DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 225 SP 009 105

AUTHOR	Lindsey, Margaret
TITLE	The Professional Scholar as Teacher: A Conception.
PUB DATE	1 Apr 74
NOTE	23p.; Paper delivered as a Centennial Lecture at Eastern Kentucky University (Richmond, Kentucky, April 1, 1974)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Educational History; Educational Philosophy; Educational Research; *Historical Reviews; Schools of Education; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Educators; *Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	*Professional Scholars

ABSTRACT

This account of professional concerns and arguments dating from the time when normal schools were first established and nurtured makes the following points: (a) conditions in which schools operated and teaching took place were then comparatively simple; (b) given these simplistic conditions and the extremely limited knowledge available both about teaching and in the school subjects themselves, it was possible for people to apply their minds to the total range of questions and problems in relation to schooling and the preparation of teachers; (c) educators dealt with the same basic questions and problems we are confronted with today and perceived clearly the need for more knowledge in a range of disciplines; and (d) many of their early principles and ideas have been confirmed through recent research. Conditions surrounding education and schooling have, in the past century, become much more complex. What teacher education needs now, as it once had, is an integrating force which will serve to make possible the meaningful systematization of knowledge about the teaching process. The most useful integrating force is professional scholarship, which is distinguished from academic scholarship by its focus on study of practice. The total institutional environment is responsible for generating the conditions that bring about disposition toward scholarship. The unique function of the college of education is inquiry into professional practice, and such inquiry must be what integrates and gives meaning to the collegiate preparation of professional scholars who will teach. (PB)

THE PROFESSIONAL SCHOLAR AS TEACHER: A CONCEPTION*

Margaret Lindsey
Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

On this special occasion as a part of your centennial celebration, I would like to direct your attention to the notion of a professional scholar as contrasted with the academic scholar or the general scholar and to elicit a search for the meaning of this notion for a particular professional practitioner -- the teacher. A debate on the nature of scholarship required of teachers has persisted since the establishment of the first normal school in 1839; indeed that debate had much to do with the inception of single purpose schools to prepare teachers. The controversy was popular not only at the time this institution was founded one hundred years ago, but it has contributed in no small degree to the rapid development of this institution from 1906, when your State Legislature agreed to the establishment of two Normal Schools, this one in Eastern Kentucky and the other at Bowling Green in Western Kentucky, to its present status as an honored university. Concepts of scholars and scholarship have varied greatly over time and within a single time period as manifested in statements by different educational leaders.

It is instructive to consider the arguments persented by those interested in the preparation of teachers during the period when the rise of the normal school was dominant for, according to historians, those arguments set the stage for teacher education as it has developed during the present century. The same basic arguments, with revised content, are present in varying degrees today, and they are illuminating with regard to the meaning of professional scholarship of teachers.

*Delivered as a Centennial Lecture at Eastern Kentucky University on April 1, 1974.

Teachers for the newly developing secondary schools and for the established academies of the nineteenth century were drawn largely from the faculties of colleges. Their preparation consisted primarily of advanced study of subjects thought to be liberalizing and to develop those qualities essential to leadership as citizens. Prerequisites were quickly established for entrance into the colleges; and the secondary schools rapidly developed an emphasis on college-preparatory programs. Consequently, the tie between secondary schools and colleges became tight, and students prepared for college in the secondary schools, pursued advanced study of subjects in the colleges, and returned to the secondary school to prepare more students to follow the path they had taken. Since it was generally believed that the prime requirement for teaching was knowing the subject matter and that there was no body of knowledge about teaching worthy of study in the college, secondary school teachers were prepared to know their subject matter, but they had no systematic instruction in how to teach.

On the other hand, teachers for the rapidly developing common (elementary) school were recruited from faculties of academies or secondary schools. It was believed that their academic study was adequate preparation for teaching in the lower schools. However, the realtionship between what was studies in the academicies and the subjects taught in the common schools was slight. Moreover, it was clear that those who advocated that teachers for the common schools should be prepared in the academies did not view study of the common branches or of how to teach them as worthy content for the academy.

In this setting, the normal school was established to provide specific preparation for teachers of the common branches in the elementary schools. Students began to go directly from a few years' study in the common school to the normal school and back to the elementary school as teachers. The curriculum of the normal schcol tended to focus exclusively on the common branches of the

elementary school and on study of the mechanical techniques of teaching these common branches. As the secondary schools and colleges became closely tied, so did the elementary schools and normal schools.

Controversy over the content of the normal school curriculum was severe and to a very large extent an expression of difference in opinion on what was required of a teacher -- knowing the subject matter he was to teach his pupils and how to teach it or knowing the foundations of the subject matter and the more abstract and advanced elements of it.

Nicholas Tillinghaust, the first principal of the Bridgewater (Massachusetts) Normal School described his ideal to Henry Barnard as follows:

> My idea of a Normal School is, that it should have a term of four years; that those studies should be pursued that will lay a foundation on which to build an education. I mean, for example, that algebra should be thoroughly studied as the foundation of arithemtic....[1]

William Phelps, the first principal of the Trenton (New Jersey) State Normal School was "heard many times repeating the plaintive cry, 'How are you to teach them how to teach that of which they know nothing?'"[2] Others, Horace Mann and Henry Barnard among them, were committed to the notion of single-purpose institutions, normal schools, where future teachers for the common schools might be prepared by study of the common branches and how to teach them. In fact, it was argued that thorough study of the common branches to be taught in the elementary schools could be a genuine liberal education with as much merit as study of the classics in other institutions.

---

1. Merle L. Borrowman, THE LIBERAL AND TECHNICAL IN TEACHER EDUCATION, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956, p.44.

2. Ibid., p. 45.

Questions surrounding the normal school curriculum were not confined to what subject matter should be included; there were also questions about how one learned to behave as a teacher, how one developed control over the skills and techniques of teaching. Cyrus Pierce, principal of the first normal school in Lexington, Massachusetts advocated that prospective teachers should practice the arts of teaching by playing the role of teacher in contrived situations where each normal school pupil would teach his peers. Dissatisfaction with this role playing stategy resulted in Pierce's establishing a model school where his normal school students could observe models of teaching. Sheldon saw the need for more than observation of model teachers and demonstrated in his program at Oswego, New York a sequence of practice experiences for future teachers. His concept of such experiences became the heart of the normal school program.

A sharp line of distinction between study of the subject matter to be aught and practice in teaching it became increasingly apparent. Some advocated the professionalization of subject matter as a means for bringing what to teach and how to teach it into proper relationship. These educators proposed that in the course of studying a subject the student in the normal school should be instructed simultaneously in how to teach the subject to pupils in the elementary school. The concept of professionalized subject matter, and practices emanating from it, have been subjected to varying interpretations and to considerable debate. Like the arguments over what subject matter should be included in the normal school program and over the role of practice in the preparation of teachers, the controversy over professionalization of subject matter is relevant to examination of professional scholarship today.

As might logically have been predicted, when emphasis on teaching became paramount both in theoretical study of specifc techniques of teaching the various subjects in the common school in requirements for observation of model teachers and practice in model schools, serious debate erupted around such questions as: What is education? What is teaching? Are there common principles of teaching? Is there a science of education? What evidence supports opposing answers to such questions? Interestingly enough, these questions captivated the attention of college and university professors preparing secondary school teachers as well as teachers designing and conducting normal school programs preparing elementary school teachers. Efforts to establish pedogogy as a respectable subject in the colleges and universities resulted and, combined with continuing advocacy of practice in teaching as the core of normal school programs, served to provoke analysis of knowledge relevant to teaching behavior.

In 1888, Charles Kendall Adams presented a paper to the convention of the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in which he argued for the introduction of pedagogy into college and university programs and proposed a sequence of four courses for this purpose: (1) History of Education, (2) Philosophy of Education, (3) Methods in the School Room, and (4) the Teachers' Seminary. "Then, in addition to these courses, there may well be given by professors in the leading departments of the college or university courses designed exclusively to instruct how to teach young pupils the subject at hand."[1] (In passing, the marked similarity between this proposal and the courses in the professional sequence in secondary education three quarters of a century later should be noted.) At the next annual convention of the same association,

1. Charles Kendall Adams, "The Teaching of Pedagogy in Colleges and Universities," New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, ADDRESSES AND PROCEEDINGS, 1888, pp. 17-19.

J. B. Sewell responded to the Adams paper, stating his agreement with this idea that specialized preparation in pedagogy should be required for teachers but forcefully rejecting the suggestion that colleges and universities should provide it. The responsibility of colleges and universities, he argued, was liberal education, non-professional and non-vocational in orientation. He, and others who shared his view, advocated that study of pedagogy should follow graduation from the college and be done in professional schools, similar to the pattern in medicine and law.

Meanwhile the designers of normal school programs were also dealing with the fundamental question of the substance of pedagogy. Reports of the early conventions of the American Normal School Association reveal a continuing search for principles of teaching and a science of education; for knowledge relevant to understanding pupils, how the mind works, and how teachers might behave to bring about greatest accomplishment in their charges. Simple rules for teaching, specifying devices and techniques as the substance of study about teaching in the normal schools, were beginning to be questioned. If teachers were to be more than mechanical manipulators of pupils, materials, and activities in their classrooms, it was recognized that they would need knowledge from several disciplines as based for looking at their programs and activities. Adolpheus Crosby spoke to this point at the first Normal School Convention in 1888:

> It seems obvious that any course of professional training which is merely mechanical or empirical, must have as its basis a thorough consideration of the principles of the profession, of its philosophy, and that this should underlie and give form to all the attention which may be paid to practical methods ...
>
> In most professional schools, the fundamental importance of study of principles upon which the profession is based has been recognized and practically regarded. ...Why has it not been seen that in the Normal School, for the training of educators, the prime subject of study should be the principles of Education, and that the most earnest effort of the student should be directed, not to the solution of a miscellaneous question in Mr. Blank's arithemetic, but to answer

> for herself such questions as these, "What is Education? What does it comprise?"[1]

At this same convention, John Ogden

> pointed out that the mere grouping of practical hints about teaching subjects was not a science. Ogden went on to develop his concept of the science (of education) as being composed of absolute laws and axioms capable of definite classification and arrangements and of being studied independently of other subjects. He defined the science of education, in the manner then customary, as embracing, (1) the nature of man's educational capacities, (2) the nature of educative forces and instrumentalities (i.e., subject), and (3) the modes of teaching.[2]

Crosby and Ogden represented a group of normal school proponents who were convinced that education was already a science. But Richard Edwards and others, while seemingly committed to the potentiality of education as a science, saw the then available knowledge in the field as inadequate and challenged the validity and reliability of principles of practice as then taught in the normal schools.

> Every principle, before it is deemed trustworthy, should be subjected to a rigorous process of verification, and the system finally adopted should be the result deduced from the experience of many, continued through the years.[3]

Our predecessors seldom employed the words scholar and scholarship when speaking of teachers or of students preparing to be teachers. They did often refer to pupils in the common school as scholars and to professors in universities as academic scholars. Yet it may readily be inferred from their work

---

1. American Normal School Association, AMERICAN NORMAL SCHOOLS, THEIR THEORY, THEIR WORKINGS, AND THEIR RESULTS, AS EMBODIED IN THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN NORMAL SCHOOL ASSOCIATION. New York: A.S. Barnes and Burr, 1860, pp. 25-26.

2. Merle L. Borrowman, THE LIBERAL AND TECHNICAL IN TEACHER EDUCATION, New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956 p. 64-65.

3. AMERICAN NORMAL SCHOOLS ASSOCIATION, loc. cit., p. 82.

that they were concerned with scholarship and with teachers becoming scholars. In his famous LECTURES ON SCHOOL KEEPING, Hall admonished students in his private normal school, "A man cannot teach that which he does not himself know" and in further explanation of what he meant by knowing, he said, "I do not mean that smattering of science, which so often passes for a knowledge of it; but a thorough acquaintance with its principles."[1] Fifty years later, Thomas Gray reported the professional needs of teachers as identified by some respondents to a questionnaire he had distributed:

> to see the subject in proper relationship to others in the curriculum
> to understand the psychologically sound order in which it might be presented
> to have a clear insight into the loci of its organization
> to be sensitive to the processes by which the student came to understand the subject[2]

Gray was seeking to support the notion of professionalized subject matter by calling attention to the specific needs of teachers as different from the needs of persons studying subject matter for purposes other than teaching. His statement is clearly an indication of a concept of scholarship in subject matter required of the teacher. Today we speak of the teacher as a scholar in his teaching field and we are still engaged in a search for what this scholarship means.

In another one of his famous LECTURES ON SCHOOL KEEPING, Hall advised his students, "Endeavor to become acquainted with the nature of your employment." From their own observations of teaching, Hall and his contemporaries

1. Arthur Wright and George Gardner, HALL'S LECTURES ON SCHOOL KEEPING, Hanover, N.H.: The Dartmouth Press, 1929, pp. 69-70.

2. Thomas Gray, "Report of the 'Chicago Committee' on Methods of Instruction and Courses of Study in Normal Schools," NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION PROCEEDINGS, 1889, p. 581 as reported in Borrowman, p. 96.

deduced "principles of teaching" and proceeded to train their students to behave in specific ways based on those principles. It was later that Edwards and others began to question the validity of the principles and to suggest that they should be subjected to rigorous verification before they were accepted as trustworthy. Libraries in colleges of education house many hundreds of volumes as witness to the continuing search for understanding the teaching process, principles by which it may be guided, and suggestions on the application of those principles to classroom behavior. Educators in diverse fields today are attracted to the same questions being asked a century ago and are devoting their energies to rigorous inquiry in search for knowledge in relation to them. We often speak of these educators as scholars of teaching, that is, persons who commit their scholarship to the study of teaching for the purpose of advancing knowledge about it.

It was suggested at the outset of this paper that consideration of the controversies surrounding the establishment and early years of universities was instructive. The sketchy review of highlights of selected issues and arguments presented here serves an instructive purpose. It reveals a persistency in the fundamental questions about education, about teaching, and about the preparation of teachers. It furthermore reveals a continuity in the search for every more reliable answers to those questions. It provides perspective for present-day inquiry. It suggests that from the beginning of formalized teacher education programs there has been a concerted effort to develop professional scholarship, although those words seem not to have been common in the literature until comparatively recent times. Today's teacher educators are the continuing link in this stream of scholarship. Our heritage is the residue of the work and wisdom of conscientious, able educators who dealt with their problems in their times within the conditions of knowledge

and the methods of inquiry available to them. The conditions of knowledge and the methods of inquiry in today's setting provide an incalculable advantage over previous periods in history. What is done with the opportunities for professional scholarship by today's teachers and those who prepare them will determine the inheritance of the next generation. What heritage will they receive? What legacy will you leave?

What is professional scholarship? What does it mean to be a professional scholar? What characterizes today's professional scholar who teaches? Scholar may be variously defined all the way from any pupil in an elementary school person of any age who loves learning and devoted his energies to study, often outside of formalized educational structures. The key words in defining a scholar are student, study, and learning. The scholar is a student seeking to learn. For most scholars, the seeking is directed by questions relevant to a particular field of knowledge. Hence we speak of a scholar in epistemology who seeks to develop understanding of the nature of knowledge and what it means to know; we speak of a scholar of history who seeks to order and interpret events in verifiable ways: or we speak of the scholar in learning theory who searches for new knowledge about learning processes and products. But what is the scholar of professional practice seeking to learn?

As history is the subject of scholarship for the historian and as mathematics is the subject of scholarship for the mathematician, practice is the subject of scholarship for any professional practitioner; teaching is the subject of scholarship for the professional teacher. The historian may select within his broad field, a single person, an event, a condition, a theme, or a time and focus his scholarship on it. Methods appropriate to his scholarship as an historian are rather clearly defined and accepted by his peers. But the professional teacher has no such easy delimitations to his task of scholarship. His subject, teaching or pedagogy, is a complex

system, encompassing numerous subsystems which must be considered in their interrelationships. The very complexity of the system and subsystems demands not one but many modes of inquiry. The questions to which he directs his inquiry are multiple, demanding knowledge and tools from a range of disciplines.

Our heritage, both as viewed from historical perspective and as evidenced in contemporary programs, is one of steadily increasing compartmentalization and decreasing relatedness among the bodies of knowledge and methods in inquiry appropriate to scholarship in teaching. Our membership in the general intellectual community in a changing society has made us both beneficiaries of and contributors to the explosion of knowledge with its accompanying specialization, the emphasis on scientific modes of inquiry, and the problems of relevance, morality, and socio-political sensitivity. Confrontation between practices handed down from the past, and still in widespread use, and real conditions of today is a source of anxiety and confusion for those who must make decisions about the education of professional scholars who teach. Solutions in dealing with this confrontation are not easy to come by.

Ideas on how to go about establishing some coherence and integrity in the development of professional scholarship in teaching ought to be subjected to critical examination in the domain of teacher education. A few such ideas, seen only partially and relying on still untested assumptions, make up the content of the remainder of this paper. They are offered here, not as solutions but rather as something to spark criticism and lead to discussion of new patterns and practices in the preparation of teachers. Moreover, the sum of the ideas briefly mentioned in the following paragraphs in no way implies the total of teacher education; the focus is directly and singly on professional scholarship.

A scholar is first and foremost characterized by a syndrome of particular attitudes that cause him to respond in predictable ways to

conditions in his environment (events, people, things, ideas). His basic dispositions prompt him to feel excitement and satisfaction in adventures into the unknown, to experience discomfort in the absence of rationale, to seek to define significant questions with accuracy and precision, to be open to alternatives, to move habitually toward search for relevant knowledge, and to withhold judgment until the data are in. How does one acquire this syndrome of attitudes or dispositions? Admittedly, knowledge about how attitudes are developed is incomplete, but recent research provides more hope for teacher educators whereas not long ago it was assumed by many that there was slim chance of modifying attitudes in young adults, it now appears certain that attitudes can be changed, even after twenty years of experience in living. There is accumulating evidence to suggest that attitude change is the function of direct experience, the input of relevant knowledge, and the nature and source of persuasion.

One outstanding conclusion from Jacob's analysis of research on CHANGING VALUES IN COLLEGE STUDENTS is pertinent here. It was not the specific content of courses or a particular curriculum pattern or the relative emphasis on direct and indirect instructional strategies that seemed to influence value change in college students. Rather it was the atmosphere, the institutional ethos, that affected change. It it is intended that future teachers shall acquire attitudes appropriate to a professional scholar, the primary conditions for bringing about this development are to be found in the institutional ethos -- the distinguishing characteristics or tone of the university community. Institutional tone is set by what is respected and rewarded by important persons in the environment. Important persons, be they students, professors, administrators, or others, generate the conditions that encourage or hinder the development of scholarly attitudes

in the prospective teacher.

Therefore, institutions that are committed to the development of scholars who will teach will be concerned first not with the addition to the curriculum of a research course nor with the establishment of a research institute nor with requirements of scholarly papers from students. The first concern will be with the diagnosis of the institutional ethos as perceived by members of the institutional community. Perceptions of institutional atmosphere are composed of feelings as well as knowledge, of personal interpretation of facts as well as the facts themselves. Because perceptions of the environmental rewards are powerful influences on one's behavior, data collected for diagnostic purposes must include both the cognitive and affective dimensions of individual perceptions. Information ought to be obtained on what students appear to value in their peers, in their professors, and in their administrators; on what professors seem to respect and reward in their students, in their colleagues, and in their administrators; and on what administrators appear to reward in their professors, their peers, and their students. If data reveal conditions or perceptions of them that might hinder rather than promote scholarly activities by faculty or students, then steps should be taken to modify those conditions or perceptions.

In addition to the idea of institutional atmosphere as evidenced in what is respected and rewarded, one other notion merits special comment here. It is the general stance taken by members of the university community with regard to what is known and what is yet to be known. In the field of education generally, and in teaching especially, there is a very small body of absolute knowledge on which to base decisions and to predict the consequences of behavior. Social sciences are less amenable than natural

sciences to precise, predictive principles. University personnel sometimes find it very difficult to accept the present status of knowledge and to admit to great areas of uncertainty. If prospective teachers are to have tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty, and if they are to be sensitized to the tremendous need for inquiry related to professional practice, those with whom they work must admit their lack of knowledge as well as manifest their possession of knowledge. They must show concern for discovery of needed knowledge.

An institutional environment sets the stage for the kinds of direct experiences students can have with scholarly activities, and it may or may not provide opportunities for students to acquire knowledge needed in examination of attitudes. But perhaps what is even more important is students' perceptions of the university as the source of persuasion. In the university community, particularly in a college of education, the prospective teacher is in contact with accomplished professional scholars. He tends to identify with them as models, to take on their ways of behaving, and to see worth in what they value. Professors with whom students associate are important people, and as sources of persuasion they are critical. Their persuasion, however, is effected more by their behavior than by their admonitions and their demands on students.

Given an atmosphere where scholarly attitudes may develop, a student will seek to gain control over the methods and tools essential to scholarship. Hence, a fundamental motivating force, that is, the urge to meet expectancies set in an environment -- the urge to qualify, if you will -- will be present. It then becomes the responsibility of those who work with future teachers to provide a range of opportunities for each student to acquire the methods and tools of inquiry. Although effective kinds of

of instruction in formally organized courses in research methods can make a substantial contribution, unless a student has a real need to acquire knowledge and skills, his learning from such courses is likely to lack meaning and relevance and to have short durability. Therefore, he must have opportunity to become involved as a partner, or as an independent investigator, in appropriate inquiry. It is the involvement in meaningful tasks that contributes to his acquiring mastery of methods and tools.

A number of ways are present in any college of education for getting a future teacher involved in scholarly activities. Some of these ought to be an integral part of all college courses. For example, prospective teachers ought to have many chances to engage in systematic inquiry into factors that promote or hinder their own learning in a course, perhaps as partners in larger investigations being carried on by their professors. They should be challenged regularly to make critical analyses of assumptions made by their professors or as found in printed materials. On every possible occasion, they should be required to develop precise definitions of problems and issues, to present arguments pro and con. They ought to have chances to develop and present proposals on how they would go about studying a question or problem or situation. Finally, they ought to have lots of opportunity to design and conduct simple experiments on real and important questions. <u>One learns to use the methods of inquiry by using them</u>. Few statements have more significance for teacher educators. Its implications reach into every dimension of programs to prepare professional scholars as teachers.

Not only is it important that the student have many opportunities to use scholarly methods in study of significant problems, but <u>it also is necessary that he experience success in using them</u>. Instructors

are responsible for students experiencing success. If they assume this responsibility, they are alert to cues indicating help is needed, and quick to see that help is made available in whatever form is appropriate to a student's readiness, the task in which he is engaged, and the resources available.

It will be apparent at this point, that what has been said here about professional scholarship is so generalized as to fit any kind of scholarship. That observation is intended. The position is being taken that the criteria of scholarship are everywhere the same, although the substance of inquiry will vary, and the methods and special tools may differ from one discipline to another or from one problem to another. There is a striking degree of similarity in the approaches to inquiry, regardless of problem, substance, or level of investigation. An affirmative attitude toward inquiry and control over the general methods of inquiry are the two basic requirements for the professional scholar as teacher.

The third fundamental requirement has to do more with commitment than with knowledge or skills. It has to do with respect for one's profession as a practice worthy of study. The professional practice of teaching requires one to carry on scholarly activities in at least three distinct but closely interrelated realms. First, the teacher must continue to employ scholarship in specialty, the subject matter with which he works. Second, he must continue to apply scholarly methods in his self-development as a man and a citizen. But, thirdly, if he is a professional scholar who teaches, he must also be conducting inquiry into the teaching process itself.

The first of these, that is, continuing study of the subject matter with which one works, has always received much attention as noted in the historical sketch in the first part of this paper and as apparent in

contemporary writing. Today there is strong advocacy from all quarters that a teacher needs to be a scholar of his subject matter. There is less evidence that the prospective teacher's study of his subject specialty results in either devotion to continuing scholarship or control over the methods of inquiry in his field.

Concepts of scholarship in relation to personal-citizenship development perhaps ought to be most observable in programs of general or liberal education. If this is so, such programs need to be subjected to critical examination to discover what manner of scholarship they actually encourage in college students. The commendable objectives stated for these programs -- development of intellectual skills, of curiosity, of love of learning, etc. -- seem to be rather far removed from both content of courses and instructional processes in too many general education programs. Much of what one sees and hears seems to be focused on the lowest levels of cognitive processes -- memory and recall -- and to be some distance from dealing with real problems of living by use of rational processes.

Professional scholarship is far from adequate if the teacher concentrates his inquiry exclusively in the two categories just mentioned -- continuing search in his special subject matter field and in his personal-citizenship functions. As a professional he is required to focus his study on his practice -- teaching. That is to say, it is expected of him that he will subject to rigorous inquiry his behavior as a teacher -- his planning, his encounters in interaction, his methods and instruments of evaluation, his communication, his sensitivities, his knowledge and perceptions of his pupils, his use of materials and resources, his feelings, the atmosphere in his classroom, and so on. This he is expected to do as a scholar who studies his practice for the purpose

of improving it and as a member of a profession, responsible for the discovery and verification of knowledge related to professional practice.

If, as should be so, the prespective teacher is prepared in an atmosphere where scholarship is respected and rewarded, if his study in his teaching field is designed to result in understanding of both the key concepts and methods of inquiry appropriate to the field, if his general education program actually prepares him to take a rational approach to conditions and problems of living, it remains for the college of education to cause him to focus his scholarship on his professional practice. This is a primary function of a college of education. The prevailing distance between commitment to this function and its implementation in curriculum and instruction is a sadder commentary on schools of education than are similar comments about programs of subject matter specialization and general education. After all, most undergraduate programs in education are designed to prepare teachers; they are concerned with teaching students about teaching; their subject matter is knowledge relevant to teaching. Professors of education ought to be models of scholarship in professional practice, committed to inquiry into that practice, and continuously investigating important questions and problems related to that practice.

The other day a group of student teachers were asked to read Robert Schaefer's THE SCHOOL AS A CENTER OF INQUIRY in preparation for a seminar. Observation of that seminar disclosed a "recitation type lesson" where the professor asked for recall of statements and ideas from the book, and student teachers played the established rules of the game by responding as expected. Toward the end of the discussion, one student raised a

question about the meaning of Schaefer's concept for his planning for teaching. Soon the dialogue centered on "what do we do ourselves to inquire?" Testimonials, one on top of another, spilled out, all reporting no recall of a place in their preparation to date where they were really forced to engage in solid inquiry.

In still another setting students were in a seminar that immediately preceded student teaching. A resource person had come to them to talk about research on teaching. He made a strong case for systematic study of the teaching process and emphasized how important it was for them to begin to design some studies they would carry out during student teaching. But the students needed considerable help in identifying the kinds of problems or questions that might be subjected to inquiry. The resource person turned to the professor ans suggested that he indicate the kinds of studies being carried on by him and his colleagues as illustrations. The professor was stumped, for as he began to go through the catalog of researches he knew to be under way in that institution, he could find none that focused on the teaching process itself. Could it be that the professors in this college of education did not respect their practice enough to view it as worthy of study in its own right?

The early part of this paper was concerned with historical perspective. It was suggested that gaining such perspective could be instructive in dealing with the present conditions surrounding teacher education programs. A few conclusions may be drawn from the brief account of professional concerns and arguments at the time when normal schools were established and nurtured.

(1) Conditions in which schools operated and teaching took place were comparatively simple.

(2) Given the simplistic nature of the enterprise of schooling, and the extremely limited knowledge available both about teaching and in the school subjects themselves, it was possible for men to apply their minds to the total range of questions and problems in relation to schooling and the preparation of teachers.

(3) They dealt with the same basic questions and problems we are confronted with today, they found themselves holding different positions on them, and they perceived clearly the need for more knowledge in a range of disciplines, if they were to understand and cope with the problems and issues about which they were concerned.

(4) Many of the principles and ideas, arrived at through wise observation by early teacher educators, have come to have meaning and support through recent research.

During a century of remarkable accomplishment, conditions surrounding education and schooling have become so complex as to almost defy description. Knowledge has multiplied in every direction; completely new disciplines have emerged. Of necessity, academic scholars close in to more and more specific and narrow specialties, and the specialty of one has less and less relationship to specialties of others. Research possibilities have expanded, not along because of financial support, but also because of sophistication in methods and tools. Institutions have become size and prestige conscious. Technology has opened wide vistas of previously unthought of possibilities. These developments have had an impact on teacher education programs as much, and perhaps even more, than on other levels and areas of education.

No one would seriously propose a return to 1870. But this writer would propose a return to the central focus on teaching that was so explicit at that time. This is not to suggest a return to simplicity; that is totally

foolish. It is not to suggest a return to the levels of knowledge, skills, and methods known at that time; that would be stupid. It is not to suggest a return to single purpose institutions; that would be to defy reality. It is not to suggest a return to complete dependence on wisdom gained by means of reflection on one's own experience; that would be denial of the extent and nautre of knowledge available now.

Rather, it is to suggest that teacher education needs now, as it used to have, an integrating focus, a center of attention, an organizing structure which will serve to make possible the meaningful systematization of knowledge around the teaching process.

It is proposed that the most useful integrating force, both for the student and for program designing, is professional scholarship. Professional scholarship is distinquished from academic scholarship by its focus on study of practice. It is the inquiry into practice itself that gives reason for study in bodies of knowledge that help in understanding, explaining, and interpreting practice. The total institutional environment, including human and material resources and activities, is responsible for generating the conditions that bring about in all members of the university community (faculty and students alike) dispositions toward scholarship. Development of intellectual skills required in taking scholarly approaches to one's work and life is the obligation of every member of the institutional body. The unique function of the college of education is inquiry into the professional practice, and such inquiry must be what holds together, gives meaning to, integrates, makes coherent the collegiate preparation of professional scholars who will teach.

Those who care deeply about professional scholarship in this institution and those who have confidence in the future of your kind in the business of

educating school and college personnel may move forward with heads held high because of the foundation on which the present is built and the future must stand.

> Founders of Normal No. 1 showed great foresight in their educational objectives as reflected in their "exit requirements." "The proper place at which to safeguard an institution's standards of a scholarship and efficiency is at the exit rather than at the entrance. Acting according to this proposition, the State Normal will place their courses of study within reach of any student who can profit from them, and in most cases the student will be permitted to show whether he can profit by them, by being given an opportunity to do the work rather than by being required to submit to an 'entrance examination.' ...
>
> "But every student must prove himself or herself to the full before being allowed to go out with the certificate which the law empowers the State Normals to confer. There must be evidence at the exit that the student has attained to the high standards of scholarship and teaching skill which have been set by the Normal Executive Council."
>
> Ron G. Wolfe, "EKU: 100 Years Old and Still Growing." The Eastern Kentucky University Alumnus, Winter, 1974, pp. 18-19.

You see, your founding fathers were far out front, ahead of their counterparts in their time, and quite ahead of many educators today. They saw then that a teacher's performance was what really made the difference; they recognized then that what one knew and could talk about had significance as it was used in determining behavior; they were sensitive then to the responsibility of institutions like this one for the performance of its graduates. Indeed, they surely must have been the architects of today's concern with competency-based teacher education and certification. What they believed is a commitment of many persons right now. It is yours and mine.