

THE GOODLAD OCCASIONAL

Volume Two, Issue Three

March 14, 2007

In an earlier issue of Volume Two of *The Goodlad Occasional*, I wrote that in issues to come I would be addressing primarily the importance of the tripartite relationship of colleges of education, departments in the arts and sciences, and partner schools in the education of educators. In an issue of Volume One, I wrote that the renewal of each of these components and the simultaneous renewal of all three were essential to robust teacher education programs. In issue two of this volume, I addressed primarily the expectations of partner schools in regard to the readiness for the student teaching experience on the part of individuals planning to become teachers.

What all three groups of players share is their necessary attention to pedagogy: the art and science of teaching. This is not the exclusive interest and responsibility of any one of the three groups. Much common practice implies that pedagogy is the unique responsibility of schools and colleges of education. I disagree. The professor of mathematics properly engaging in his or her responsibility for the preparation of future teachers must pay attention to pedagogy. Interestingly, many professors in colleges of education who are engaged in preparing teachers have had no more preparation in the field of pedagogy than have professors in the arts and sciences. Given present-day rhetoric regarding the importance of instruction in the preparation of teachers, it is essential that all the educators making up the tripartite

relationship be well prepared in pedagogy. Since they have this responsibility in common, what should they share in common in the infrastructure of teacher education? Pedagogical knowledge, ideas, and practices? Collaborative attention to staff development in the field of pedagogy? Should they all be engaged in the study of pedagogy and the conduct of their own and their colleagues' teaching? Should the members of these three groups share membership in some common entity? A center of pedagogy?

These are important questions. They lack satisfactory answers. These are questions that should now be attracting the attention of members of all teacher education programs. Do good models presently exist?

In order to engage thoughtfully in the necessary dialogue, it is desirable I think to have a good understanding of earlier efforts to come up with satisfying solutions. We might well begin with John Dewey's efforts in the beginning years of the twentieth century to create a department of pedagogy at the University of Chicago. His failure to get such a department approved probably contributed significantly to his decision to leave the university and join the department of philosophy at Columbia University in New York. The rest of this issue of *The Goodlad Occasional* is taken from an article I wrote entitled "Whither Schools of Education?" published in the

Journal of Teacher Education in 1999. What I have written in the first third of that paper suggests some of the questions that must be raised in seeking to renew the conduct of teacher education in the United States.



Excerpt from “Whither Schools of Education?” *Journal of Teacher Education* 50 (November 1999): 325-338.

The history of schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) suggests that they were born with a congenital malaise, into an inhospitable surround, or both. Conduct of their teacher education function brought into academe the often-unappreciated baggage of connections with the low-status occupation of teaching in the lower schools. Conduct of their academic function and assumption of the designation “education” was an affront to the traditional departments that saw themselves also in the business of education. The consequence for many SCDEs appears to have been a kind of schizophrenia, with its complex etiology clearly manifested in the institutional exercise of the faculty reward structure.

The malaise intensified with the transition of normal schools to teachers colleges to state colleges to state universities. Responsibility for teacher education did not diminish as the decades of the 20th century passed by, while the importance of research escalated (Ducharme, 1993; Shen, 1999). With each step in the transition, the status of teacher education in institutional priorities dropped and, with it, the status of and identity of the SCDE (Ducharme, 1987; Ducharme & Agne, 1986). Dependent on the arts and sciences departments for their necessary contribution to the *preservice* teacher curriculum, education neither sought nor attained the autonomy of professional schools for whom the academic disciplines were largely *precurricular* admissions requirements.

Early in the century, John Dewey had urged the new schools of education to look to the training of architects, engineers, doctors, and lawyers so as to “learn from the more intensive and matured experience of other callings” (Dewey, 1904, p. 10). Was he seeking for them the relative autonomy that the major professional schools secured within the universities? The record shows that schools of education did not follow such a course. Or was Dewey seeking something else that study of the education for these other callings might have provided? If so, might following his advice have helped ameliorate the seeming malaise and troubled circumstances of the nation’s SCDEs? Responding at all usefully to these questions requires some inquiry into both Dewey’s thinking and the evolution of these entities in the 20th century.

Dewey on Pedagogy

My analysis suggests that it was not greater autonomy for the new schools of education that Dewey sought but the *intellectual methods* that he may have overgenerously attributed to other professional schools. He had been quickly at odds with faculty members of the Chicago Institute acquired by the University of Chicago in 1901, even though he presided over them in what had recently become the university’s school of education (Ryan, 1995, p. 120). He viewed these new colleagues as engaged almost exclusively in “giving teachers in training working command of the necessary tools of their profession; control of the technique of class instruction and management; skill and proficiency in the work of teaching” (Dewey, 1904, p. 1) to the neglect of principles derived from theory tested in the laboratory. For Dewey, there was no duality of purpose that separates practice and inquiry. They nourish each other.

During the concluding years of the 19th into the early years of the 20th century, Dewey’s considerable powers of thought and energy were focused on his laboratory school, learning, and pedagogy. It is important to remember that he was as much a psychologist as a philosopher with a deep interest in human development. His proposal to President William Rainey Harper for a department of pedagogy to be closely linked with philosophy and psychology (Tanner, 1997,

p. 16) stated, "The conduct of a school of demonstration, observation and experiment in connection with the theoretical instruction is the nerve of the whole scheme" (Dewey, 1896 [?], p. 434).

Accounts of the time suggest the existence of a veritable crucible in which all of the issues that have plagued SCDEs and teacher education were being melted down and shaped. Dewey stressed the interplay of theory and practice in professional education: "I shall assume without argument that adequate professional instruction of teachers is not exclusively theoretical, but involves a certain amount of practical work" (Dewey, 1904, p. 9). After stating that the contrast between the two is obvious, he devotes virtually the whole of a chapter in a scholarly yearbook to explaining the relationships (Dewey, 1904).

The purposes of research and experimentation inherent in the linkage of his laboratory school and the proposed department of pedagogy were in turn to serve the professional purpose of *preparing supervisors and professors of pedagogy* (Tanner, 1997, p. 16). Not teachers? He saw no threat to his schema in the use of his children's school as an observation site for future and practicing teachers. But he saw no connections with his views in the "trainers of teachers" who came with the Chicago Institute. Elsewhere, I have described a parallel irony: In 1892, the New York College for the Training of Teachers (founded in 1887) was grafted onto Columbia University and renamed Teachers College, where the purpose would now be the preparation of *school administrators and teachers of teachers* (Goodlad, 1990, pp. 73-74). But not teachers.

Dewey's 1904 admonition to the emerging schools of education was not, I conclude, to secure the autonomy of other professional schools within the university but to learn from what he perceived to be the grounding from which they gained intellectual control of their methods. Even though the Flexner report, *Medical Education in the United States and Canada* (Flexner, 1910), had not yet been published and the course set for medical education to move solely into the universities, he saw the vocation of teaching lagging behind architecture, medicine, and law in seeking increased

scholastic attainments as a prerequisite for entering upon professional work. Dewey saw the necessity of delaying practical skill until the scientific foundations necessary to intellectual understanding and control had been laid. The direction he appears to have had in mind organizationally was toward a department of pedagogy where the principles would be grounded in the laboratory school. Apparently, he wanted to put in place a continuum connecting theory and practice from the early childhood years through advanced graduate study. Was this to be within a school of education or to exist side-by-side with the university's arts and sciences disciplines? Unfortunately, his schema was never realized.

By the time of his death in 1952, Dewey had seen in practice only scattered shavings from his schema for pedagogy and the education of educators. Dewey was "universally acknowledged as his country's intellectual voice" (Ryan, 1995, p. 19), and his views found their way didactically into the classrooms of teachers' education but were lost or distorted before reaching the schoolhouse. Increasingly, "laboratory" schools appeared on the campuses of higher education. But Dewey's laboratory concept was, at best, only dimly understood and so rarely characteristic that the few using their interpretation of the "project" method and some semblance of his inquiry approach to learning frequently were described in the literature of schooling.¹ The laboratory schools were more practice than either experimental or demonstration schools, much pressured by surrounding school districts to meet their expectations for teachers prepared to forward the established ways (Goodlad, 1980). These practical expectations were largely reinforced by the increasing entry of the states into the business of specifying requirements for credentialing teachers. What Dewey saw to be emerging in the maturing experience of the major professions of the time subsequently accelerated throughout the remaining half-century of his life. Ironically, he saw little parallel in the profession he cared most about.

What Dewey feared most came to pass: The very circumstances of school work combined with the short and thinly grounded theoretical instruction made primary what he perceived to be secondary. Control of the class

and the mechanics of learning and teaching came to overshadow gaining personal intellectual control of the art and science of teaching – pedagogy.

Academe: Tensions Without, Tensions Within

The evolution of SCDEs in the 20th century is, of course, closely tied to the evolution of higher education. There is a sharp and scarcely analyzed difference between teacher education and education for such professions as medicine, engineering, and dentistry in regard to their entry into higher education. The new schools of education to which Dewey referred in 1904 grew out of roots already established in the soil of their respective institutions. Indeed, for those of the latter that were once normal schools, teacher education constituted the only roots. However, the normal schools came to do much more than prepare teachers; they may have contributed as much as the early land-grant universities to educating our people through the college level (Herbst, 1988).

SCDEs were, then, indigenous to many universities; most of the other professional schools were additions to the established arts and sciences core resulting from the callings they represented seeking scholarly grounding for their practice.² Connected to the low-paid, low-status occupation of teaching in the lower schools, the SCDEs lost rather than gained prestige in the transition of higher education institutions from normal schools, where teacher education was central, to universities, where teacher education became increasingly peripheral. By contrast, the practitioner in medicine, for example, on becoming also a clinical professor, with an income usually exceeding that of all professors including colleagues in the school of medicine, was the role model to be cloned. The young doctors more and more seeking careers of university teaching and research in the second half of the 20th century were at first looked upon by full-time practitioners as a little strange. The rapid rise in the place of the scholarship of discovery in the faculty reward structure soon shifted the perspective regarding what counts most in the university and its family of departments and schools.

Whatever one's beliefs about the correct organizational arrangement for SCDEs within academe, the degree to which they took on the mantle of the arts and sciences, perhaps not deliberately, should not come as a surprise. Many of our early liberal arts colleges announced in their founding documents high interest in supplying preachers and teachers. They envisioned not training for vocations but ensuring that these two groups would carry into their communities after graduating the exemplary values and ideals presumably built into the very fabric of these institutions. For future teachers, the pedagogy was part and parcel of the subjects emphasized and the relations among students, faculty, and their communities of discourse. Likewise, the normal schools, while presenting a modicum of technique and management, offered primarily a curriculum in the subjects of instruction, albeit at a lesser level. Preparing to be a teacher meant immersion in the arts and sciences as virtually the whole of it in one type of our early colleges and a good deal of it in the other. There was in both types little incongruence between fulfilling the function of preparing teachers, as then conceived, and that of providing a general education for all students, even though their institutional missions were stated very differently.

The American universities that arose in the 20th century are quite different creations, even though most have gone through sometimes torturous rhetorical passages of claiming central allegiance to the cherished attributes of the residential liberal arts college and its commitment to teaching undergraduates. What Douglas (1992) labeled "rampant specialization" did not simply surround the liberal college in the university's graduate and professional programs but, in his judgment, destroyed liberal learning. Undergraduates would have been better served, he claimed, by closer allegiance of our universities to the English rather than the German model of higher education (p. 120). In the preface to a treatise on the "distinctively American residential liberal arts colleges," Koblak (1999) wrote: "Until higher education for the most ambitious youth in American society is seen as something other than credentialing – providing a certificate that the individual will be able to exchange for something called a job – the joys and necessities

of learning will be rendered in a debased coinage. The best of America's liberal arts colleges recognize that their so-called product is something other than a negotiable instrument designed to guarantee employment" (p. ix).

Not only was the general education curriculum of the undergraduate disciplines increasingly infused with courses preferred or required for admission to the professional schools, but departments in the arts and sciences increasingly directed upper-division courses to the expectation that students majoring in them would continue to more exclusive postgraduate specialization. With research rapidly becoming the prime criterion for advancement and professors commonly teaching at both undergraduate and graduate levels, it is not surprising that seminars and classes of the latter, frequently close to professors' specialities, took precedence over the more general courses of the former. With some notable exceptions, the courses once prized as the core of liberal studies ballooned in size and were assigned more and more to graduate assistants and the least experienced junior professors. Douglas (1992) is scathing in his account of what he, a professor of English, perceived to be common: "Seldom do students enjoy the opportunity to question what they are being taught. They are passive receivers. They may on rare occasions get a chance to ask a question, but it is likely to be something they need to survive and pass the professor's examination. The subject matter itself and its place in the broader picture of science of human culture are never brought into question" (p. 121).

Although SCDEs are commonly described as peripherally detached, as sleepy backwaters – recently by the current secretary of education, no less – their programs, faculty members, and students have been profoundly impacted by the developmental course of their universities. They rely on the arts and sciences for providing a very large part of the future teacher's professional tools. Teachers – not doctors, lawyers, or engineers – are expected to use the funded knowledge derived from their own liberal education to help the young understand themselves and their world and participate widely in the human conversation. Yet, SCDEs, charged until very recently with almost sole responsibility for the quality of our

schoolteachers, have had much less say in the general education curriculum than have the schools of medicine, law, and engineering – a default for which SCDEs share culpability.

With purpose quite clear and not claimed elsewhere in the university, these and other professional schools had little problem in establishing their own curricula and degrees and not much more in establishing pieces of the undergraduate college curriculum as recommended prerequisite studies. With professional purpose entangled with the academic purpose of the undergraduate college, SCDEs were supported by neither conventional wisdom nor convincing argument for similarly serving the purposes of teacher education.³

It is important to observe, also, that the SCDEs in the most distinguished universities (with a few notable exceptions) chose the Ph.D. as the ultimate and most prestigious *scholarly* attainment. Most SCDEs have had difficulty differentiating the Ed. D., justified as recognition of professional scholarly attainment, from the requirements of the Ph.D. Yet, there still exists the argument that the latter should be given precedence over the former in considering the appointment of assistant professors. It is not surprising that campus review bodies commonly look to scholarship in its own right and only sometimes for its professional relevance in making recommendations for the promotion of faculty members in education, whether they hold the Ph.D. or the Ed. D. On the other hand, it is not at all uncommon for schools such as law and medicine to remind such bodies of the professional relevance criterion in reviewing the record for their professors. In recent years, medical schools have employed increasing numbers of research personnel holding the Ph.D. (or sometimes both the M.D. and the Ph.D.) for whom Boyer's (1990) concept of the scholarship of discovery applies almost exclusively. Most SCDEs in the United States are charged primarily with professional purpose for which teaching and student guidance are essential accompaniments, but it is common for professors to fear that major commitment to such will place their advancement in jeopardy.

Perhaps the charge that SCDEs have languished in a sleepy backwater is quite accurate and fair. Such a charge does not mean

that they have neglected what they perceived to be their work. The demand on most to produce large numbers of teachers did not lessen with the advent of greater expectations for research and publication. Perhaps it was prestige deprivation resulting from the low status of teacher education within academe that kept SCDEs from being aggressive in seeking to shape the undergraduate curriculum to ensure both the liberal and specialized subject education teachers should have. Similarly, there is little in the record to suggest that they have sought to shape the faculty reward structure beyond that of the arts and sciences disciplines. Rather than blending the expectations and demands of professional and academic purpose, they have had an uncomfortable ride with a leg in a stirrup of each of two ponies.

Notes

1. An instructor in the normal school I attended introduced us to the project method but, so far as I can recall, not to anything Dewey wrote. My post-secondary school year was coming to a close, I was running out of money, and anxious to teach. Consequently, I approached my authentic burning out of a model of a native American canoe as a welcome lark. Although the effort produced considerable smoke and coughing (the instructor was conveniently out of the room for a time), I was commended for catching the spirit of the thing. See Goodlad, J. I. (1988), *Coping with curriculum*, in Jackson, P. W. (Ed.), *Contributing to educational change: Perspectives on research and practice* (pp. 179-190). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp.

The "project method," often attributed to Dewey, is better connected to William Heard Kilpatrick. See Beineke, J. A. (1999), *And there were giants in the land* (pp. 99-116). New York: Peter Lang.

2. Robert M. Hutchins, long-term president of the University of Chicago, accepted the idea of professional schools attached to the university but at the periphery. He viewed "vocationalism" as endangering the liberal studies core of the university. For him, education warranted at best only a closet in a nearby inn. See Hutchins, R. M. (1936), *The*

higher learning in America. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

3. Might the narrative be quite different had the development of higher education included the public sustenance of 4-year colleges devoted solely to teacher education and provision for graduate professional specializations? Bank Street College of Education in New York, National College of Education in Illinois, and George Peabody College for Teachers in Tennessee are examples of private institutions that did very well with this pattern into the second half of the century until financial considerations broadened purpose in the case of the first two and resulted in the third being absorbed into nearby Vanderbilt University.

References

- Beineke, J. A. (1999). *And there were giants in the land*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Dewey, J. (1896[?]). Statement to President William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago. Reprinted in Dewey, J. (1972). *The early works, 1882-1898*, vol. 5, 1895-1898: *Early essays* (J. A. Boydston, Ed.). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1904). *The relation of theory to practice in education*. In C. A. McMurry (Ed.), *The relation of theory to practice in the education of teachers*. Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Douglas, G. H. (1992). *Education without impact*. New York: Birch Lane Press.
- Ducharme, E. R. (1987). Professors of education: Beasts of burden, facilitators, or academicians. *Journal of Human Behavior and Learning*, 4, 1-9.
- Ducharme, E. R. (1993). *The lives of teacher educators*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Ducharme, E. R., & Agne, R. M. (1986). *Professors of education: Uneasy residents of academe*. In R. Wisniewski & E. Ducharme (Eds.), *The professors of teaching: An inquiry* (pp. 67-86). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Flexner, A. (1910). *Medical education in the United States and Canada: A report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*. Washington, DC: Science and Health Publications.

Goodlad, J. I. (1980). How laboratory schools go awry. *UCLA Educator*, 21 (2), 47-53.

Goodlad, J. I. (1988). *Coping with curriculum*. In Jackson, P. W. (Ed.), *Contributing to educational change: Perspectives on research and practice* (pp. 179-190). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Herbst, J. (1988). *And sadly teach*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Hutchins, R. M. (1936). *The higher learning in America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Koblik S. (1999). Distinctively American: The residential liberal arts colleges. *Daedalus*, 128 (1), ix.

Ryan, A. (1995). *John Dewey and the high tide of American liberalism*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Shen, J. (1999). *The school of education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Tanner, L. N. (1997). *Dewey's laboratory school*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.



John I. Goodlad
Institute for Educational Inquiry
124 East Edgar Street
Seattle, WA 98102
(206) 325-3010