DOCUMENT RESUME

TE 000 611

ED 021 849

By- Fen, Sing-Nan

THE PROFESSIONAL AND LIBERAL EDUCATION OF TEACHERS.

Pub Date Nov 67

Note- 5p.

Journal Cit- Peabody Journal of Education; v45 n3 p158-61 Nov 1967

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.28

Descriptors- EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT, *EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS, EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, EFFECTIVE TEACHING, *GENERAL EDUCATION, METHODS COURSES, PRESERVICE EDUCATION, *PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION, SELF ESTEEM, TEACHER ATTITUDES, TEACHER EDUCATION, *TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM, TEACHER EDUCATORS, *TEACHER IMPROVEMENT, TEACHER MORALE, TEACHER ROLE, TEACHERS

The organic integration of professional training and liberal education is essential if teacher education programs are to succeed. Many required courses of questionable value in practical teacher training should be replaced with vital courses in the methods for teaching particular subjects. In addition, a teacher must acquire a personal philosophy of education which will help him to answer questions about why he is teaching, what his goals are, and how he should teach to achieve them. Many of the "so-called 'foundation courses'," in which this philosophy should be developed, are "the most irrelevant courses taught by incompetent professors;" and until these courses are modified and good teachers are found to teach them, they will hinder new teachers more than they will help. Deprived of practical training and of the justification of their activities, teachers lose self-respect and become mere civil servants; but with such training, they will become competent and confident enough to stand up for themselves and what they believe. (LH)

Contributing to human welfare through education

PEABODY Journal OF EDUCATION

VOLUME 45 • NUMBER 3 NOVEMBER 1967

CONTENTS

The Professional And Liberal Education of Teachers

SING-NAN FEN
University of Nebraska
Lincoln

In this article, I shall present a program of teacher education, taking advantage of the most fruitful thought in this area during recent years. I shall start with Professor Burner's proposal:

> The chief source of my argument about teacher training comes from a close analysis of pupil learning—the complementary case from which I shall argue. The path by which one student finds his way to the heart of a subject will vary from the way another finds his way . . . The diverse routes by which students get to deeper understanding are many in number and motley in kind. To be of fullest help to students, a teacher must appreciate the diverse paths to understanding . . . For what is implied is that not only must a teacher know a subject, but know it or recognize it in terms of its alternative renderings. Not only must a teacher learn what she is going to teach with greater thoroughness, but she must also discover the different ways *she* can learn it and the different ways *children* can learn it. And where will she be able to get such training? Where find this intense mix of substance and pedagogy? Certainly not by here a course in physics and there a course in educational psychology. . . . Let us begin instead with a concrete psychology that occupies itself with wily strategies for learning specific things like mathematics, or geography, or sonnets. . . . What is critical about this type of psychological effort is that it is an account of learning that remains married to what is being learned. . . . Consider the two basic points proposed thus far: that a teacher be trained to understand the diverse routes by which a student can get to the comprehension of some subject matter, and that the teacher also have some sense of the psychological processes involved when the student sets out to traverse a particular route. These two matters are crucial to the teacher's effectiveness. . . . And that is the modern version of the curriculum project—a consortium of talents, involving not only the scholar, but the appropriate psychologist operating as we have urged, the film maker, the master teacher with a sense of what is possible with children, the teacher of teachers, the apparatus designer, and the inventor of pedagogical games and toys. It is in the setting of such an establishment—a curriculum institute—that I would prefer to see the training of teachers taking place. . . . It does not suffice to go first to the mathematician, next to the specialist in pedagogy, and then to join the two as an intersect. What is needed is some means whereby teaching of a subject can be brought back within the genus of that subject, aided and abetted by all the special talents that our society can muster to help us transmit knowledge more effectively.[1]

Bruner's proposal should be adopted by all colleges and schools devoted to teacher education. Its merit lies in the organic integration

of how to teach and what to teach, which separates the Department of Education and the Departments of Arts and Sciences to this day. The proposal is both practical and mandatory. It is practical because it does what a teacher education program is supposed to do, to teach the future teachers how to teach a particular subject. John Dewey, more than a half century ago, made the distinction between the education of a scholar or scientist and the education of the teachers of science and arts, yet regretted the separation of how to teach and what to teach.[2,3] Bruner's proposal, while being less conscious of the distinction, integrates the how and the what. The proposal is mandatory for on the implementation of such a proposal depends the genuine professional status of teaching. In contrast, the present offerings of teacher education in response to certification requirements are either over-theoretical or down-right empty. William James, long, long ago reminded the practicing teachers of the uselessness of the knowledge of psychology to them.[4] We continue to require future teachers to take courses in educational psychology or theories of learning as if when they have completed them, they would know how to teach. Such an assumption psychologists themselves should cast doubt upon. As to "methods" courses, taught in separation from particular subject matter, they are liable to be empty. What else can a methods course do, apart from subject matter than busy work; making bulletin boards, fixing machines or writing standardized but impractical lesson plans. Impracticability, emptiness, and irrelevance are not the exclusive sin of teacher education. Otherwise the whole system of higher education would not be on trial today. Those who have been making a career of being critical of teacher education may do well to take a good look at their own back yard. This is the time that college teachers should see their role as "teachers" in distinction from their role as "scholars." At the same time, institutions devoted to teacher education must seriously reconsider the "content" of their offering. Bruner's proposal has the merit of being "contentful" in a way unique to teacher education.

It could be argued that, in adopting Bruner's proposal, we are subject matter bound and that certain presuppositions about education are taken for granted without being properly examined. This is a question about philosophy of education. Alas, philosophy of education, worse than educational psychology, is so irrelevantly taught and carried on by pseudo-philosophers that it is no wonder Mr. Conant has no use for it in his scheme. But philosophy of education is needed by all future teachers if they are to learn thoroughly the why, the what, and the how of teaching their specialty to their students. When a teacher teaches a particular lesson to a particular student body, he, if he is professional, should have some idea of what his purposes are, what he wishes the student to learn, and whether the materials and the methods he uses would accomp-

lish these purposes. No one else can or should answer these questions for him. His philosophy of education, properly learned in correlation with his specialty, should help him answer these questions himself. In learning to answer these questions, the teachers have become professional in a liberal sense. Then and only then is he no longer a functionary or a petty civil servant in a big bureaucratic machine, for he knows what he is there for. As the matter stands now, it is both hypocritical and ridiculous to have statements of the philosophy of education everywhere: in each school, in each superintendent's office, in each state department of education. No, philosophy of education is more practical and more serious. Practical for it is in what we actually do with our children and the effect on them thereof that a philosophy of education acquires reality. Philosophy is not a handout to be accepted or obeyed by subordinates. It is a school master's vision of the importance of his daily work. If a teacher sees no importance in what he is teaching, he is a living lie, is he not? How else would he know the importance of his work than a sound philosophical consideration of his teaching?

We are now moving toward the liberal education of teachers. The philosophical consideration of the value and significance of subject matter to be taught illustrates another important point: that the liberal and the professional education of a teacher can and should be correlated.[5] It is unimportant whether philosophy of education is taught by a philosopher or a philosopher of education. It is important, however, whether or not it is taught to liberate the professionals. A good professor of literary criticism, for instance, could do more for the future teachers of English, whether on the elementary, secondary, or college level of education, than either a philosopher or a philosopher of education. The same can be said of a good professor of historiography, theories of science, aesthetics, or music theory. The catch word is of course the word, good. But good, in this instance, is definable: good in the sense of usefulness and relevance.

But liberal education for teachers is more than philosophy of education. Theoretically, it should be carried out in all the so-called "foundation courses." But the foundation courses, history and sociology of education, comparative education, as well as philosophy of education, as they are being taught at present in the majority of teacher education institutions are neither useful, nor ornamental. At their best, they compete for toughness and scholarship with liberal arts courses and seldom make the grade. At their worst, they are the most irrelevant courses taught by incompetent professors. What has the Old Deluder Act to do with the present day working teacher? Why does an American teacher need to know the eleven plus examination in the British system? What can a working teacher do if he realizes that the present IQ test is culturally biased? Seldom do the foundation professors examine

the why, the what, and the how of their own subject matter and teach accordingly. The sheer irrelevance of these courses becomes evident if we examine the text books on the market in the foundation field. Instead of liberating the teaching profession, foundation courses are senseless burdens and details to be covered instead of enlightenments to be enjoyed. Only books like *Sociology of Teaching* by Willard Waller could have met the liberal educational requirement. We need more up to date books of the same kind.[6] Teachers of foundation courses must be trail blazers in the profession, men of the caliber of Paul Goodman, Edgar Z. Friedenberg, Myron Lieberman, Newt Sanford, James Coleman, or David Riesman.

The sweeping indictment of the present teacher education is the lack of zest for life, as Whitehead used the term, on the part of its products. Professor Friedenberg's description of public school teachers as petty civil servants could have been a calculated affront. But to say common school teaching is a "profession" is simply self-deception. No profession, absolutely none worthy of its name, would allow politicians and laymen to control its performance as teaching does. The teachers dare not stand up to the "public" pressures unless they themselves are both competent and confident enough to articulate "the public and its problems" as Dewey once put it. Where else can teachers acquire this "self-concept" or "self image" except through a program integrating the professional and the liberal education.[7]

REFERENCES

1. Bruner, Jerome S., "On Teaching Teachers" in *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1964. pp. 97-99.
2. Dewey, John, *The Child and the Curriculum and The School and Society.* (paperback) The University of Chicago Press. P. 22 of *The Child and the Curriculum.*
3. Ibid. p. 70 of *The School and Society.*
4. James, William, *Talks to Teachers on Psychology: and to students on some of Life's Ideals* (paperback). New York: W. W. Norton & Company Inc. p. 24.
5. Hook, Sidney, *Education for Modern Man.* New York; Dial Press. p. 168-169.
6. Dovonan, Charles F., S. J., "Tradition and Innovation in Teacher Education" The eighth Charles W. Hunt Lecture of AACTE, 1967.
7. Sing-nan Fen, "Vocational and Liberal Education, An Integrated Approach," *School Review*, Vol. 69, No. 2.