this position implies at least a degree of importance attached to the notion of solving problems, this approach also intimates the possibility that learning strategies (specific or otherwise) should become the focus above and beyond resolving actual problems and overcoming immediate difficulties. Moreover, the Holmes Group position conflicts with Dewey's work in that the problems mentioned in *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* do not necessarily arise out of the immediate experiences and needs of the students. Rather, the reader might reasonably assume that the teachers shoulder the primary responsibility for generating difficulties to be overcome in an effort to create scenarios in which problem-solving strategies might easily be employed by the students. Although the

Holmes Group position in this case does not align directly with that of Dewey, it certainly speaks more to the issue than does the work of either the Carnegie Forum or NCATE, as neither group attends to the worth or necessity of solving problems as part of the learning process.

Gooodlad's research which looks at typical teacher education programs does not suggest that the current practice in the preparation of educators taps into the potential Dewey sees in solving problems in the process of living and learning. Goodlad (1991) charges that some education faculty claim the students are too immature to deal effectively with, for example, the moral issues which make teaching school so complex and problematic (p. 293). Further, he charges that "scarcely any efforts to introduce teacher education students to the calcified problems that school reformers have addressed with little success over the years" (p. 254). In pointing out the dearth of opportunities of pre-service teachers to wrestle with the genuine and relevant problems inherent in education, he also emphasizes the need for such experiences if a student's professional preparation is to be as complete as possible. Thus, Goodlad (1994) arrives at one of his postulates, his "standards" which describe effective teacher preparation, claiming that education students must be afforded the chance to encounter and attempt to resolve conflict:

> Programs for the education of educators must engage future teachers in the problems and dilemmas arising out of the inevitable conflicts and incongruities between what is perceived to work in practice and the research and theory supporting other options. (p. 91)

Although this does not perhaps represent the general call for introducing conflict into the classroom made by Dewey, Goodlad's work points clearly to the desirability – in fact the necessity – of teacher education students finding opportunities and encouragement to solve relevant and real problems in the course of their professional preparation.

Reflective Thought

It may seem logical to conclude that the learning process completes itself when, through the efforts of the student, a problem is solved or a difficulty meets with resolution. However, Dewey points to reflection as the next, necessary step to be taken. Dewey (1910) contends that reflective thought includes "Active, persistent, and careful consideration" of any kind of knowledge or belief, along with the considerations such consideration prompts (p. 6). LaBoskey (1993) notes that Dewey's understanding of reflective thought requires certain attitudes of "openmindedness, responsibility, and wholeheartedness" (p. 26). In other words, a teacher or student engaged in reflection must be willing to suspend judgment temporarily, to live in a state of flux, and actively search for both supporting and contradictory evidence.

One of the primary benefits of living a reflective life in and out of the classroom, according to Dewey (1910), is the avoidance of a routine, inert mental existence (p. 14). Unfortunately, the very type of environment which often stifles or destroys one's capacity to think reflectively also tends to thrive in schools. Because so much of formal education inclines toward the rote memorization of facts and the passive acquisition of information, reflective thought becomes superfluous. That is to say, when teachers assume the task of organizing information and making certain that discrete bits of knowledge are in no way problematic, they also may be diminishing the need for reflective thought and for the

student to work through problems, seeking resolution. In this way, students lose the power inherent in reflective thought and instead surrender their potential for learning to the authority figure of the teacher.

Students are, of course, not the only ones who can benefit from reflective thought. Tanner (1997) claims that "Teachers need to be able to stop and think – collaboratively and individually" (p. 168). Additionally, Tanner claims that the educators who taught in Dewey's Lab School always took the opportunity to slow down and reflect on their work, and that such an opportunity existed as a natural part of the curriculum development process. Also writing about Dewey's position on teachers and reflection, Tann (1993) agrees that Dewey's work emphasizes the need to actively consider one's beliefs and practices in the classroom. In fact, Dewey holds that the only means available for teachers to avoid acting as mere technicians in the classroom, to escape the tendency to fall into thoughtless and routine action, is to become a "reflective practitioner" (p. 54). In this way, Dewey subscribes to the necessity for all persons engaged in the educational process – students and teachers alike – to assume the role of learners who constantly engage in reflective thought.

The Holmes Group similarly recognizes the imperative nature of encouraging reflective thought in students and teachers alike. In the course of listing what it considers fundamental elements of a core knowledge base requisite in quality teacher education, the Holmes Group (1995) lists "Inquiry, Reflection, and R&D in the Interest of Young People's Learning" (p. 70). By way of explanation, the authors continue by noting that educators should learn how to "reflect productively" on the actions and learning of their students (p. 73). Moreover, the Holmes Group envisions the TSE (Tomorrow's School of

Education) as the place which will ensure that pre-service teachers are predisposed to act as reflective practitioners. The Carnegie Forum (1986) also makes mention of reflection, claiming that the organization's fundamental take on a truly professional environment includes more time for all professional teachers to "reflect, plan, and discuss teaching innovations and problems with their colleagues" (p. 60). Finally, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, writing *in Quality Assurance for the Teaching Profession*, charges that the professional teacher "reflects on practice and changes methods that are not working" (p. 9). Although the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum, and NCATE all recognize reflection as a critical element worthy of emphasis, not one of the groups articulates a clear vision of why it is that reflection should be pursued as a goal or how acting as a reflective practitioner would quantitatively or qualitatively differ from one who does not.

According to Goodlad's research, obstacles exist at every turn for the professional educator wishing to work in schools as a reflective practitioner. Like Dewey, Goodlad warns that reflection takes time and can only be done when an individual is willing and able to simply slow down and think. To that end, Goodlad (1991) claims that teacher education programs typically work against the goal of creating a learning atmosphere in which students can work to solve problems and overcome dilemmas through both exploration and reflection: "The rush to cram it all into the limited time available in teacher education programs appeared to abort the emergence of sustained inquiry and reflection" (p. 265). Goodlad (1994) continues by noting that the school settings in which pre-service teachers ultimately end up rarely support an atmosphere conducive to "reflective, introspective, or self-critical" inquiry (p. 18). His solution to the problem

emerges as the blending of course work and field experiences in teacher education, a fusion of two typically separate components of professional preparation which Goodlad sees as joined by reflective thought (p. 187). Interestingly, both Dewey and Goodlad see reflective inquiry as means to a larger goal. For Dewey, reflection leads ultimately to growth; for Goodlad, reflection emerges as a tool to effect educational renewal. In both cases, reflection serves as an essential element serving the greater goal of progress.

Purposes of Education

Comparing the finer points of Dewey's work with that of the contemporary voices in teacher education reform emerges as a critical aspect of this study. However, the points of departure and alignment which exist among the various positions with respect to education *generally* must also be addressed. It becomes absolutely essential to look at the fundamental assumptions about the purpose of formal education which underlie not only Dewey's work, but also the writing of the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum, John Goodlad, and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. In this way, a comparison can be made between the position each assumes in regard to the need for, purpose of, and ends associated with a formal system of education.

As is often the case, Dewey looks to the past in order to situate and explain his own ideas about what course to take and what position to support in regard to the ultimate aims of a general education. According to Boisvert (1998), Dewey articulates a very traditional stance concerning the issue of education:

> To say that he was old-fashioned is to indicate that his model of education was a traditional kind of formation: the kind that children would have gotten in the home or on the farm. The whole challenge of Deweyan educational philosophy

> involves the attempt to preserve the best of home education in a world where schooling as a distinct institution had become a necessity. (p. 96)

In this way, Dewey's stance on the most appropriate educational scheme represents a typical effort to reconcile two seemingly polar positions and, thus, avoid the pitfall of thinking in dualisms. Moreover, one can discern in Dewey's attempt to synthesize the best of education at home and at school a general stance which holds that the fundamental problem in education is the harmonizing of both social and individual needs and ends (Tanner, 1997, p. 25). In other words, when thinking about Dewey's fundamental stance on the purposes and ends of education, one cannot avoid speaking of both social and personal aims.

Without question, Dewey avoids narrow prescriptions concerning the ultimate end of education. Fishman and McCarthy (1996) note that "Dewey's educational goals focus on the development of certain habits and dispositions rather than on the acquisition of a fixed body of knowledge or belief" (p. 346). Recognizing that times constantly change and viewing a comprehensive set of educational goals as mere folly, Dewey settles on a position which holds that the business of education, broadly formulated, ought to properly focus on the development of sound thinkers capable of directing their own growth and advancement in learning. Thus, Dewey calls for education to encourage mental habits which lead one to have an open-minded approach to solving problems, to cultivate rigorous reasoning skills, and to develop habits of the mind which result in beliefs based on principles rather than mere guesses or assertions.

Ultimately, however, Dewey centers his idea of education upon the idea of growth, a concept which implies activity. In fact, Archambault (1964) concludes that

Dewey sees the ends of education in terms of processes rather than as static goals (p. xxi). In order to be considered successful or worthwhile, education must equip the learner with the power to effect change not only for himself, but also for his society. To that end, Dewey (1916) posits that "The business of education is rather to liberate the young from reviving and retraversing the past than to lead them to a recapitulation of it" (p. 73). The learner must be able to use his own skills, capacities, and inclinations to move forward with his learning and to direct not only his own experiencing of the world, but to change the world itself. As Dewey (1897) summarizes, "the process and the goal of education are one and the same thing" (p. 434). Thus, the ultimate aim of education turns around on itself, emerging then as the capacity to direct one's own education, without the support or the structure of a formal school setting.

The Holmes Group articulates a vision of educational aims which holds out a promise of social equity and harmony. Writing in *Tomorrow's Schools of Education* (1995), the authors argue that the "frayed but enduring" promise of public education is that of "society's great equalizer" (p. 42). Beyond such an aim which looks to ameliorate the circumstances which serve only to ensure disparity and fragmentation in the society at large, the Holmes Group also points to three other, more specific, goals for education: Schools should prepare students to participate in a democracy, provide students with the capacity to reason and problem solve, and lead students in such a direction which ultimately leads to a life both productive and rewarding (p. 31). These aims represent lofty goals which find support in the literature of Dewey. It should be noted, however, that in articulating such goals for education, the Holmes Group creates a scenario in which an individual might actually *complete*, at some time, his or her education. In other

words, these aims represent attainable goals which merit consideration, but which also set up a circumstance which makes further education unnecessary.

For the Carnegie Forum, the ultimate goal of producing an educated population comes around again and again to issues tied up with standards of living and the abilities necessary to thrive in a competitive global economy. In short, the Carnegie authors situate their call for the reform of teacher education as well as their fundamental position on education in general upon economic concerns and the United States' position in the world marketplace. In stating its purpose behind the call for educational reform, the Carnegie Forum (1986) claims that the nation's educational system must be rebuilt "to match the drastic change needed in our economy if we are to prepare our children for productive lives in the 21st century. . . . The cost of not doing so will be a steady erosion in the American standard of living" (p. 14). The authors assume a stance clearly dominated with economic and market concerns, as the very title of their document (*A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*) suggests that the plan draws its impetus from the need to prepare for future eventualities, most specifically the fluxes and changes which will inevitably occur in the world's economy.

Although the vast majority of the Carnegie Forum's rhetoric concerning the aims and purposes of education centers on economic issues, one can find instances in which other matters are considered. For instance, the Carnegie Forum (1986) claims that the country must encourage its young students to become "humane and caring people imbued with a set of values that enables them to use their skill in the service of the highest goals of the larger society" (p. 20). Having said that, however, the language turns again and again to issues of competitiveness and stature in a global economy; that is to say, the

report repeatedly assumes a position which presumes winners and losers in an economic zero-sum game. The authors continue by claiming that "Our argument, then, is simple. If our standard of living is to be maintained . . . our schools must graduate the vast majority of their students with achievement levels long thought possible for only the privileged few" (p. 21). Despite periodic mention of educational aims outside of the scope of global economic competitiveness, the Carnegie Forum maintains a consistent position which holds that the ultimate aim of improving the education of our nation's youth rests upon the premise that we must do so in order to maintain the current standard of living some have come to enjoy.

At numerous turns within his work on teacher education reform, Goodlad (1994) addresses the necessity of articulating and clarifying educational goals. Goodlad claims, in fact, that the myriad bureaucratic requirements placed on public school teachers make it difficult to "respond to their own inner voices or any other voices that might help them define and carry out the educative role" of formal schooling. Rather, the aims and goals of education become wrapped up within and confused with tests, Carnegie units, texts, and graduation requirements (p. 34-35). Goodlad (1994) poses an even more disturbing picture than the educator too busy to settle on a cogent, meaningful notion of the role of education when he notes that some perceive the function of the educational system to be that of "processing raw materials (students) to satisfy the nation's need for workers" (p. 31). Goodlad condemns both situations equally, in that he calls for teachers and teacher education programs to clearly express a comprehensive understanding of both the ends of education and the roles of schools beyond the marketplace.

Writing in *Educational Renewal*, Goodlad (1994) speaks specifically about the ultimate aim of teacher education programs. He notes that such programs must aim not only to develop the mechanical skills necessary for success in the classroom, but that pre-service teachers must begin to develop in them "the intellectual habits of reflection on their calling and daily work that are the mark of a professional continuously engaged in self-improvement" (p. 38). Whereas Goodlad speaks here of the professional preparation of teachers, one might reasonably assume that such "intellectual habits" as he commends to educators might be the same capacities he would hold as important for any student. Finally, Goodlad (1991) laments the fact that only a "very small percentage" of pre-service teachers view themselves or schools as "performing a role in transforming society" (p. 221). In this way, Goodlad aligns himself closely with the educational aims held by Dewey; namely, Goodlad points to the absolute necessity of becoming a reflective learner capable of directing one's own growth and improvement, as well as transforming one's world.

The Language of Contemporary Reform Literature

When examining the use of language in the contemporary literature of teacher education reform, two issues might be considered. Readers can profit from engaging in careful and critical analysis of the concepts and terminology under discussion, as each report often uses many of the same terms and phrases, albeit in significantly different ways. Thus, a certain degree of conceptual analysis is called for when looking specifically at the actual word choice and terminology of the reformers. Moreover, the reader can likewise profit from examining and assessing the figurative language of the reform reports. Educational literature boasts a long history filled with writers who

express complex ideas within metaphorical language in an attempt to convey their meaning more clearly. Landy (1988) notes that metaphorical language makes detailed claims for likeness between the subjects being compared (p. 503). Given that the use of any metaphor implies a certain degree of similarity in the subjects under consideration, the careful and critical reader must attend specifically to the relationship between the subjects compared by the reformers, remembering that much may reasonably be implied about the writers' positions by simply examining the metaphors they choose to employ in an effort to make their respective cases about the professional preparation of teachers and about education, in general.

Within the literature of educational discourse, variations on the productivity metaphor have long dominated the language of reform. In fact, the factory model of education came into vogue in the early twentieth century, riding the reform wave driven by the scientific management movement. Kliebard (1986) claims that the work of Frederick Winslow Taylor, a reformer known as the father of scientific management, served as a catalyst for the "bureaucratization of the American educational enterprise" due in part to the metaphors he drew upon in articulating the agenda for the social efficiency movement (p. 94). Kliebard (1986) also explains that in 1912 Frankilin Bobbitt wrote a highly influential article extolling the virtues of the so-called "platoon system," an approach to school management which was designed to operate schools at peak efficiency by moving students around the building in the most economical and productive manner. In articulating his ideas regarding the movement of students about the schools in order to increase efficiency, Kliebard notes that Bobbitt employed highly mechanical, metaphorical language in order to make his point:

> While the platoon system was clearly more managerial than curricular as an educational innovation, Bobbitt's use of such terms as "educational engineer" refer to the superintendent of schools and "plant" to refer to the school was no merely decorative use of language; it had implications far broader than the pedestrian question of space utilization. It provided the emerging curriculum field with the root metaphor on which a new and powerful theory of curriculum could be built. (p. 98)

In short, Bobbitt purposefully employed the factory metaphor, a linguistic turn which closely compared students to products and associated schools with the dominant economic production vehicle of the day: the factory. In doing so, to some degree he framed the context and drove the direction of the curricular debate for many years to come. Berliner and Biddle (1995) also recognize the industrial ideology which came to impact educational thought beginning as early as the nineteenth century, and consequently argue that the contemporary technological drive in modern educational debate exists as an offshoot of this earlier industrial, factory model. Their critique notes that "Human Capital theorists argues that education should be thought of as 'investing' in human resources and that appropriate investments in education can benefit industry and fuel the national economy. . . . Although it remains popular today, Human Capital theory has never been supported by much evidence" (p. 141). From the factory model to Human Capital theory, curriculum reform movements have long felt the impact of the ideology and the language of the economy and the marketplace.

In contrast, the figurative language employed by Dewey looks much more to nature than to the economy for its inspiration. Rather than turning to the forces which

> While the platoon system was clearly more managerial than curricular as an educational innovation, Bobbitt's use of such terms as "educational engineer" refer to the superintendent of schools and "plant" to refer to the school was no merely decorative use of language; it had implications far broader than the pedestrian question of space utilization. It provided the emerging curriculum field with the root metaphor on which a new and powerful theory of curriculum could be built. (p. 98)

In short, Bobbitt purposefully employed the factory metaphor, a linguistic turn which closely compared students to products and associated schools with the dominant economic production vehicle of the day: the factory. In doing so, to some degree he framed the context and drove the direction of the curricular debate for many years to come. Berliner and Biddle (1995) also recognize the industrial ideology which came to impact educational thought beginning as early as the nineteenth century, and consequently argue that the contemporary technological drive in modern educational debate exists as an offshoot of this earlier industrial, factory model. Their critique notes that "Human Capital theorists argues that education should be thought of as 'investing' in human resources and that appropriate investments in education can benefit industry and fuel the national economy. . . . Although it remains popular today, Human Capital theory has never been supported by much evidence" (p. 141). From the factory model to Human Capital theory, curriculum reform movements have long felt the impact of the ideology and the language of the economy and the marketplace.

In contrast, the figurative language employed by Dewey looks much more to nature than to the economy for its inspiration. Rather than turning to the forces which

Forum on Education and the Economy) suggests something of its propensity to compare the education of students to the betterment of the economy and its disposition to cast the fate of learners in with the fortunes of the marketplace. Within the pages of *A Nation Prepared*, the authors time and time again return to metaphorical language which closely and unmistakably associates people with *product*, while at the same time linking notions of learning with *output*. The Carnegie Forum claims, for example, that Americans consistently turn to schools in times of economic and social crisis, rightly demanding "an improved supply of young people" with the skills necessary to pull the country out of crisis (p. 2). Moving outside of the context of schools, the authors go on to argue that the future success of the nation's economy will depend in part upon the ability of businesses to effect a "vast upgrading of the American work force" (p. 13). The tendency of the Carnegie Forum to objectify students as some sort of economic currency continues as it claims that "the country can conceive of schools and the people in them as its most important investment" (p. 35). In short, metaphorical language such as this tends to depersonalize the students, turning them collectively into some sort of economic marker or commodity to be improved and upgraded.

When the language of teacher education reform relies upon metaphorical language grounded in economics, the field as a whole runs the risk of being conceptualized as something which has more in common with businesses and profit margins than to classrooms and student learning. For example, the Carnegie Forum (1986) advocates a position which holds that "It would be far more efficient to establish most school districts' instructional and other services as 'cost centers' which have to sell their services to the schools in order to survive" (p. 61). In this case, the competitive forces which

drive the global markets are presumed to have the same effect in an educational environment such as a school district. To make the association between big business and schools complete, the Carnegie authors use language highly reminiscent of a corporation's annual report in assessing the real target of educational reform and quality control. Consider the following excerpt from *A Nation Prepared*:

> The incremental cost of reform must be weighed in relation to the cost of inaction and the returns of productivity. . . . The professionalization of the teacher work force is the key. Professionalization promises much greater returns on our investment by reorienting policy to enhance the productivity of teachers. The effect would be to lower the cost of attracting more capable people to the classroom. In the long run, in schools as in business, the cost of quality is negative. (p. 107)

In this way, the lines which serve to separate the markets from the schoolhouses blur and effectively disappear, potentially leaving one with the impression that what serves one well will be good for the other. Unfortunately, the writers simply take for granted this close connection between schools and markets, never bothering to explicate in detail such a position, but rather simply presupposing that such a positive relationship exists.

Interestingly, the Carnegie Forum (1986) acknowledges that our current educational practices may easily be traced back to an economic system based on mass production. In other words, it recognizes the role of the factory model in shaping educational debate and policy (p. 15). However, the authors also note that such a system became, somewhere along the way, outmoded and obsolete. Now, the Forum claims, the educational system must shift its foundation to be more reflective of a new marketplace

and to be more responsive to the demands of a new marketplace. To do so seems to ignore the high probability that the demands of this new global economy will, like the old model, one day become obsolete as well, thus undermining the very basis for reform upon which *A Nation Prepared* rests.

In addition to addressing the metaphorical language when attempting to discern the fundamental principles which underlie a particular reform position, one must look at specific word choices which also speak to a writer's stance on issues, for example, such as learners and learning. Whereas the Carnegie Forum favors a market model in its attempts to describe the needs and weaknesses of the educational system, the Holmes Group (1986) assumes a deficit model of learners when describing students: "Students do not approach learning as empty vessels; they more likely present the teacher with initial conceptions that are incomplete, flawed, or otherwise in need of transformation" (p. 53). While avoiding the "tabula rasa" conception of learners, the writers definitely assume that all learners are, presumably, constantly in need of correction. Needless to say, while Dewey does not support the idea that students are infallible, neither does his work suggest a stance which holds that learners are inherently flawed and otherwise in need of fixing. Writing in *Tomorrow's Schools of Education*, the Holmes Group authors subscribe to a notion of learning which suggests a certain authoritarian role for the teacher related, perhaps, to their assumptions about learners as deficient. In describing the responsibilities of education schools, the Holmes Group (1995) proposes that the university programs should "devote themselves to producing knowledge and putting it into the heads, hands, and hearts of educators" (p. 26). Again, this passive conception of learning and quiescent view of the learner runs counter to the vision held by Dewey and

suggests a particular approach to the ways in which the education of teachers should proceed, an approach which places the teacher at the center of the educational process and assumes that the teacher can simply transfer knowledge from himself to the students.

In stark contrast to the organic language which typifies Dewey's discussions of teaching and learning, the language of the NCATE standards sounds quite austere and lifeless. Perhaps owing to the nature of standardization, the requirements which stand at the center of the accreditation process convey a certain legalistic and mechanical tone. In the NCATE standards, schools are referred to as "units." While teachers are not recognized as potential life-long learners who pursue learning for its own sake, the standards assure that they will work in a place in which there are "systematic and comprehensive activities to enhance the competence and intellectual vitality of the faculty." Schools are not portrayed as places in which individuals work and live and learn together by working cooperatively to solve common problems, but the standards dictate that the teacher education unit must operate as a "professional community" with the "responsibility, authority, and personnel to develop, administer, evaluate, and revise all professional education programs." As in much of the work of the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum, the language of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education shares very little common ground with the organic and dynamic portrayal of schools as presented by Dewey.

Summation

Many other points of comparison and departure exist between the work of John Dewey and the contemporary reform proposals. However, for the purposes of this study, this examination of the main points emphasized in this report will serve to illuminate the

numerous similarities and differences between and among the pieces largely responsible for setting the terms of the contemporary debate on teacher education. While some agreement can be seen within the various recommendations made for improving teacher education, some clear contrast also emerges when such issues as notions of democracy, community, and the purposes of education are considered.

Much of the work offered by the reforms stands in stark contrast with Dewey's positions on educating teachers and students alike. For example, the work of the Carnegie Forum quite rarely aligns with the writing of Dewey. Much of the discrepancy might be traced back to the fact that the authors of the Carnegie report focus to such a great degree on the economic benefits of improving the educational system in general and the professional education of teachers, specifically. That is to say, the impetus which drives the recommendations from Carnegie rest in such ideas as improving the nation's status in international comparisons and raising the country's status in the global marketplace. A sense of competitiveness colors the ideas contained in *A Nation Prepared.* In stark contrast, Dewey locates his recommendations concerning a good education for teachers and for students generally in a desire to reconcile both individual and social needs. His work is characterized much more by an emphasis on cooperation and collaboration as opposed to competition and overcoming the opposition.

Likewise, the drive for standardization through accreditation headed by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education rarely resonates with Dewey's work. When trying to compare the relative positions on issues such as education for preparation or importance of problem solving, the work of NCATE provides little or no point of reference. In other words, it is often difficult to find allusions in the work of

NCATE to the basic tenets which form the foundation of Dewey's educational thought. In contrast to the broad and principled writing of Dewey, the work of NCATE seems instead to focus on highly specific, programmatic concerns. Clearly, the accreditation body occupies itself with articulating a precise and explicit set of standards aimed at creating a workable system for comparing the relative "worth" of teacher education programs. The work of NCATE focuses less on explaining why a particular program element ought to be considered essential and more on how one might reasonably and consistently recognize that the program element is, in fact, in place. None of this is to say that Dewey would disagree or take exception with the recommendations of NCATE; the two may not necessarily be completely mutually exclusive. Rather, it simply suggests that the accreditation agency and Dewey concern themselves with vastly different approaches to the same problem of improving teacher education.

On the other hand, many points of favorable comparison exist between the work of the contemporary reformers and that of Dewey. Throughout the three reports authored by the Holmes Group, numerous references are made to the issues most prevalent in Dewey's writing. That is to say, the Holmes Group makes mention of the importance of topics such as democracy, community, subject matter, problems solving, and reflection. However, the authors do not examine those topics in the same depth or degree as does Dewey. Although the Holmes Group makes countless references to the critical goals of educating for democracy, the consortium does not explicate its position on democracy to such a point which would allow the reader to know beyond any question that its position and Dewey's were the same. For the Holmes Group, the explanation behind its take on democracy seems to stop with the idea of a representative form of government which

demands informed, critical voters capable of reasoning and making solid decisions. On the other hand, Dewey clearly approaches democracy as a way of living rather than a political arrangement. Thus, the work of Dewey and the Holmes Group can be compared in many ways, although the comparisons must be made knowing that the concepts under examination and the terminology being used may not be identical.

More than any other, the writing of John Goodlad compares favorably with the work of Dewey. Both writers tend to explicate their ideas and clarify their use of terms to a much greater degree than do the others. Moreover, Goodlad addresses the very same issues and ideas with which Dewey deals, quite often in the same manner. It should also be noted that Goodlad makes more direct references to the work and ideas of Dewey than do all of the other contemporary reform agendas combined. Whereas the work of NCATE and the Carnegie Forum quite rarely speak of the same issues in the same way as Dewey, the Holmes Group addresses many of the same concerns without getting into the same degree of specificity as does Dewey. Finally, the work of Goodlad aligns itself on a vast number of fronts with that of Dewey, making his work the most similar to the writings and ideology of John Dewey.

It may be concluded, then, that a significance difference exists between most of the rhetoric and recommendations of the reformers and that of John Dewey. Below the fundamental ideological differences exists a contrast in terms of the language used to convey their respective ideals and agendas. Even when points of comparison seem to exist between Dewey and the reformers, one must carefully analyze the terminology and jargon being used in order to determine if the concepts are actually being utilized with the same meaning in mind. As mentioned earlier, *democracy* clearly means drastically

different things in the work of most of the reformers and in the work of Dewey. Thus, any calls for democratic schooling must be seen in their complete context and in their full meaning in order to make any appropriate and fitting comparison between and among the reform agendas aimed at improving the professional preparation of teachers. In short, even those issues upon which Dewey and the reformers seem to be in agreement must be carefully scrutinized in order to determine whether or not any points of resonance actually exist or merely appear to do so.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND REFLECTIONS

Summary

As stated at the outset of this dissertation, the purposes which underlie a philosophical study are numerous: to focus thought, to generate questions for reflection, to examine linguistic and logical clarity, to analyze the specific use of language, to place ideas within an historical and ideological context, and to acknowledge the complexity of a given issue. To that end, the final chapter of this study will serve to complete those tasks which, up to this point, have not yet been addressed. The chapter will start, then, with an evaluation of the reports and their tendency to simplify the issue of education generally and of the education of teachers specifically. Thus, the reform reports will be critiqued in terms of their use of poorly defined terminology and jargon and their inclination toward focusing on one narrow and specific facet of teacher education at the expense of fundamental educational issues. Following that, I will argue that the motivating forces which drive the contemporary reform efforts often come from outside of actual classrooms, thus ignoring the possible contributions which classroom teachers and students might make to the debate, given the opportunity. Additionally, I will suggest that the reformers' efforts often come out of an exclusive concern for future gains as opposed to present benefits afforded by an education. Following that, I will list a number of areas for further study which might be profitably explored. And finally, the chapter will close with my final conclusions, recommendations, and reflections

concerning the nature of teacher education and the efforts to reform the professional preparation of teachers.

Teacher Education: Oversimplified and Trivialized

Over the course of his professional career, John Dewey wrote exhaustively about the intricacies and the possibilities of education. His body of work comprises a vast number of books, speeches, and articles addressing the complexities of the teaching and learning processes. In articulating this exhaustive and comprehensive treatment of education, he underscores the depth and breadth of topics to which one must attend in order to develop and articulate a comprehensive educational philosophy. Unfortunately, some of the contemporary reform literature falls well short of delivering an educational scheme built upon any such exhaustive approach to the topic of teacher education. The reformers often used poorly or loosely defined terminology. They employ metaphors rooted more in the business world than in the world of learners. And particular issues, such as the professionalization of the field, come to occupy the central place of importance in the reform movement, supplanting more fundamental questions regarding such topics as community, motivation, interest, and reflection. On occasion, the reformers tend to trivialize, simplify, and reduce the issue of education into a topic which can be easily addressed in a single document, a few books, or a set of standards. Reform emerges as something to be achieved rather quickly by simply following a prescribed set of recommendations. John Stuart Mill once wrote that "Reforms worthy of the name are always slow; and reform even of governments and churches is not so slow as that of schools, for there is the great preliminary difficulty of fashioning the instruments – of teaching the teachers" (qtd. in Proefriedt, 1994, p. 131). Perhaps Mills' words have

relevancy to the contemporary teacher education reformers, as they quite often turn education into something much neater, tidier, and substantially different from what it actually is as it plays itself out within the reality of life in the classroom.

Given the significance and impact of the teacher education reform literature produced by the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum, and NCATE, it becomes imperative to subject such work to a critical analysis of the language typically employed in their reports. Fraser (1992) claims that the authors of the work by Holmes and Carnegie have "set the terms of the debate about teacher preparation," and suggests that the literature demands a certain degree of critical reflection. To that end, Fraser continues by adding that one must look beyond the mere programmatic recommendations of the reform reports; rather, he suggests that the very words chosen by the authors deserve the utmost attention and scrutiny:

> Most important of all, progressive people must militantly reject language that views children as human resources for the expansion of competitiveness and insist that the purpose of education remains the creation of a more humane, more democratic society. Our vision must be – and we must always be clear about this – not the development of schools that will help us compete more effectively with Japan, but rather the development of what W.E.B. DuBois called for in his plea for an education that would produce "young women and young men of devotion to lift again the banner of humanity and to walk toward a civilization which will be free and intelligent, which will be healthy and unafraid." (p. 35)

The ideas proffered in the work of the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum, and NCATE rarely if ever offer such an expanded, complicated, and problematic view of education

and its possibilities. Instead, the authors choose words and analogies which sanitize the larger issue of education by adopting language which ascribes to teachers the ability to control and shape the educational process with external controls. In doing so, the reports in some ways rob schools of their complexity and their promise by presenting a limited, quite incomplete picture of students, teachers, learning, and schools.

Beyond the metaphors which serve to draw often inappropriate and oversimplified comparisons between education and a market economy, and even beyond the language which suggests a negative, inert view of learning and learners, the reform reports base their recommendations largely upon terminology which is, at best, poorly defined and explicated. For example, the reports invariably make mention of the benefits of *reflection* as an integral part of the educational process. Outside of Goodlad, however, little or no effort is made to clarify such a term, to explain what is meant by its use, or even to argue for its status within the literature by explaining why it might be important in educational discourse in the first place. The writers simply presume its place in the literature of reform. In many ways, the term *democracy* gets similar treatment. Whereas Dewey wrote exhaustively about the nature and importance of democracy as an educational ideal, the reformers (again, aside from Goodlad) use the term almost exclusively in terms of a political arrangement. Thus, it becomes important to recall that while Dewey and the reformers both write a great deal about the significance of democracy in the educational debates, they are in most cases utilizing the term in vastly different manners and attaching meanings to the concept in widely varying ways. The same might be said for terms such as *subject matter*, *community*, and *growth*. For example, while Dewey sees community as manifested in shared goals and cooperative problem solving, many of the reform reports

write of community as if it were something which exists as a result of physical proximity and as if it were a construct that automatically improves the learning process. Although such concepts appear with great regularity both in the teacher education reform literature and in the work of Dewey, the terms in the reform reports are rarely explored or analyzed. Instead, the writers assume their place in the debate as well as the readers' understanding of such terminology. The end result is that ill-defined abstractions and overused terms such as *community*, *democracy*, and *reflection* lose their rhetorical potency and cease to carry any real meaning for the reader. In this way, the arguments offered by the reformers are ultimately weakened as a result of their lack of clarity and detail.

One result of consistently failing to clearly define terminology and using language in a casual and unclear manner may ultimately be to simplify and underestimate the complexity of the issue at hand. On occasion, the reform writers tend to trivialize the process of preparing teachers when they resort to using educational catch phrases without taking the time and energy to properly explain their meaning. Moreover, the writers neglect the complicated aspects of education and ignore the difficult facets of teaching and learning when they focus so specifically on one course of action or path to reform which will supposedly fix what is presumably wrong with the educational system in general. Purple (1989) speaks of this phenomenon of trivializing matters pertaining to educational issues when he suggests that such treatment takes two courses in contemporary educational discourse. To that end, he suggests that trivialization occurs when critics evade or "neglect the larger, more critical topics" as well as when they place unmerited stress "on technical rather than on social, political, and moral issues" which are presumably more difficult to handle (p. 2-3). Ohanion (1999) notes a similar trend in the

work of educational critics fond of pushing the standards movement when she notes that "They brook no talk about the ambiguity of the schoolhouse" and that in producing their documents they "delineate teaching and learning as a neat and tidy thing" (p. 3). In certain cases, the reformers concerned with the improvement of teacher education fall prey to such temptation as described by Purple and Ohanion and, in the process, they simplify the issue at hand by supporting shallow and trifling calls for change such as differentiated career ladders and extended professional preparation programs, recommendations only likely to further the split between pedagogy and subject matter expertise. The reformers often support changes which will likely result in only minor tinkering, as opposed to backing comprehensive change for the way teachers are prepared for the classroom.

In narrowly circumscribing the means unto a cure for teacher education, the critics limit the possibilities for reform and run the risk of devoting themselves so heavily to one avenue of change that they ignore the myriad other possibilities which might also be highly useful in effecting substantive improvements in the professional preparation of teachers. For the Holmes Group, the professionalization of the teaching field rests at the very heart of its reform agenda. If only differentiated career ladders and more rigorous requirements for entry into teaching existed, the Holmes argument goes, then the arena of teacher education might be drastically changed for the better. For the Carnegie Forum, nearly all the hopes for the betterment of professional teacher preparation may be traced back to an overarching and overriding concern for economic improvement and the preservation of the American way of life. For the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, its clarion call for reform hinges entirely upon the supposition that the

standardization of teacher preparation programs will inevitably result in improvements which will translate into better, more effective classrooms in our nation's schools. In each case, the writers do not overtly *discount* the complexity of the field which they are hoping to reform; nobody attempts to make the case that teaching and learning are easy endeavors. But neither do they take the time and devote the energy required to delve deeply into the myriad facets which ought properly be discussed when speaking of the fundamental changes necessary to improve such a complicated enterprise such as teaching teachers. In this way, the reports suffer when they do not fully explicate positions on issues such as democratic living, reflective thinking, or cooperative problem solving.

Purple (1989) recognizes the tendency for reformers to skirt the more puzzling aspects and minutiae of educational discourse, while focusing the terms of the debate to more conventional, easily understood areas:

> The term "education" has been defined and examined in a myriad of ways and from innumerable perspectives, resulting in genuine perplexity and unsettling uncertainties – it is a field fraught with conundrums, puzzles, mysteries. It is an area that had been addressed by virtually every major social, political, and philosophical theorist over the centuries from Plato to Rousseau to Machiavelli, from Marx to Dewey. However, the public dialogue on education in America rarely touches upon major theoretical alternatives but rather focuses on the much narrower possibilities within the perspective of existing practices. (p. 4)

The reformers concerned with the preparation of teachers often turn to agenda items which resonate on a note of familiarity or concern with readers. That is to say, the writers pick a cause such as standards, professionalization, or economic prosperity and then

develop a plan for reform around that one particular, ultimately to the neglect of the various factors which must be included for a full, comprehensive debate. Dewey (1938) warns of such a turn of events when he expresses that "What we want and need is education pure and simple, and we shall make surer, faster progress when we devote ourselves to finding out just what education is and what conditions have to be satisfied in order that education may be a reality and not a name or a slogan. It is for this reason alone that I have emphasized the need for a sound philosophy of experience" (p. 90-91). While Dewey is not addressing the reform of teacher education specifically, he most definitely claims that serious, profitable discourse about education cannot take place when the participants resort to reductive arguments which ignore the complexity and intricacies of the subject at hand, and instead turn educational reform into some sort of catch phrase, cause, or slogan.

As discussed earlier, the contemporary literature of reform quite often inclines itself toward terminology, catch phrases, and metaphor more closely associated with business and behaviorism than with teaching and learning in the classroom or world at large. In point of fact, the forced comparison between the corporate world and that of schools my result in a decidedly negative relationship. Commenting upon the responsibility of schools to encourage a democratic character in the citizenry, Giroux (1999) argues that education must be recognized as a "public good" as opposed to establishing its status or worth based on its viability as a commercial investment: "Reducing higher and public education to the status of handmaiden of corporate culture works against the critical social imperative of educating citizens who can sustain and develop inclusive democratic spheres" (p. 14). Giroux, then, fears that closely allying the

demands upon schools with the needs of business will ultimately and inevitably result in a dangerous narrowing of possibilities for the schools, effectively limiting their role to that of a means unto the ends desired by the corporate world. In this way, the discourse of the reform debate limits its own possibilities through the words and phrases—in this case, the language of business—often favored by the writers. The debate would benefit, then, from a new approach to the language commonly used in the reports, thus breaking away from the objective and business-oriented terms which dominate the current landscape of teacher education reform. In doing so, perhaps a language which rejects the discourse of business also eliminates the possibility of looking at students as merely a collective supply of people in need of an upgrade in order to assure economic boon times for the United States. Rather, a new language might support a vision which portrays students as individuals worthy of education for its own sake.

Dewey (1902) voices his own concern that reformers often hamper and ultimately check their own efforts by simply using the common terms and familiar language in the conventional ways, never pushing the debate beyond the limits imposed in some ways by the very language used in the debate: "Solution comes only by getting away from the meaning of terms that is already fixed upon and coming to see the conditions from another point of view, and hence in a fresh light" (p. 339). Ohanion (1999) sums up her position on the typically limiting language of education reform by noting that "politicians, corporate leaders, media pundits, and education entrepreneurs don't talk about compassion, about caring, about creativity, curiosity, initiative, self-reliance, or myriad other qualities that we must nurture in our students" (p. 27-8). Finally, Giroux and McLaren (1989) lend their voice to this argument by observing that, in recent years, the

dominant language of the education debates has not "valorized . . . the issue of reclaiming public schools as agencies of social justice or critical democracy" (p. xii). Whereas the reform reports often deal in the language of efficiency and accountability and productivity, Dewey inclines his language more toward notions of growth and continuity and community. In some respects, while the contemporary reformers and Dewey ostensibly write about the same issue, they utilize such drastically different language that they sometimes seem to be writing on completely different topics.

What type of language, then, might be useful in order to extend and expand the current debate concerning teacher education? In an article specifically addressing the reconsideration of the language of schooling, Giroux (1988) argues that in the mid-80s, and at the very time when the many debates on the state of education needed a new language to help people understand the meaning and structure of schooling, the discourse has returned to a language "of management and administration, with its focus on issues of efficiency and control" (p. 1). Giroux goes on to note that such terminology actually prevents educators and, presumably, others from "critically examining the ideological assumptions embedded in their own language" (p. 2). He concludes that the debate on education must deal with more than simple notions of accountability and control, and adopt language which will allow for the discussion to encompass ideas and concerns about emancipatory learning, power structures within schools, and social transformation. The current debate on the best practice as it relates to the education of teachers, then, could benefit from a new language, from an acknowledgment of the work of writers such as Henry Giroux, Peter McLaren, Paulo Freire, Elliot Eisner, and other writers who

broaden the possibilities and amplify the potential of the debate on the professional preparation of teachers by the words and phrases they introduce into the debate.

The danger inherent in adopting a catch phrase or slogan as the driving force behind one's agenda for reform rests in the possibility of arriving at narrow, simplistic conclusions. In the case of the Holmes Group, for example, the authors arrive at a point upon which they cannot see any other course of actions other than their own recommendations, a conclusion tantamount to claiming that the highly complex and multifaceted issue of teacher education might be improved only one way, through only one approach. Writing in *Tomorrow's Schools of Education*, the Holmes Group (1995) makes the following ultimatum regarding its plan for the reform of the professional preparation of teachers:

> We begin this brief with a radical premise: institutions preparing educators should either adopt reforms that link their educational contributions closely with improved schooling for America's youth – along many of the lines proposed in these pages – or surrender their franchise. (p. 8)

In other words, the Holmes Group holds forth its proposal as *the* way to effectively reform teacher education, surely an oversimplification of the issue, especially given its narrow focus on the professionalization of the teaching field as the means unto the end of reform. Labaree and Pallas (1996) question such thinking by noting that the Holmes Group acknowledges "only one model for salvaging tomorrow's education schools" despite the fact that their ideas and methods have never been implemented anywhere at any time (p. 28). Moreover, they also criticize the Holmes Group for pinning the sum total of its reform plan on the model of the Professional Development School, thus

focusing too narrowly on one function and mechanism for education schools at the expense of other important purposes and means (p. 27). By holding up a single, monolithic view of teacher education, the Holmes Group ultimately underestimates the demands of a practical, comprehensive solution to the question of reform, and in the end simplifies the issue to such a degree that its efforts fall short of moving the debate forward in a positive manner.

Likewise, the work of the National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education assumes a narrow stance on the reform of teacher education. By delineating a given number of standards which professional preparation programs must meet in order to be considered legitimate, NCATE also offers up a stock view of what teacher education ought to look like, with only a passing acknowledgment that variations on the theme must be allowed to exist. Although NCATE recognizes that program specifics must necessarily differ from campus to campus, that does not change the fact that the centerpiece of the NCATE approach remains a set of standards to which all programs desirous of recognition as accredited must strive. Ohanion (1999) laments the common problem with those who call for standardization of *any* aspect of education when she claims that "They insist that their shrink-wrapped, committee-certified curriculum is better than my accumulated wisdom" (p. 44). A similar argument might be made against a reform agenda predicated on the notion that any program worthy of educating teachers must aspire, first and foremost, to meet a set number of standards, a number which, interestingly, has fluctuated in number over the course of time. In criticizing the single-minded approach to reform taken by the Carnegie Forum, Rich (1993) voices a concern which has applicability in the case of the NCATE stance, as well:

> It would be better to acknowledge the diversity and pluralism in American education, to recognize a number of plausible models of effective teaching, and to encourage different teacher education institutions to select a model and experiment with programs that will likely produce graduates who in their teaching could become exemplars of those chosen models. (p. 40)

Due to the complex nature of educating teachers, the most prudent course of action would be to encourage a number of different principled approaches to the preparation of teachers and, in doing so, eschew the notion that one best model for doing so exists in either theory or practice. The end result would be much more likely to develop a national corps of teachers who approach their classes and their students in a variety of styles and approaches than any monolithic approach to the teaching of teachers.

When critiquing the typically narrow view reformers often take of teacher education, notions of accountability and autonomy might also be considered. Both the Carnegie Forum and NCATE clearly call for accountability measures and standards which might be employed in order to determine whether or not the work of the teacher educators is proceeding according to their stated plans and agendas. Such voices articulate a particular vision of teacher education and then presume that all teacher educators should work toward that idea as the model for professional educational studies. More specifically, the Carnegie Forum ties the determination of classroom success to such measures as graduation rates, attendance figures, and rate of acceptance to colleges and universities. Such simplistic and reductive measures, aimed at maintaining a strong degree of accountability and control, surely fail to acknowledge the complexity and need for flexibility inherent in the educational process. Moreover, the Holmes Group further

limits the autonomy of educators when it proposes to introduce Instructors in the classroom who operate as subject matter specialists, but because of their lack of pedagogical knowledge must stand in a position of submission to other teachers who serve in a supervisory role. Not only does such an arrangement overtly split notions of pedagogy and subject matter expertise, but it undermines the authority and autonomy of the classroom teacher. In this way, accountability measures and differentiated career ladders both serve to reduce the already low levels of professional autonomy and self-determination which teachers now possess. Beyond that, such ideas promulgate a simplistic vision of the roles and responsibilities which need to be assumed by classroom teachers.

John Goodlad's work and research, however, stands in stark contrast with the prescriptive and didactic approach taken by the Holmes Group, NCATE, and the Carnegie Forum. Rather than set forth an agenda for reform which must be followed to the letter, Goodlad and his researchers offer a broad perspective on the state of teacher education which serves as a context for their discussions aimed at its improvement. Writing in *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*, for example, Goodlad (1991) describes the postulates recommended for the professional preparation of teachers as "a blueprint" as opposed to a set of absolutes (p. 66). In a similar vein, Goodlad (1990) summarizes his approach to his five-year Study of the Education of Educators by noting that his recommendations should not be viewed as obligatory: "I tried to avoid presenting a laundry list of findings and recommendations. Instead, I sought to place both in a larger social, institutional, and regulatory context and to provide some historical perspective" (p. 186). In assuming this stance, then, Goodlad recognizes the highly complex nature of

teacher education, taking the time and investing the energy necessary to place the issue in its proper, if demanding, context. Moreover, he affords those actually involved in the professional preparation of teachers the autonomy to understand his findings and recommendations in light of their own experiences and knowledge, all the while refusing to water the larger issue down into some lone, tangentially related cause such as professionalism.

Dewey cautions against the tendency to create educational aims which serve to regiment the process rather than encourage thoughtful, reflective action. Writing about the proper frame of reference in which to consider educational aims, Dewey (1916) argues that "An aim must, then, be *flexible*; it must be capable of alteration to meet circumstances. An end established externally to the process of action is always rigid" (p. 104). Dewey's position runs counter to the approaches taken by many of the teacher education reformers in that the recommendations made rarely take into consideration the particulars of a specific teacher preparation program, opting instead to focus on recommendations made based on some larger issue – such as professionalism or the need for status borne on the shoulders of accreditation – as opposed to sound educational principles. Dewey (1916) extends these comments when he points to the dangers inherent in educational programs and goals being passed down from an external source:

> The vice of externally imposed ends has deep roots. Teachers receive them from superior authorities; these authorities accept them from what is current in the community. The teachers impose them upon children. As a first consequence, the intelligence of the teacher is not free; it is confined to receiving the aims laid down from above. Too rarely is the individual teacher so free from the dictation

> of authoritative supervisor, textbook on methods, prescribed course of study, etc., that he can let his mind come to close quarters with the pupil's mind and the subject matter. (p. 108-09)

Perhaps Dewey (1897) makes an even more succinct statement of his position when he warns that "All reforms which rest simply upon the enactment of law, or the threatening of certain penalties, or upon changes in mechanical or outward arrangements, are transitory and futile" (p. 437). Clearly, Dewey is not specifically addressing any attempts to reform teacher education in the United States; it becomes equally clear, however, that Dewey's warning against the practice of handing dictates and mandates down from external authorities has currency in today's educational debates. Thus, his comments may be read as an indictment of the posture assumed by the Holmes Group, NCATE, and the Carnegie Forum in their attempts to impose external ends and standards on the programs designed to prepare teachers for the classroom.

If not program dictates, then what? Writing near the end of a career which saw countless educational trends come and go, Dewey calls for change based squarely upon principle. Rather than encourage more programmatic dictates and recommendations, Dewey (1938) claims that many educational innovations suffer from the tendency to simply base themselves on reactions to outside issues. Instead, Dewey submits that principles should be formed based on a "comprehensive, constructive survey of actual needs, problems, and possibilities" (p. 6). Similarly, Lucas (1997) quotes Alpheus Crosby as saying that "It seems obvious that any course of professional training which is not merely mechanical or empirical, must have for its basis a thorough consideration of the principles of the profession, of its philosophy . . . " (p. 62). Taking this stance, then,

one would be inclined to deny support to the reform agendas based so heavily on notions of professionalism, meeting standards, or economic concerns. Rather, Dewey favors ideas for change and reform based on principles, not programs.

One might reasonably assume that establishing principles demands more of an individual than picking out one particular idea and developing a set of recommendations or standards. To deal with the sum total of teacher education, and not simply a single aspect, requires one to acknowledge the complexity of the prospect of preparing teachers for the art and the science of education. Labaree (1999) argues that doing so, however, demands a great deal of energy and effort: "Education is an extraordinarily complex social activity carried out by quirky and willful actors, and it steadfastly resists any efforts to reduce it to causal laws or predictive theories" (p. 36-7). In stating this, Labaree aligns his position with that of Dewey, while setting himself in opposition to any approach to teacher education which trivializes education reform. In short, his statement honors an endeavor such as teacher preparation and recognizes it as perplexing and difficult work, and in doing so rejects the tendency of some reformers to trivialize the effort by proposing didactic, narrow programs. In short, no one-way-only roads exist which lead to genuine reform. No one-size-fits-all standards will allow for the diversity needed in professional preparation for teachers. No simplified definitions and catch-phrases can adequately develop arguments for the importance of learning as a community, the necessity of reflection, or the valuing of growth as an educational ideal. And no one single reason or motivating factor exists which is broad enough to drive a comprehensive reform agenda for teacher education.

Motivation to Reform: Issues of Time and Place

History suggests that the driving forces which motivate reform efforts aimed at teacher education quite often come from places and concerns which exist outside the realm of daily classroom life. In many instances, the push to alter fundamentally the ways in which teachers are taught can locate its impetus in arenas not directly tied to the living and learning which takes place inside the schoolhouses across the country; rather, teacher education reform has in many cases had less to do with pedagogical issues and more to do with societal and political affairs. For example, the early normal schools very often served a population much less interested in teaching than in achieving some level of convenient and inexpensive higher education, and the concerns and demands of those students had to be addressed by institutions supposedly chartered strictly to educate teachers. Historical efforts to reshape and redirect teacher education in the United States have quite often located their motivation and drive in places outside of concerns strictly related to the classroom. The work of teachers, past or present, very often plays little or no role in the drive to change teacher education. In enumerating the top ten major influences on contemporary educational reform, Mitchell (1998) does not even mention fundamental educational writers such as Dewey, suggesting instead that entities such as governments, local advocacy groups, and the media have more effect on the direction of change in our schools (p. 217). Likewise, the contemporary reform literature follows suit in many instances, looking not only to a *place* outside of the schools for its inspiration to make sweeping changes, but also to a *time* outside of the present moment for its incentive to reform.

One need not look any further than the title of the Carnegie Forum's work in order to recognize its overt concern with a time other than the present moment. *A Nation*

Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century places a tremendous emphasis on the reform of teacher education as a means unto preparation, as a way of readying the nation for a changing world. As a result, the work is marked by an overriding sense that education and learning derive their importance almost exclusively from what they will provide students in the future rather than what it might offer for them in the present. Similarly, the Holmes Group places the ultimate value of schooling in what it will bring students in the way of preparation and in terms of promise which it holds out for a day and time beyond the current moment. The Holmes Group (1995) urges that "The schools, in their purest and ideal form, prepare young people to take their rightful place in the American democracy, as old-fashioned as that may sound" (p. 39). The writers also indicate that "Knowledge about the knowledge needed by the next generation helps professional educators decide, each step of the way, what children should know" (p. 32). Surely no harm comes from the practice of considering the future when thinking about the best practice when it comes to teaching; however, an exclusive or even primary concern with the future runs directly counter to the philosophy held by Dewey, who clearly recognizes the inherent value of the present moment in the educational process. As mentioned earlier in this document, Dewey (1897) notes at the end of the last century that "With the advent of democracy and modern industrial conditions, it is impossible to foretell definitely what civilization will be twenty years from now. Hence it is impossible to prepare the child for any precise set of conditions" (p. 429). If Dewey is correct to say this over one hundred years ago as he looked to the turn of the 20th century, how much more accurate and relevant has his position become today, at the start of the 21st century? The ideas and philosophy which drive educational change and reform, for Dewey, must

absolutely be located in the problems and possibilities of the present moment, in stark contrast to the tendency of the contemporary reform literature to look constantly to the future for motivation, inspiration, and rationale.

Efforts to reform the preparation of teachers look not only to the future in order to decide upon the supposedly best, most advantageous course of action, but also to segments of our society and culture outside of the educational community. The Carnegie Forum, as previously mentioned, places heavy emphasis on the absolute necessity that the United States remain competitive economically with other countries. As a result, its report is peppered with unfavorable comparisons between American students and those from Taiwan, Japan, Germany, and many other industrialized countries. In essence, the Carnegie Forum locates its motivation to change our schools and our teachers outside of our own borders, looking at the performance of the students and the marketplaces of countries around the world. While the Holmes Group centers its propositions closer to the schools than does the Carnegie Forum, it also places its call for reform upon an idea situated outside the walls of the classroom, opting instead to emphasize the professional stature of teachers. Although obviously related to schools and schooling, the primary vehicle for the reform plan proffered by the Holmes Group remains the improved and upgraded perception and treatment of teachers, a goal ultimately dependent upon forces which exist outside of the scope of schools – forces such as political action and public perception. Finally, the work of NCATE ultimately derives its momentum from an idea that adopting standards will result in greater status for the teaching profession. Thus, NCATE takes many of its cues from other professions as it articulates its justification for teacher education's supposed need for national accreditation procedures. Once again, the

work of Goodlad provides a counterexample for the work of the other reformers, as the recommendations and principles included in his writing locate their basis in an extensive, five-year study of the institutions, programs, and people responsible for preparing teachers for the classroom. That is to say, Goodlad locates his reform agenda within a context borne of research in real classrooms and with actual teachers and students.

Although one might reasonably assume that education reform has always taken its cues from practitioners and their work with students, that has not always been the case. Kliebard (1986) points to the rise of the social efficiency movement in schools as a prime example of a time in which the direction and emphasis of school reform took cues from places other than the needs and concerns of the schoolhouse. In a time when the influence of social institutions such as the church and the family were in decline, the functions of schools "had to be restructured radically in order to take up the slack." Moreover, the scope and content of the curriculum offered in schools also changed significantly in order to align more closely with the "adult activities that one would later be called upon to perform" (p. 89). In short, the tendency of the contemporary reformers to look elsewhere for reasons to alter the way institutions prepare teachers has deep roots in the history of educational reform in the United States. Lucas (1997) relates much the same story when he claims that the drive to reform education must, in essence, come from needs and demands from within the field as opposed to those from without:

> More compelling by far is the suggestion that teacher education reforms need to be assessed on their own merits, *without regard to issues involving the social standing of teachers – or of teacher educators*. Considerations of prestige and

> status afford an exceedingly weak basis on which to endorse or to reject specific reform measures. . . . (p. 137)

Dewey, too, recognized the absolute importance of reform based on its own merits as opposed to that which develops momentum simply as a reaction against some other trend. Concluding his preface to *Experience & Education*, Dewey (1938) argues that those interested in effecting change in education must "think in terms of Education itself rather than in terms of some 'ism about education. . . . For in spite of itself any movement that thinks and acts in terms of an 'ism becomes so involved in reaction against other 'isms that it is unwittingly controlled by them" (p. 6). In terms of relevance to the contemporary reform literature, the overemphasis placed on responding to the social demands for greater status for teachers or for the economic needs for greater competitiveness in global marketplaces ultimately limits the terms of the discourse and inhibits the possibilities and promises of fundamental educational change simply for the sake of the students. Those wishing to fundamentally improve the education of teachers ought to look first to the classrooms and to the teachers when looking for ideas and inspiration. Only in that way will the reform recommendations made be based upon the very real and very immediate needs and experiences of the students.

Conclusions

Although few would argue that the work of John Dewey has nothing of substance to offer in the contemporary debate over reforming teacher education, his actual influence on the direction of the controversy surrounding the professional preparation of educators may be quite minimal, at best. Kliebard (1987) acknowledges the contributions Dewey's

work makes in the way of educational reform, but questions the ultimate impact the philosopher has made:

> John Dewey, the quintessential American philosopher, may, paradoxically, have been out of step, in at least some significant respects, with dominant American values, and while, personally, he was much revered in his own lifetime, his educational reforms remained confined largely to the world of ideas rather than the world of practice. (p. 88)

Given Kliebard's contention that Dewey impacts the "world of ideas" more than the world of practice, one might reasonably assume that his work would find currency in the contemporary reform literature, where ideas and propositions should be openly considered. However, the fact is that the reformers attend directly to Dewey and his work in a very limited degree, rarely referencing the man and even more rarely mentioning his work. The Holmes Group makes very occasional allusions to Dewey, and even in such cases where his name comes up it is mentioned more in passing than in the context of substantive discourse. The Carnegie Forum and NCATE standards make absolutely no references to Dewey's work on teacher education or on education, in general. The books and articles on teacher education reform written by Goodlad, however, contain multiple and varied referrals to Dewey and to his work. Goodlad cites the philosopher on numerous occasions and quite often acknowledges the pioneering work done by Dewey in the field of research on the education of teachers as well as his experience in the Chicago Lab School. In short, the only *directly* discernible impact of Dewey on the contemporary reform literature aimed at improving the education of teachers may be found in the work of John Goodlad and his colleagues.

Not surprisingly, Goodlad maintains that the apparent impact of Dewey in the actual teacher education programs sadly matches his presence in the reform literature. That is to say, the programs responsible for preparing teachers for the classroom and a career in education do very little in the way of introducing their students to the educational and philosophical writings of John Dewey. Goodlad (1994) notes with dismay that he found it a quite common occurrence to interview recent graduates of education programs who "know nothing about the relevant contributions of such seminal thinkers as Alfred North Whitehead and John Dewey" (p. 32). Likewise, Westbrook (1991) laments the unfortunate fact that Dewey remains "largely unread today even by those who share his democratic faith" (p. xvii). Given the current state of affairs which places such a central figure as Dewey on the periphery of the debate, Kliebard's assertion that Dewey exerts little influence because he is out of step with current American values may, unfortunately, be right on target. Dewey has little to say in his work about differentiated career ladders, economic competitiveness as an educational ideal, or program standards for accreditation purposes. As a result, his formidable voice ends up silenced by virtue of omission from not only the teacher education reform literature, but also by the university faculty responsible for educating tomorrow's teachers.

I believe, however, that the current debate which centers around the goal of improving the education of teachers could be expanded by the inclusion of Dewey's voice and his work. In his essay *The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education*, Dewey provides a quite direct, concise discussion of his vision for teacher education. However, his influence on the discussion does not need to end with that single piece. Dewey provides a working case study for those interested in the preparation of teachers in the

history of his Chicago Lab School, an institution designed specifically for the study of pedagogy in action. Moreover, Dewey's voice resonates in countless aspects of the teacher education debate because he touches on so many issues which are important to education in a very general manner. That is to say, his writings find great applicability across the landscape of any discussion relating to the larger issues of teaching and learning. As it turns out, the education of teachers revolves to an extraordinary degree around those twin concerns, as the preparation of educators must take into account not only what material is to be learned by the pre-service teachers, but also how the students are taught and how they come to understand the pedagogy of their own discipline.

We must attend to the work of Dewey in our efforts to improve teacher education for numerous reasons. Dewey recognizes and honors the wonderful complexity of teaching in learning. Dewey locates the foundation of his work on education in the world of practice and practicality. Dewey presents a vision of education so broad and far-reaching that it could never be subsumed under a single-minded movement or trend bent more on mere tinkering rather than fundamental reform. Most of all, however, the work of John Dewey invites one to look beneath the surface of any idea, cause, call to action, or word in an effort to consider every possible side of an issue, even those not readily apparent. Dewey (1929) reminds us of the necessity to carefully, critically examine every aspect of any issue or proposal:

> The profit of education is the ability it gives to discriminate, to make distinctions that penetrate below the surface. One may not be able to lay hold of the realities beneath the froth and foam, but at least one who is educated does not take the latter to be the realities; one knows that there is a difference between sound and

> sense, between what is emphatic and what is distinctive, between what is conspicuous and what is important. (p. 776)

Dewey's lucid and integrated work offers a lens through which anyone interested in improving the education of teachers might examine the issue in its full complexity. His work affords us the chance to consider all the possible angles of a given topic, formulate the pertinent questions, and make the fine distinctions which would differentiate real teacher education reform from that which recommends simply more of what has been attempted in the past and failed. However, the contemporary reformers often ignore the invitation to examine the education of teachers in its full complexity and, in doing so, propose simplistic and shallow reforms which may be more "froth and foam" than real reform.

Beyond that, Dewey's work should be recognized and included in the discourse on teacher education reform because it possesses a certain integrity borne out in the fact that the motifs and ideals which he returns to again and again in his writing all relate one to another in a seamless and logical fashion. That is to say, Dewey's argument for *democratic* living cannot be separated from his belief about the value of *community*. His sense of community ties neatly into his vision of personal and social *growth*. Dewey recognizes that growth finds a natural motivation to occur when we attend to the *present moment* at hand. From the present moment, Dewey argues that we must incorporate our own interests and experiences into the *subject matter* we encounter in our formal schooling. The subject matter, if it is to have value, must then be used to solve real and relevant *problems* which face us in the course of our daily lives. And finally, Dewey subscribes to the notion that we must *reflect* on the entire process if we are to incorporate

our pasts, presents, and futures into a coherent whole. Dewey's complex educational scheme, then, provides a conceptualization of the learning process far more sweeping, realistic, and ultimately useful than anything presented by those interested in reforming the education of teachers.

Because of the nature of Dewey's work, and because his body of writings cover so much educational territory, his voice must be reintroduced into the discourse of the education of teachers. Certainly, the language used by Dewey acknowledges education and learning as important for countless reasons beyond any idea of mere exchange value. In other words, Dewey recognizes the process of education as valuable for reasons other than what one might get in return for it some day. More than anything else, perhaps, the work of John Dewey possesses the power to dramatically impact the terms of the debate on teacher education because he so clearly recognizes and honors the absolute and direct link between the professional preparation of teachers and the work of teachers in countless classrooms across the country. His extensive and comprehensive body of work offers a degree of continuity and completeness which recognizes the complex, difficult nature of teaching. In other words, taking his work in its entirety affords one a sweeping and broad view of what it means to be a learner, what it takes to be a teacher, and how one might bring the art or science of both those endeavors together in order to create a classroom atmosphere where individuals can learn and live in community and in genuinely democratic conditions.

The teacher education program characterized by a Deweyan philosophy could, naturally, take on many different faces. Assuredly, however, it would boast several constant elements. Students would learn to teach by solving genuine and pressing

problems, not merely by imitating and parroting their mentors. Students would learn not only to ask questions, but to critically consider the answers they are given. Students would possess a high degree of authority not only over their subject matter, but over the pedagogy of that material. Students in a Deweyan teacher education would relentlessly test conclusions and reject dogma. And students would live and learn in a milieu of cooperation, not competition. Having made these claims, however, it should be noted that the face of a Deweyan professional preparation program for teachers would take its real direction from the educators and the students who fill the classrooms in pursuit of careers and lives in teaching.

Perhaps the best course of action might take inspiration from the example of Dewey, who consistently held a position inclined toward resolution and synthesis. As Peters (1977) notes, Dewey demonstrates a "passion for unifying doctrines that, on the surface, seemed irreconcilable" (p. 102). Whereas each of the voices in the contemporary reform literature falls short on some, if not most, aspects of its treatment of teacher education, that is not to say that each does not have something of worth to contribute to the debate. The current and future debate on teacher education may best be served by taking only the very best elements of the various reform agendas and moving the issue forward behind the strength of an amalgam of the better aspects of the work by the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum, NCATE, John Goodlad, Dewey, and others. The Holmes Group offers a body of reform literature characterized by a willingness to articulate a detailed and comprehensive plan for the improvement of the education of teachers. The Carnegie Forum attends to the perceived needs and concerns of the general public in its efforts to change the face of teacher education. NCATE attends to the very

real need of encouraging education schools both to proclaim and clarify the knowledge base considered essential in order to support a program of excellence in preparing educators for the classroom, an idea which finds support in the work of Dewey. Goodlad derives the impetus for his reform agenda directly from his research in the trenches, so to speak, as his reform agenda rests upon a solid foundation of scholarly work in the education schools. And John Dewey sets forth an ambitious and exhaustive philosophical base on which he proceeds to set forth his vision of the best for students, teachers, and the society at large. Taken together, perhaps a synthesis of the best these varied and often contradictory voices have to offer would result in a degree of resolution to the problem, and ultimately move the debate forward in a positive direction.

Questions for Further Study

One of the previously stated purposes of a philosophic inquiry is the generation of questions for further study. Upon the completion of such a study, a researcher might reasonably expect to not only come to a number of conclusions, but also to arrive at a point from which additional study and reflective thought might be initiated. To that end, the process of examining the contemporary teacher education reform literature through the lens of Dewey's theoretical work suggests the following questions which might serve as extensions of this research: (1) The Holmes Group, NCATE, the Carnegie Forum, and John Goodlad all proffer various models for a professional development school aimed at bringing together in a single setting the teachers, students, and researchers from both higher education and the common schools. To that end, what theoretical and organizational comparisons might be made between and among the various proposals for professional development schools and the Dewey's Laboratory School on the campus of

the University of Chicago? (2) Without question, the contemporary reform literature paints an often bleak picture of the current practice of the professional preparation of teachers. Moreover, one might reasonably argue that the reformers merely raise concerns and questions about the education of pre-service teachers which have already been dealt with in various ways since the very earliest days of the normal school movement. With that being the case, how much of what the contemporary reformers recommend might actually be considered *new* and *innovative* reform, and how much of what they demand has actually been suggested and tried in the past? (3) The Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum, and NCATE all argue vigorously that the increased professionalization of educators will result in a better teacher workforce and, consequently, better schools. However, little or no evidence is provided by the reformers to back up the correlative connection they assert between the professional status of teachers and school performance. Does evidence exist, then, which would give credence do the idea that the increased professional status of teachers would, in fact, result in better schools and increased learning among students? (4) With the exception of Goodlad, the contemporary reformers largely ignore the work of Dewey. That being the case, what accounts for the nearly complete omission of Dewey's theoretical work from the reform literature of consortiums such as the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum, and NCATE? (5) The process of critiquing contemporary teacher education reform literature through the lens of Dewey's work might easily be applied to any subject of interest or concern pertinent to education. In addition to canvassing such a huge portion of the pedagogical landscape, Dewey also comes across as a distinctly modern educational thinker, dealing at length and in depth with contemporary issues such as character education, problem

solving, critical thinking, reflective thinking, and cooperative learning. Thus, assuming a philosophic mindset and armed with a solid grasp of Dewey's work when considering any educational movement, proposal, or approach should yield rewards in that Dewey's work forces one to confront in a comprehensive and rigorous manner nearly any issue relative to the pedagogy of living and learning with students.

Pedagogical Impact of the Research

In the course of conducting the research, writing, and reflection necessary to complete this dissertation, the work of John Dewey has found repeated and constant application in my own practice as a teacher in a university teacher education program. While working through the dissertation process, I taught an English methods course, supervised a number of student teachers during their field experiences, and conducted an observation course for pre-service teachers. In this way, I found myself immersed both in the highly practical and immediate concerns of *practice* as seen through the eyes of my young students who hoped to make teaching their profession, as well as the highly *theoretical* and difficult work of Dewey. Time and time again, these two worlds easily and naturally intersected, making explicit the power and relevance of Dewey's thought, while at the same time obscuring the line which too often serves to separate ideas of theory from the pressures of practice.

In addition to impacting the focus of my teaching in the past, this exposure and prolonged acquaintance with Dewey will no doubt influence the direction my classroom teaching takes in the future, as well as my general approach to pedagogical issues. I resolve to heed Dewey's admonition to *psychologize* learning for my students, to look for ways in which the subject matter of the course at hand might find natural connections

with their own life experiences from both within and without the walls of the classroom. I endeavor to create situations and circumstances which will require my students to *solve problems*, to afford them the opportunity to use their own knowledge to deal effectively and critically with the dilemmas that educators must deal with on a daily basis. I will strive to incite and encourage *curiosity and wonder* in my students, recognizing that Dewey felt such habits of the mind must be animated so that learners take command of their own powers of inquiry and learning. I will seek occasions to learn alongside my students and to become a part of a community of *reflective thinkers*. And I will attempt to engender a *philosophic mindset* in my students, always encouraging them to be careful and critical thinkers who continually place educational issues in the larger context to which they belong, to analyze language and ideas, and to generate their own questions and concerns for further thought and reflection.

I began my work with pre-service teachers at the university and my work on this dissertation at roughly the same time. And I can recall wondering at that time, before I had ever stepped into the English methods class, what the ultimate purpose of a teacher education program ought to be. I wondered what the end result of the professional preparation program in education should look like. At the time, I had a vague and ill-defined feeling that, contrary perhaps to common sense, the goal of a teacher education program might not be the production of fully-formed teachers, immediately ready to operate in the classrooms by managing the technical aspects of teaching. I did not believe that the purpose was to teach them *pedagogical tricks of the trade*. Rather, I thought that the real goal might be to teach them how to *think like teachers*. Having now spent nearly two years immersed in Dewey's work, I find support for such a stance, as he argued

against the instantaneous development of efficient technicians in the classroom, and instead said that we need students of teaching. Dewey knew then and I believe now that teacher education programs exist not only to help individuals *think like teachers*, but also to become *constant and vigilant students* of everything relating to their professional lives; that is, teachers must be finally be students of their subject matter, their pedagogy, their pupils, their community, and themselves. I realize, then, that teacher education has no end, that its ultimate purpose should stand as the encouraging of individuals to be eternal students who direct their own growth and development. Through their work in the classrooms, then, such teachers ensure progress not only for themselves as individuals, but also for the society as a whole.

Concluding Comment

As a profession, education boasts a long history characterized by trend followed by trend and by a tendency to move in whatever direction the prevailing winds of reform happen to be blowing at the time. Dewey (1904) maintains that educational reform tends to "proceed by reaction from one thing to another, to adopt for one year...this or that new study or method of teaching, and then as abruptly swing over to some new educational gospel...." He goes on to claim, however, that such capriciousness would be impossible if educators were more "adequately moved by their own independent intelligence" (p. 16). Such intellectual autonomy rests at the very heart of Dewey's educational philosophy, and would surely form the basis for any program for the professional preparation of teachers based on his precepts. One might reasonably assert that a Deweyan teacher education program would not be based upon the goal of producing

proficient teachers immediately, but rather upon the objective of encouraging intellectual independence to be used in the classroom.

The work of a teacher education program, then, might ironically be thought of not in terms of simply producing students steeped and drilled in the skills of classroom management and armed with subject matter knowledge. Moreover, the aims of teacher education reform must surely not be thought of with regard to professional status and global economic competitiveness. Instead, teacher education should hold forth the promise of encouraging aspiring educators to being thinking like teachers and considering the educational use of their particular discipline. As Dewey (1904) notes, the practical work of a teacher preparation program should focus primarily upon developing students who become "thoughtful and alert" students of education, as opposed to making them immediately skilled (p. 320). In this way, the professional preparation of teachers should ideally invite students to think intelligently, creatively, critically, and originally about the art and the science of teaching. The real mark of a professional educator would be the capacity and the propensity to continually direct and redirect one's own growth as a teacher – to become a lifelong student of teaching. Dewey (1928) describes education as "the most difficult and the most important of all human arts" (p. 181). In doing so, he underscores the absolute necessity for attending to the preparation of teachers in a way which honors the complexity, the ambiguity, and the significance of the role and responsibility of teachers to live and learn and grow at the same time and in the same place as their students.

Bibliography

Altenbaugh, R.J. & Underwood, K. (1990). The evolution of normal schools. In J.I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K.A. Sirotnik (Eds.), Places where teachers are taught (pp. 136-186). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Anyon, J. (1997). Ghetto schooling: The political economy of urban educational reform. Teachers College Press.

Axtelle, G.E. & Burnett, J.R. (1970). Dewey on education and schooling. In J.A. Boydston (Ed.), Guide to the works of John Dewey (pp. 257-305). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Ayers, W. (1990). Rethinking the profession of teaching: A progressive option. Action in Teacher Education, 12 (1), 1-5.

Baker, M.C. (1966). Foundations of John Dewey's educational theory. New York: Atherton Press.

Berliner, D.C. & Biddle, B.J. (1995). The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Borrowman, M.L. (1965). Liberal education and the professional preparation of teachers. In M.L. Borrowman (Ed.), Teacher education in America: A documentary history (pp. 1-53). New York: Teachers College Press.

Braun, J.A. (1989). Introduction. In J.A. Braun (Ed.), Reforming teacher education: Issues and new directions (pp. xv-xviii). New York: Garland Publishing.

Brumbaugh, R.S. & Lawrence, N.M. (1963). Philosophers on education: Six essays on the foundations of western thought. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Carnegie Forum of Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Author.

Carter, G. (1996). Developing professional community amid change: The challenge of the 21st century and beyond. NCATE Quality Teaching, 5 (2), 1-2.

Clifford, G.J. & Guthrie, J.W. (1988). Ed school: A brief for professional education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Cwiklik, R. (1997, November 17). Dewey wins! If the "new" teaching methods pushed by high-tech gurus sounds familiar, it isn't surprising. Wall Street Journal, p. 19.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). The quiet revolution: Rethinking teacher development. Educational Leadership, 53 (6), 4-10.

Dewey, J. (1902). The child and the curriculum. In R.D. Archambault (Ed.), John Dewey on education (pp. 339-358). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York: Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Dewey, J. (1910). How we think. Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, Inc.

Dewey, J. (1938). The need for a philosophy of education. In R.D. Archambault (Ed.), John Dewey on education (pp. 427-439). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. In R.D. Archambault (Ed.), John Dewey on education (pp. 427-439). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1928). Progressive education and the science of education. In R.D. Archambault (Ed.), John Dewey on education (pp. 169-181). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1920). Reconstruction in philosophy. New York: Holt.

Dewey, J. (1904). The relation of theory to practice in education. In C.A. McMurry (Ed.), The third yearbook of the national society for the scientific study of education (pp. 9-30). Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company.

Dewey, J. (1933). The way out of educational confusion. In R.D. Archambault (Ed.), John Dewey on education (pp. 422-26). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Einstein, A. (1936). On education. In Out of my later years (pp. 29-35). New York: Wings Books.

Eisner, E.W. (1994). The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs. New York: Macmillan College Publishing Company.

Floden, R.E. & Buchmann, M. (1989). Philosophical inquiry in teacher education (Issue Paper 89-6). East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 320 849)

Fraser, J.W. (1992). Preparing teachers for democratic schools: The Holmes and Carnegie reports five years later – a critical reflection. Teachers College Record, 94 (1), pp. 7-40.

Gardner, W.E., Scannell, D., & Wisniewski, R. (1996). The curious case of NCATE redesign. Phi Delta Kappan, 77 (9), 622-629.

Geiger, G.R. (1958). John Dewey in perspective. New York: Oxford University Press.

Giarelli, J.M. (1995). Qualitative inquiry in philosophy and education: Notes on the pragmatic tradition. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods (pp. 22-27). London: The Falmer Press.

Giarelli, J.M. and Chambliss, J.J. (1995). Philosophy of education as qualitative inquiry. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods (pp. 30-43). London: The Falmer Press.

Giroux, H.A. (1999). Corporate culture and the attack on higher education and public schooling. (Fastback 442). Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Giroux, H.A. (1988). Teachers as intellectuals. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Giroux, H.A. & McLaren, P.L. (1989). Schooling, cultural politics, and the struggle for democracy. In H.A. Giroux & P.L. McLaren (Eds.), Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle (pp. xi-xxxv). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Glesne, C. (1999). Becoming qualitative researchers. New York: Longman.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990). Better teachers for our nation's schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 72 (3), 184-94.

Goodlad, J.I. (1994). Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J.I. (1991). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Griffen, G.A. (1999). Changes in teacher education: Looking to the future. In G. Griffen (Ed.), The education of teachers: Ninety-eighth yearbook of the national society for the study of education. (pp. 1-28). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hammersly, M. and Atkinson, P. (1983). Ethnography: Principles in practice. London: Tavistock.

Herbst, J. (1989). And sadly teach: Teacher education and professionalization in American culture. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Hill, P.J. (1984). A deweyan perspective on higher education. Liberal Education, 70, 307-313.

Hodge, C.M. (1991). Teacher education and NCATE: An interview with Arthur Wise. Teacher Education and Practice, 7 (1), 7-12.

Holmes Group. (1995). Tomorrow's schools of education: A report of the Holmes Group. United States of America: Author.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. United States of America: Author.

Hunt, S. & Staton, A. (1996). The communication of educational reform: A nation at risk. Communication Education, 45, 271.

Karges-Bone, L. (1997). Wanted: idealist, intellectual, prophet – John Dewey as a teacher educator for the new millennium. Educational Forum 62 (1), 53-59.

Kliebard, H.M. (1987). The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893-1958. New York: Routledge.

Kneller, G.F. (1964). Introduction to the philosophy of education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Koetting, J.R. What we talk about when we talk about philosophy and educational research. University of Nevada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 397 807)

Labaree, D.F. (1999). Too easy: The trouble with ed schools and the implications for the university. Academe, 35-39.

Labaree, D.F. & Pallas, A.M. (1996). Dire straits: The narrow vision of the Holmes Group. Educational Researcher, 25 (5), 25-28.

LaBoskey, V.K. (1993). A conceptual framework for reflection in preservice teacher education. In J. Calderhead & P. Gates (Eds.), Conceptualizing reflection in teacher education. (pp. 23-38). London: The Falmer Press.

Lagemann, E.C. (1994). The complexity of educational change. Teachers College Record, 96, 1-7.

Landy, A.S. (1988). The heath introduction to literature. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company.

Little, W.J. (1989). Conditions and forces influencing educational reform. In J.A. Braun (Ed.), Reforming teacher education: Issues and new directions. (pp. 5-22). New York: Garland Publishing.

Lucas, C.J. (1997). Teacher education in America. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Marsalis, W. (1990). Standard time volume 3: The resolution of romance. Jacket notes.

Maxwell, J.A. (1992). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. Harvard Educational Review, 62, 279-300.

Mitchell, S. (1998). Reforming educators: Teachers, experts, and advocates. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Moore, K.D., Hopkins, S. & Tullis, R. (1994). NCATE standards: Restructuring teacher education. Teacher education, 21 (2), 27-36.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Handbook for initial accreditation visits.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Quality assurance for the teaching profession.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1994). The standards.

Olafson, F.A. (1977). The school and society: Reflections on John Dewey's philosophy of education. In S.M. Cahn (Ed.), New studies in the philosophy of John Dewey (pp. 172-203). Hanover: The University Press of New England.

Ozmon, H. & Craver, S. (1995). Philosophical foundations of education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Parkay, F.W. (1992). Two approaches to an intellectual posture for teacher educators. Texas Tech Journal of Education, 9 (1), 61-70.

Peshkin, A. (1993). The goodness of qualitative research. Educational Researcher, 22, 23-29.

Peters, R.S. (1977). John Dewey's philosophy of education. In R.S. Peters (Ed.), John Dewey reconsidered (pp. 102-123). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Postman, N. & Weingartner, C. (1969). Teaching as a subversive activity. New York: Dell Publishing Company.

Proefriedt, W.A. (1994). How teachers learn: Toward a more liberal teacher education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Purpel, D.E. (1989). The moral & spiritual crisis in education: A curriculum for justice & compassion in education. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Rich, J.M. (1993). Promises and pitfalls in Carnegie's "A nation prepared." Teacher Education Quarterly, 20 (2), 35-41.

Rury, J. L. (1986). Book reviews: "The relation of theory to practice in education." Journal of Teacher Education, 37, 58.

Sanders, T. (1994). The new professional teacher project. NCATE Quality Teaching, 4 (2), 2-3.

Schubert, W.H. (1991). Philosophical inquiry: The speculative essay. In E. Short (Ed.), Forms of curriculum inquiry (pp. 61-76). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Smylie, M.A., Bay, M., and Tozer, S.E. (1999). Preparing teachers as agents of change. In G.A. Griffin (Ed.), The education of teachers: Ninety-eighth yearbook of the national society for the study of education. (pp. 29-62). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Soares, L.M. (1998). Structure, content, and process in teacher training: The relevance of Copernicus, Gardner, and Dewey. The Clearing House, 71, 217-220.

Su, Z. (1996). Teaching, learning, and reflective acting: A Dewey experiment in Chinese teacher education. Teachers College Record, 98, 126-152.

Tann, S. (1993). Eliciting student teachers' personal theories. In J. Calderhead & P. Gates (Eds.), Conceptualizing reflection in teacher education. (pp. 53-69). London: The Falmer Press.

Tanner, L.N. (1997). Dewey's laboratory school: Lessons for today. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wassermann, S. (1994). Using cases to study teaching. Phi Delta Kappan 75 (8), 602-611.

Westbrook, R. (1991). John dewey and American democracy. Ithica: Cornell University Press.

Wise, A.E. (1993). A vision of the future: Of teachers, teaching, and teacher education. Phi Kappa Phi Journal, LXXIII, 8-10.

Wise, A.E. & Leibbrand, J. Profession-based accreditation: A foundation for high-quality teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 78 (3), 202-206.

Yinger, R.J. (1999). The role of standards in teaching and teacher education. In G.A. Griffin (Ed.), The education of teachers: Ninety-eighth yearbook of the national society for the study of education. (pp. 85-113). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

VITA

Kevin B. Kienholz

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: WHERE HAVE YOU GONE, JOHN DEWEY?: A PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY INTO THE CONTEMPORARY REFORM MOVEMENT IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Major Field: Curriculum and Instruction

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, on April 10, the son of James and Johnna Kienholz.

Education: Graduated from Enid High School, Enid, Oklahoma, in May 1986; received Bachelor of Science degree in Secondary Education and a Master of Science degree in Curriculum and Instruction from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in December 1990 and December 1994, respectively. Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in Curriculum and Instruction at Oklahoma State University in July, 2000.

Experience: Taught at Stillwater High School from 1991 to 1997. Worked and taught as a graduate assistant at Oklahoma State University from 1998 to the present.

Professional Memberships: Society for the Study of Education.