

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 829

SP 012 139

AUTHOR Cremin, Lawrence A.
TITLE The Education of the Educating Professions.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 78
NOTE 28p.; 19th Annual Charles W. Hunt Lecture, presented at the Annual Meeting, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (30th, Chicago, Illinois, February 21, 1978).

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; Doctoral Programs; *Educational Change; *Educational History; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; *Professional Training; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Educators; Teaching Methods; Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT This speech covers three major topics: (1) the origins of the present day paradigm of professional training in education and the problematics of education as a field of study; (2) the recent history of the doctorate in education; and (3) recommendations on the present day doctorate in education, based on an analysis of the central requirements of the educating professions. (JD)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available. *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED148829

19th Annual
Charles W. Hunt
Lecture

LAWRENCE A. CREMIN

THE EDUCATION
OF THE
EDUCATING
PROFESSIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

American Association
of Colleges for Teacher Education

SP 012 139

Technical Editor: Ruth Barker

Copyright © 1977 by
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, D.C. 20036
Standard Book Number: 0-89333-008-6

CHARLES W. HUNT The Lectures and the Man



Through the Charles W. Hunt Lecture, given at each of the Annual Meetings of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education since 1960, AACTE proudly acknowledges its debt to this dedicated educational statesman.

Though he spent most of his professional life as an administrator, Charles Hunt rightly insisted on identifying himself as a teacher. His infectious enthusiasm for life and his championing of the God-given right of every individual, young or old, to develop to maximum potential are qualities which always marked his commitment to the preparation of teachers. His vitality and determination to move ahead in reshaping teacher education, and his skill in firing up others to do so are in the best tradition of the good teacher.

As champion of the democratic ideal, he counseled grassroots organization and solidarity to accomplish reform. As a true pioneer in teacher education, he was wise enough to view the community not only as a laboratory, but as a source for ideas and support. A teacher, communicator, and an agent for change, he "shook the ideas and structure" of teacher education.

As AACTE Executive Director Edward C. Pomeroy said at the memorial service for Dr. Hunt September 5, 1973: "Without a man of the vision of Charles Hunt and the encouragement he provided, certainly the history of these past 50 years in American education would have been significantly different." Indeed, much of importance in organized teacher education happened in his lifetime.

Born in Charlestown, New Hampshire in 1880, Charles Wesley Hunt was educated at Brown University (B.A. 1904) and Columbia University (M.A. 1910, Ph.D. 1922), all the while teaching English in New England and New York until he began a supervisory career in 1916. In his 18

years as a college president, from 1933 to 1951, he helped to transform an old normal school at Oneonta into the State University of New York at Oneonta, a multipurpose institution within a state system of colleges.

Our Association owes much to Charles Hunt. Serving voluntarily for 25 years as secretary-treasurer (1928-53), he was instrumental in transforming the American Association of Teachers Colleges into the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Until his death, he continued to serve as consultant to the Association's Board of Directors. His inspiration still guides AACTE and its professional men and women who represent their institutions.

The Lecture Series is conceived as a continuing professional tribute to the years of leadership and service which Dr. Hunt gave to education. When this series was begun in 1960, Dr. Hunt advised us to hold fast to "enduring faith in our purposes, faith in our fellow workers, and faith in the democratic tradition and process." Such dedicated commitment is still needed today to lift the quality of education in American society. Charles Hunt has built a model that will serve future professionals well.

LAWRENCE A. CREMIN
Frederick A.P. Barnard
Professor of Education
and President
Teachers College
Columbia University



Cremin joined the Teachers College faculty in 1949 and the Columbia University History Department in 1961. From 1958-1974, he served as chairman of the Teachers College Department of Philosophy and the Social Sciences. He also directed the college's Institute of Philosophy and Politics of Education for a nine-year period, 1965-1974. He has been president of Teachers College since 1974.

A prolific author, his history of the United States progressive education movement, *The Transformation of the School*, was awarded the Bancroft Prize in American History for 1962. Currently, he is working on a comprehensive history of American education; the first volume, *American Education: The Colonial Experience*, was published in 1970. The American Historical Association, U.S. Office of Education, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York are cosponsoring the research.

His other books include *Traditions of American Education*, 1977; *Public Education*, 1976, *The Republic and the School: Horace Mann on the Education of Free Men*, 1957; and *The American Common School: An Historic Conception*, 1951. In 1965, both *The Wonderful World of Ellwood Patterson Cubberley* and *The Genius of American Education* by Cremin appeared in print. He has coauthored five books and edits the Teachers College series, *Classics in Education*.

Cremin was associate editor of *Teachers College Record* from 1952-1959, and has served on editorial advisory boards of *History of Education Journal*, *Sociology of Education*, *History of Education*, *School Review*, *International Review of Education*, *World Book Year Book*, and *Year Book of Education*.

Many honors have been bestowed on Cremin including Columbia's 1972 Butler Medal in Silver for his contributions to American educational theory. An alumnus of the College of the City of New York, he earned Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy degrees at Columbia, and was awarded an honorary doctorate there. Ohio State University, the University of Bridgeport and Kalamazoo College have also presented him with honorary degrees.

A native New Yorker, he is on the Educational Advisory Board of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation. In 1957-58, he won a Guggenheim Fellowship for research in the history of American education. He has been both a fellow and a visiting scholar at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, New York University and the American Educational Research Association have presented him research awards.

Federal government activities have also demanded his time. He was vice chairman of the White House Conference on Education in 1965, and chairman of the Regional Laboratories Panel of the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) in 1965 and 1966. Prior to that, he chaired USOE's Curriculum Improvement Panel. From 1966-1970, he chaired the Carnegie Commission on the Education of Educators. Current board memberships include Children's Television Workshop and the Spencer Foundation. Jerusalem's Hebrew University and the University of Chicago include him on their school of education visiting committees.

Visiting professorships conferred on Cremin include the Sir John Adams Memorial Lectureship, University of London, 1966 and Cecil H. Green Visiting Professorship, University of British Columbia, 1972. He has taught at the Seminar in American Studies, Salzburg, Austria, and at a number of U.S. colleges and universities.

THE EDUCATION OF THE EDUCATING PROFESSIONS

LAWRENCE A. CREMIN

THE 19th CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

Presented at the 30th Annual Meeting
of the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Chicago, Illinois, February 21, 1978

It is a very special honor that has been accorded me, to deliver the Charles W. Hunt Lecture this evening, and I am grateful to Henry Hermanowicz and his colleagues for the invitation that has made the opportunity possible.

I had the pleasure of knowing Charles W. Hunt during the last two decades of his life. He was a great figure in the affairs of Teachers College as well as of AACTE; and no one could serve long on Morningside Heights during the 1950s and 1960s without becoming familiar with this genial alumnus, who gave so unselfishly of his time and energy to raise fellowship money for TC students who needed it. But there was another service Charlie Hunt insisted upon performing that proved of inestimable value to my generation of young, post-World War II professors: he was always ready to take you in hand, march you up to the great men and women of the profession, and see that you became acquainted. Charlie served as an invaluable link between young and old after a time of severe discontinuity in the life of our profession; and I for one shall always be grateful for the prized friendships I was privileged to enjoy as a result of his gentle, prodding mediation.

I should like to take the opportunity this evening to consider three matters with you. First, I should like to review the origins of the present-day paradigm of professional training in education, and in particular of the problematics of education as a field of study. Second, I should like to sketch the recent history of the doctorate in education, once again, with emphasis on the developing problematics of the field. And third, I should like to advance a series of recommendations about the present-day doctorate in education, based on an analysis of what seem to me to be the central requirements of the educating professions in our time.

First, to the review of origins, which takes us back to that fascinating period between 1870 and 1910, when at least three decisive models of professional training emerged in the United States—training for law, as developed by Christopher Columbus Langdell and his colleagues at the Harvard Law School; training for medicine, as developed by William Henry Welch and his colleagues at the Johns Hopkins Medical School; and training for education, as developed by James Earl Russell and his colleagues at Teachers College, Columbia University. All three models emerged at nascent universities: Johns Hopkins had been founded in 1876 entirely as a center for graduate study, and late 19th-century Harvard and Columbia were in the process of transforming themselves into universities. All three models were created in response to widespread dissatisfaction with contemporary professional training. And all three models imposed drastically raised standards upon their respective fields. But they couldn't have been more different in the solutions to the problems of professional education they embodied.

Legal education at the time Langdell's appointment as dean of the Harvard Law School in 1870 was a combination of apprenticeship in a law office, study of textbooks on the law by commentators such as St. George Tucker, James Kent, and Joseph Story, and formal lectures. Most aspirants to the law entered the profession via apprenticeship and self-study, assisted from time to time by lectures purchased on a course-by-course basis. The primary claim of the law schools was not that they could substitute for law office training but rather that their lectures represented a more efficient way of teaching the general principles of law than the haphazard instruction of busy practising attorneys.

The heart of Langdell's law curriculum was the case method of instruction, the doctrinal analysis of appellate court opinions. Rather than studying the commentaries of Tucker, Kent, or Story, students were

presented with the cases themselves and asked to derive their own commentaries in the form of general principles. And, rather than listening to lectures on the general principles of law, students were confronted with a Socratic dialogue in which the professor sought at the same time to elicit "true" rules and to inculcate proper modes of legal reasoning. (As three generations of law professors have put it, the goal was to have students "think like lawyers.") At bottom, the case method rested on three assumptions—that lawyers are better trained in law schools than in law offices, that law schools are better established within universities than independent of them, and that for law to be worthy of a place in the universities it must become a science, the substance of which can be presented in printed books. (As President Charles W. Eliot once observed, the book became for Langdell's law school what the laboratory was for the physics department.) Once students had successfully grasped the science of law, everything else of significance to the practice of law would follow(1).

Now, Langdell instituted other reforms as well. He raised admissions requirements; he lengthened and systematized the course of study; he lobbied for educational requirements for admission to the bar; and he formed powerful alliances with Harvard Law School alumni on the bench, in legislatures, on committees of the bar, and on the faculties of other law schools. But it is the problematics of his curriculum that interests me here. Preparation for law became the study, via the case method, of a baker's dozen of core subjects—property, common law, pleading, contracts, torts, and criminal law during the first year; and equity, evidence, corporations, sales, agency, persons, bills and notes, and constitutional law later on. It was an undifferentiated course of study required of all aspiring practitioners, national and cosmopolitan in outlook (one could learn something of Massachusetts and New York law at Harvard but not Nebraska or Illinois law), essentially self-contained within the professional school, and wholly lacking in any systematic study of practice itself.

Medical education at the time of Welch's appointment as professor of pathology at Johns Hopkins University in 1884 was in its own way much like legal education, a combination of apprenticeship, the study of textbooks such as Caspar Wistar's anatomy, Robley Dunglison's physiology, and George Wood's medicine, and formal lectures. If there was a difference, it lay in the fact that most aspiring physicians entered the profession via one or another of the proprietary medical schools that had sprung up by the score during the 19th century. Generally organized and staffed by local practitioners and often closely allied with local medical societies, these schools offered what were

essentially didactic lectures in the principal medical subjects, that is, anatomy, physiology, chemistry, surgery, medicine, therapeutics, pharmacology, and obstetrics. The total course ordinarily ran from one to three years in length, and the degree generally carried with it the legal right to practice.

The heart of Welch's medical curriculum lay in three major reforms. First, the preclinical subjects of anatomy, physiology, pharmacology, and pathology were rooted in laboratory inquiry. Following the example of the great European investigators who had revolutionized the study of physiology and medicine—Pierre Louis and later Louis Pasteur at Paris, Carl Ludwig at Leipzig, and Robert Koch at Breslau—Welch displayed an inveterate preference for facts over theories and for inquiry over didactics. Second, the clinical subjects of medicine, surgery, and obstetrics were rooted in the ongoing life of a teaching hospital with its own laboratories, so that students learned via a combination of inquiry and practice conducted under expert supervision. Following here the tradition of British hospital instruction, Welch's goal was to join the clinical to the scientific in the thought and practice of the nascent physician. As his colleague Franklin P. Mall once put it, "There has always been a great deal of discussion of the question whether a physician's training should be scientific or practical. It appears to me that it should be both, for if he is educated only in the sciences underlying medicine, he is not a physician, while if he is educated in the practical branches alone, he is likely to become a shoemaker-physician who will drift into ruts and never get out of them." Third, the teaching hospital was linked to the medical school via an appointment system whereby professors in the medical school also served as heads of their respective departments in the hospital. The arrangement not only made them responsible for the delivery of medical services and the organization of medical instruction, it also permitted them to integrate advanced medical students into the life of the hospital in such a way that they could serve with maximum effectiveness while they learned with maximum efficiency. Finally, the keystone of the entire program was Welch's own subject, pathology, for the essence of medicine was conceived to be the diagnosis and cure of disease(2).

Like Langdell, Welch instituted other reforms as well. He raised admissions requirements, lengthened and systemized the course of study, and formed powerful alliances within the worlds of medicine and philanthropy. But once again, it is the problematics of Welch's curriculum that interests me. Preparation for medicine became a combination of scientific inquiry in the laboratory, via the preclinical

subjects of anatomy, pharmacology, physiology, and pathology, and supervised practice leavened by scientific inquiry in the teaching hospital, via the clinical studies of surgery, medicine, and gynecology. As in law, it was an undifferentiated course of study required of all aspiring practitioners, not only national but international in outlook. As contrasted with law, however, it was not wholly self-contained within the professional school—a solid knowledge of chemistry and biology acquired at a good undergraduate institution was required for admission. And, contrary to law, it placed great emphasis on the systematic study of practice within a carefully designed instructional environment, namely, the teaching hospital.

I might add parenthetically that it was the presence of the Johns Hopkins model in operation that permitted Abraham Flexner's 1910 report, the well-known Bulletin Number Four of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, to exert such a profound influence on medical education. To be sure, the millions of dollars that the General Education Board invested in medical education in the wake of Flexner's report made an enormous difference. But Flexner did not invent a model of medical education following the study of existing practice. Instead, he used an extant model as his criterion of excellence, and found contemporary practice wanting. His report was in the end an exercise in criticism and dissemination but not in creation.

Teacher education at the time of Russell's appointment as dean of Teachers College in 1898 was, if anything, even more diverse and haphazard than legal or medical education. Many primary-school teachers had had no preparation for their work whatever beyond primary schooling itself. Most of those teachers who had obtained preparation beyond primary schooling had attended an academy or a high school for a time, and some of those had then gone on for a year or two of normal-school study, which consisted of further work in the school subjects, a course or two in pedagogy and the history of education, and practice teaching at an affiliated school or a local public school. Some high school teachers and most college teachers had been trained in the colleges and universities, primarily in the substance of what they taught. A few colleges and universities—not more than two dozen in 1898—offered formal programs of education, consisting mainly of lectures and recitations on such textbooks as Gabriel Compayre's history of education and Joseph Payne's science and art of teaching.

Russell's reformed curriculum combined four components he considered essential to success in teaching: general culture, special

scholarship, professional knowledge, and technical skill. He himself explicated this quadrivium in one of his early reports:

The general culture must be liberal enough to inspire respect for knowledge, broad enough to beget a love for the truth. The special scholarship must be sufficient for the work to be done; it should give that absolute command of the subjects of instruction which frees the teacher from slavish adherence to manuals and methods. The right professional knowledge should enable the teacher to view the subjects he teaches and the entire course of instruction in its relations to the child and to the society of which the child is a part. The true educator must know the nature of mind; he must understand the process of learning, the formation of ideals, the development of will, and the growth of character. The artist in every vocation must have consummate skill in the use of his tools. The teacher must be skilled in the technique of his art; he must have the ability to impart his knowledge in a way that shall broaden his pupils' horizons, extend their interests, strengthen their characters, and inspire them to right living. And as every art is most efficient when intelligently directed, the art of teaching should be founded on the science of teaching, which takes account of the ends and means of education and the nature of the material to be taught(3).

So far, so good; only the querulous would disagree. But as Russell explicated further, the radicalism of his proposals became clear. By general culture, he meant not only what was commonly accepted as a good college education circa 1900 but also the kind of preparation that would enable the student to see the relationships among the various fields of knowledge, particularly between his own field of expertise and all the others. By special scholarship, he meant not only further academic study but the kind of reflective inquiry that would equip an aspiring teacher to select different sequences of material and adapt them to the needs of different students. These aspirations alone would have wrought a revolution in contemporary teacher education, particularly since Russell believed that the requirements were relevant to all teachers. Beyond them, there were the requirements of professional knowledge and technical skill. By professional knowledge, he implied not the mastery of didactically conveyed lecture material but rather systematic inquiry into the theory and practice of education in the United States and abroad, during past eras as well as the present, pursued via the same controlled observation and rigorous

theorizing that pertained in the natural sciences and medicine. And, by technical skill, he implied not the rote knowledge gleaned by the observant apprentice but rather expert ability in determining what to teach and by what methods, when and to whom. Technical skill would be acquired in an experimental or model school, serving as a laboratory for pedagogical inquiry and a demonstration center for excellent practice. The heads of the various departments of the college would also be the heads of the corresponding departments of the school, and the teachers in the school would be critic-teachers, capable of exemplifying first-class reflective pedagogy at the same time that they oversaw the training of novices(4).

Now, like Langdell and Welch, Russell instituted other reforms as well. He raised admission standards, lengthened the course of study, and formed enduring alliances with state departments of education, professional associations, and faculty members in other university education departments. But, again, it is the problematics of Russell's curriculum that interests me. Preparation for teaching combined a broad general education, a solid command of one or more teaching fields, an inquirer's knowledge of educational theory and practice, gained largely via the history and psychology of education, and scientifically based technical skill, developed through practice under expert supervision. The partial similarity to the Langdell and Welch models is patent, and surely not fortuitous. It was an era in which academic leaders enjoyed a considerable acquaintance across disciplinary and professional lines, for the relentless specialization of the 20th century had not yet worked its fragmenting effect. The Teachers College trustees had been in close touch with Charles W. Eliot of Harvard and Daniel Coit Gilman of Johns Hopkins for several years prior to Russell's appointment as dean, indeed, both Eliot and Gilman had actually participated in the formal exercises marking the relocation of Teachers College from University Place to Morningside Heights in 1894. Moreover, like Welch, Russell had studied in Germany and drunk the heady wine of *Wissenschaft*, and Russell had been in correspondence with a number of Welch's colleagues in connection with the establishment of the nursing education program at Teachers College. It should not be surprising, then, that, like the Langdell and Welch models, the Russell curriculum made its obeisance to science and to cosmopolitanism—it was as difficult to learn about Nebraska's education system at Teachers College as it was to learn about Nebraska's laws at Harvard. And, like the Welch model, Russell's curriculum placed great emphasis on the systematic study of practice within a carefully designed instructional environment, in this case, the model school.

Yet, granted the similarities, there were profound differences as well. Whatever Russell's belief and aspiration concerning the relevance of his curriculum to all teachers, it was admittedly designed for those preparing for positions of professional leadership, those who would supervise and administer the burgeoning school systems of the nation and those who would staff the normal schools, teachers colleges, and university departments of education. Not was the curriculum nearly as self-contained within the professional school as Langdell's or Welch's. General culture, though essential, was obviously to be obtained during the undergraduate years. Special scholarship would be obtained, not only in Teachers College courses in the so-called professionalized treatment of subject matter, but in the graduate departments of the university as well. Only professional knowledge and skill fell entirely within the orbit of the education faculty. Finally, and the point is crucial, at the very time Russell was developing his model for the preparation of teachers at Teachers College, the graduate faculties of Columbia University, which were equally professional, I might say, despite the fact that they referred to themselves as the "non-professional graduate schools," were developing alternative models based on a different problematics, one exclusively concerned with scholarly inquiry into the substance of the subjects to be taught. The leaders of the graduate faculties—John W. Burgess, Nicholas Murray Butler, and Henry Fairfield Osborn—preferred to use the rhetoric of public service and the advancement of learning; but the latent function of their faculties was to prepare teachers for the high schools and colleges on a model that was not only different from Russell's but that competed with it for students, for positions for its graduates, and for political and financial support.

Now, as I have already remarked, the similarities among the Langdell, Welch, and Russell models were more than fortuitous. All three partook of the late 19th-century ambience of professional aspiration and academic expansionism: all three reflected the contemporary belief in scientific scholarship and the promise of its application to the improvement of human affairs, and all three profited from an expanding economy that provided jobs for trained graduates. That said, however, the differences are at least as important. For one thing, they reveal the extent to which the prevailing paradigms of professional training and the prevailing problematics of professional fields are the result of human choices at particular moments in history. There is no reason beyond the persuasiveness and influence of Langdell's model why legal education could not have included supervised practice in the courts; and there is no reason beyond the persuasiveness and influence of Welch's model why medical education

could not have concerned itself as much with the maintenance of health as with the diagnosis and cure of disease. Moreover, the differences among the models tell us a good deal about the differences in the character of the several professions. Not everything, to be sure, for the social sources of aspirants, the markets for graduates, the presence or absence of competing models, and the effectiveness with which the original models were disseminated were inevitably relevant. But patterns of professional training do have their effects and are worthy of exploration in their own right as the sources of particular historical developments.

Permit me, if I may, to move on to my second topic, namely, the recent history of the doctorate in education. I might remark at the outset that in focusing on the doctorate I am departing from what has been fairly common practice in reviewing the education of the educating professions. Most discussions have concentrated, not on the highest level of professional preparation, but rather on the minimum preparation required for entry into these professions; as a result the history of the education of the educating professions has been essentially the story of a slowly increasing minimum, from normal-school training, to baccalaureate-level training, to the masters-level training that has become common in our own times. My interest, however, is in the problematics of professional education, in the intellectual substance and systematic experience deemed essential to first-class practice; and I believe this is better gleaned from a scrutiny of doctoral programs than from consideration of preservice preparation in general. That there is such a gap between the doctorate and the minimum level of preparation required for entry into professional service is a datum of great significance.

There are three bench marks that I should like to note before turning to the more recent history. The year 1893 was the one in which Teachers College, then newly allied with Columbia, announced this country's first formal Doctor of Philosophy program in the field of education. The year 1920 was the one in which the newly established Harvard Graduate School of Education announced the first formal Doctor of Education program. And the year 1934 was the one in which Teachers College announced a Doctor of Education program alongside its Doctor of Philosophy program. The dates and programs are significant because they allow us to glimpse the problematics of professional training in education at important turning points in the history of two influential institutions.

Let us consider the requirements for the Teachers College Ph.D. in education during the early years of Russell's administration. They

included formal work in educational psychology, history of education, and philosophy of education, two practica, at least one of which had to be in a specialized field of education ("practicum" seems to have been used to refer to any advanced course in which the students were expected to produce original work); graduate study in some department of Columbia other than education, and a dissertation "showing power of independent thought and capacity to advance knowledge in the candidate's chosen field." Now, at least two observations are in order as one sets these requirements against Russell's own ideal paradigm of professional education. First, as one studies the available practica, they seem much more closely related to "professional knowledge" than to "technical skill." The description of Professor Edward L. Thorndike's practicum in educational psychology read as follows. "The course prepares advanced students to investigate such problems in education as involve accurate treatment of mental characteristics, and will provide future principals and superintendents of schools with the technical knowledge of statistics which will enable them to use conveniently and profitably the data available in any school system." Fair enough, one might say, that is precisely what Professor Thorndike should have been teaching aspiring principals and superintendents. But consider the descriptions of Professor Milo Hillegas's practicum on elementary education and Professor Julius Sachs's practicum on secondary education. The description of Hillegas's read as follows: "A preliminary study of the principles underlying the course of study will be followed by a detailed investigation of current practice in the leading American cities. A comparison of conditions in this country with the practice in England, Germany, and France will form part of the course." And the description of Sachs's read. "Students are expected to prepare during the course, in addition to assigned book reviews, papers bearing either on (1) general tendencies in American and foreign secondary school systems, or (2) the relation between the secondary school and the elementary school, as well as the college, or (3) specific problems in secondary education, with special reference to the public high school." Second, as one looks over the lists of dissertations produced, it is clear that there was an initial concentration on studies in the history and philosophy of education and then a shift to studies in the psychology of education and in the statistical analysis of survey data relating to educational institutions and programs. If there was a problematic of the Teachers College curriculum circa 1910, then, it was that of a historical and statistical approach to the institutions and processes of education(5).

Let us turn now to the requirements for the Harvard Ed.D. during the early years of the Graduate School of Education in the 1920s.

Students seeking candidacy for the degree were required to show evidence of successful teaching experience and a working knowledge of biology, psychology, and the social sciences. Once admitted, their programs revolved around formal work in at least five fields of education, with studies of the social theory of education, the history of education, and educational psychology required of all. As for the thesis, its stated purpose was to enable the student "to conduct an independent investigation, in which he handles effectively the knowledge already available upon his subject and produces a constructive result of importance and value."

Once again, two observations are in order. First, as one examines the actual curriculum at Harvard, one is struck by the paucity of course offerings in comparison with those of Teachers College. The Harvard program of study had greater focus, to be sure, but doctoral candidates were more likely to pursue this program on an independent basis, doubtless with occasional assistance from the faculty. Second, the programmatic requirements for the Ed.D. were really quite similar to those for the Ph.D. at Teachers College, with the principal difference being in the latitude permitted students in the choice of thesis topics. When one considers the topics actually chosen, however, it is clear that they were far more like contemporary dissertation topics at Teachers College than they were different. Ultimately, the difference between the Harvard Ed.D. program and the Teachers College Ph.D. program during the 1920's derived much more from the differing size and character of the two institutions than from any fundamental difference in the problematics they embodied.

Finally, given the preeminence of Teachers College in doctoral training in education before World War II—Columbia granted 1,600 doctorates in the field between 1898 and 1941—it is instructive to examine the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Teachers College when it was first authorized in 1934. These included three years of formal course work, at least a sixth of which would consist of courses "covering issues common to workers in the educational field", a series of written and oral examinations intended to appraise "preparation and fitness for professional leadership in the field of specialization", and a project report on some educational activity or service, designed to demonstrate professional competence in its widest possible personal and professional application. Initially, courses "covering issues common to workers in the educational field" were conceived to be courses in the so-called foundations of education—the history, philosophy, sociology, and psychology of education—but later the conception was broadened to include courses

in educational administration, guidance, and curriculum and instruction. As for the topics of project reports, they very quickly went beyond the subjects of contemporary Ph.D. dissertations to include, among other things, syllabi for new courses, suggestions for curriculum development in particular states or localities, and plans for administrative and institutional reform. By 1941, the number of Ed.D.s granted at Columbia each year was nearly equal to the number of Ph.D.s the university was awarding in the field of education.

Now, my purpose in sketching the development of these early doctoral programs at Columbia and Harvard has been primarily to convey some sense of what actually happened to Russell's model of professional education at his own institution in the years prior to World War II. And it seems to me that the principal generalization one must draw from the data is the inescapable fact of devolution. For all Russell's high aspirations to create a profession of education comparable to the professions of law and medicine, the drift in practice was steadily away from that goal. The requirement of general culture may have been assumed, but it was not carefully insisted upon, beyond the bachelor's degree needed for admission. The requirement of special scholarship was enforced in the early years of the Ph.D. via insistence on graduate study in the university outside the field of education; but it was not included in the requirements for the Ed.D., and, as a matter of fact, it was abandoned as a requirement for the Ph.D. before too long. The requirement of professional knowledge was more resolutely honored than any other, but only a minimal core of common work in the history, philosophy, and psychology of education was insisted upon. And the requirement of technical skill was acknowledged rhetorically but neither honored nor enforced programmatically. In effect, the structural disjunction between the preservice and inservice phases of professional education wreaked havoc with the integrity and coherence of the Russell model. Student teaching became the principal practicum of the preservice phase of training; and the so-called practica of the inservice phase were in truth seminars, at best, opportunities for scientific and scholarly inquiry into professional problems, at worst, didactic lectures. Even more important, the students who came for advanced training had already learned their professional roles in the field and were returning to the university for a limited amount of specialized knowledge and for eventual credentialing. The result was a fragmentation of the professional curriculum and a loss of coherence among its parts. What emerged was, to borrow a familiar phrasing from the Teachers College catalogue on the eve of World War II, a program of advanced graduate study "developed in the light of the candidate's previous

education and experience" and emphasizing "preparation for competent professional performance(8)".

That this drift was national rather than local in scope is documented by two studies of the doctorate in education undertaken in 1958 and 1969 by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (in the latter instance, in collaboration with Phi Delta Kappa). The first gathered data from 3,428 doctoral graduates of 92 institutions, who had earned their degrees between 1956 and 1958, the second, which replicated the first, gathered data from 15,140 doctoral graduates of 124 institutions, who had earned their degrees between 1965 and 1969. The two surveys covered a variety of topics, including the characteristics of the institutions, the characteristics of the students when admitted, the characteristics of the instructional programs, and the characteristic personal and professional problems associated with earning the degree. Nothing emerged more clearly from these surveys than that neither the Ph.D. nor the Ed.D. program in education had much in common from one institution to another, beyond the elemental fact that they provided advanced training. As between the Ph.D. and the Ed.D., the studies concluded that the sole distinguishing difference inhered in the foreign language requirement traditionally associated with the Ph.D. As regards any common core of subject matter generally associated with the doctorate in education, the only requirements common to as many as half the programs across the country were educational measurement and statistics, educational psychology, and philosophy of education. Beyond that, everything else connected with the doctorate, except the financial and personal difficulties attendant on earning it, could be subsumed under the rubric "diversity." For all intents and purposes, three quarters of a century after its brave formulation in 1900, the Russell paradigm and the problematics it represented were in shambles(9).

Permit me, then, to move on to my third topic. What ought the education of educators to look like in our own time? In this connection, I should like to make a number of preliminary observations about the world of present-day education and then propose a set of recommendations based on those observations.

I have argued in my recent writings that we have been living through a revolution in education that may be as profound as the original invention of the school. It is a revolution compounded of several elements—the rapid expansion of higher education to a point where one out of every two high school graduates has been going on

to college; the massive shifts in population, from east to west, from south to north, from country to city, and from city to suburb, which have created new and extraordinary clienteles to educate; the movement of women into paid employment outside the home in unprecedented numbers, with prodigious consequences for the family; the changing character of work associated with the emergence of a postindustrial society, and in particular the growth of the so-called knowledge industries; the various civil rights and liberation movements of the 1960s and 1970s, which have so radically changed the management and politics of education(10).

And beneath all of these, and inexorably affecting them, has been the educational transformation wrought by mass television. In 1950, fewer than 10 percent of American homes had television sets. Today, that figure has leveled off at around 97 percent. Moreover, so far as can be determined, at least one member of the average American household is watching television more than six hours out of every 24, with the greatest amount of viewing being done by the very young, the very old, and the very poor. Once one recognizes that television teaches—not only via channels specifically labeled educational but across the entire spectrum of public and commercial programming—the fact of television in 97 percent of American homes being viewed six hours a day itself constitutes revolution. That revolution has drastically altered familial education. It has radically altered the education of the public at large. And it has fundamentally modified the context in which all schooling proceeds.

Most important for our purposes, this complex of revolutions has transformed the traditional profession of education at the same time that it has created a variety of new educating professions—one thinks, for example, of day-care workers, scriptwriters in children's television production units, learning consultants in libraries and museums, training officers in business and industry, and gerontologists in senior citizens' centers. All these people carry on educational work of profound significance that can surely be enhanced via sound professional preparation. Moreover, to be most effective, each must pursue his or her special activities with full knowledge of what the others are doing. Their work as educators is inextricably intertwined; in fact, they are in many ways members of a single profession.

What should the education of these educators look like during the years immediately ahead? In my opinion, we can do no better than to take James Earl Russell's four components and reformulate them in present-day terms. First, general culture. Obviously, educators

working with clients of any age in any field and in any institution ought to be broadly cultivated individuals. And this means that they ought to receive their undergraduate education at institutions where faculty members and students think seriously together about the substance and meaning of a liberal education, and particularly, to repeat Russell's concern, about the relationships among the several fields of knowledge. This is not to suggest that every undergraduate institution ought to reach the same conclusions about these matters; it would be revolution enough in my opinion if the colleges simply began to reflect on them.

Second, special scholarship. Educators working with clients of any age ought to have at least one teaching field in which they are expert or have been expert in the past. No matter how general an educator's responsibilities, no matter how far removed from the diurnal business of teaching, he or she should ideally have mastered some field of knowledge or art sufficiently well to have been able to reflect systematically on the various ways in which it might be taught to clients at different stages of development and in different teaching situations. I myself have taught history in schools and colleges, in public libraries and over commercial television, via brightly illustrated pamphlets written for factory employees and heavy tomes written for other specialists in the field. I have taught history to second-graders, using facsimiles of the *New-England Primer*, to twelfth-graders, using their own programs of study as the point of departure; to school-board members, using their most pressing problems as grist for my mill; to other professors of history, using recent monographs in the field as the basis for my discussion. The approach, the sequence, the level, and the material for immediate consideration differed from one instance to another; in all of them, however, I was teaching the same American history.

Third, professional knowledge. Here, Russell, reflecting the period in which he wrote, tended to concentrate on the history, philosophy, and psychology of schooling, though he was patently aware of the need for trained educators in "trade schools, industrial schools, Sunday schools, reform schools, houses of refuge, and other philanthropic institutions." Given the breadth of today's educational enterprise and the explosion of scholarly knowledge in the relevant humanistic, social, and behavioral disciplines, I would propose a reformulation that would include three elements: policy studies, developmental studies, and pedagogical studies. By policy studies I refer to those studies of the humanities and social sciences that contribute to an understanding of the aims of education, of the

situations and institutions in which education proceeds in different societies, and of the inextricable ties between educational institutions and the societies that sustain them and that are in turn affected by them. By developmental studies I refer to those studies of the humanities and behavioral sciences (including biology) that contribute to an understanding of human development over the entire life cycle and of the various ways in which different forms of education affect that development—of critical importance here would be studies of socialization, enculturation, and learning that clarify the nature and outcome of the educational process. By pedagogical studies I refer to those systematic studies of the practice of teaching and learning in a variety of situations, that unite policy and developmental studies with studies of the substantive characteristics of various fields of the curriculum and with studies of the structural characteristics of various learning environments. In Herbert Simon's terms, pedagogical studies are among the "sciences of the artificial," marked by a quest for systematic knowledge about how to design particular kinds of human environments. As such, they must be pursued in the world of practice—in schools, colleges, day-care centers, libraries, museums, work places, and community agencies, all regarded as centers for creative inquiry as well as for the demonstration of excellent performance. I believe every faculty of education worthy of the name ought to have networks of such institutions associated with it in a research and teaching capacity, in the fashion of the teaching hospitals traditionally associated with medical schools(11).

Now, policy studies and developmental studies might well call to mind the so-called preclinical studies of the medical curriculum, with pedagogy, like pathology, partly preclinical and partly clinical. But the distinction between the preclinical and the clinical has broken down in medical education in recent years and I do not believe it would be a useful one to maintain in the education of educators. Professional curricula in general require a continuing mutual relationship between preclinical and clinical instruction that renders the distinction less useful than Welch's generation thought it might be. I would also remark that a spirit of inquiry must characterize the entire range of professional studies if they are not to deteriorate rapidly into mere didacticism. During the 1950s and 1960s the common solution to the problem of reviving a spirit of inquiry in education courses was to bring them into closer relationship with cognate offerings of faculties of arts and sciences, but too often the price of the heightened spirit of inquiry was the disappearance of any relevance to the problems of education. I happen to believe that the offerings of education faculties can embody both a spirit of inquiry and the required relevance to

educational problems; but to insure that they do so will take a steadfast commitment to both on the part of those faculties that has not always been in evidence in recent years. In addition, education faculties will have to be a good deal more imaginative than they have in the past with respect to grouping and synthesizing the substance and methods of policy studies, developmental studies, and pedagogical studies. There is not enough time for the aspiring educator to study the history, philosophy, anthropology, economics, politics, sociology, psychology, and biology of education seriatim in discrete units, and the current practice of permitting students to select one or another of these studies while ignoring the rest is simply not defensible(12).

Obviously, the discussion of pedagogical studies moves us easily to Russell's fourth component, technical skill. This is the realm in which the professional preparation of educators has been weakest over the years, despite the attention that has recently been paid to so-called laboratory experience in the preservice phase and to so-called competency-based instruction throughout the program. At their best, pedagogical studies join professional knowledge and technical skill in a way that bridges the gap that has historically existed between the two. Pedagogy is not merely a science of design; it is also, in Joseph Schwab's terms, one of the eclectic arts, marked by a quest for practice based on a continually changing calculus of knowledge drawn from many relevant sciences. I believe every candidate for the doctorate in education ought to study pedagogy partly via a rotating internship through a variety of educational situations, where direct participation in the daily business of teaching and learning can be joined to systematic study of tested practice based on continuing inquiry and appraisal. The hallmark of the technically skilled educator in our time ought to be his or her profound awareness of the relationship between what goes on in any particular educational situation and what goes on in all the other educational situations in which the client participates. It is this as much as anything else that dictates both a diversified internship involving not only schools but libraries, museums, community centers, and the like, and a common professional preparation for the educating professions(13).

A word about the thesis requirement, which has long been a touchy and controversial aspect of doctoral study. My own inclination would be to abolish it in its present form, as too much a mimicking of the Ph.D. program in the traditional academic areas (where the thesis has in any case come under increasing fire as irrelevant to subsequent responsibility and performance). Instead, I would provide ample opportunity in advanced seminars and practica for individual and

collaborative scholarship and performance that can be subjected to systematic review and appraisal by faculty and student colleagues. I would prefer to see one or two solid research papers, a terse scholarly evaluation of an educational undertaking, and a first-class demonstration of teaching skill as the publicly judged fruits of doctoral study in education rather than an overly long, if competent, thesis that will sit unread in the library forever. For those who have something of thesis length to say, the thesis ought to remain an option; but I do not believe we should continue to require it of every doctoral candidate.

Permit me a final thought. James Earl Russell stated his belief in 1900 that general culture, special scholarship, professional knowledge, and technical skill were essential to all educators, not merely the leaders of the profession. I would restate that belief as my own. And I would maintain further that the time has come to require the doctorate for all who would seek entry into the educating professions. Many states already require five years of preparation for a permanent school certificate—the requirement is most often satisfied by four years of undergraduate education joined to a fifth year of professional preparation. I would argue for redesigned programs, not unlike the six-year B.S.-M.D. programs at Northwestern University and Boston University, in which the B.A. and the Ed.D. could be obtained at the end of six years. Through careful planning, the studies leading to general culture would also provide a base for the policy and developmental studies, some aspects of which are surely as liberal as they are professional. Through careful planning, too, the policy and developmental studies could be made to relate to the pedagogical studies far more than has hitherto been the case, and the latter could be started early enough—perhaps in the third or fourth year—that they could enrich the work in the other professional realms. I do not think the decision to pursue a career in education would necessarily have to be made during the senior year of high school, as is the case with the six-year B.S.-M.D. programs, it could probably be made as late as the sophomore year in the right kind of undergraduate program. And, for able individuals who might decide at a later stage to enter one of the educating professions, there would remain the option of the three-year doctoral program following the award of the bachelor's degree. Finally, I am assuming that there would be postdoctoral programs in education, as there are in all the other major professional fields, through which practitioners would be able to extend, deepen, and update their special scholarship, professional knowledge, and technical skill, as well as to gain expertise in such fields as management, supervision, or administration.

As G. K. Chesterton once remarked of Christianity, it is not, after all, that James Earl Russell's ideal was ever tried and found wanting, it is rather that Russell's ideal was never really tried at all. Given the anticipated steady state of American education in the early 1980s, it is unlikely that we shall have a better time to make the attempt.

NOTES

- 1 The Langdell curriculum is discussed in Robert Stevens, "Two Cheers for 1870: The American Law School," *Perspectives in American History*, V (1971), 405-548; Arthur E. Sutherland, *The Law at Harvard: A History of Ideas and Men, 1817-1967* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), Chaps. vi-viii; and Alfred Z. Reed, *Training for the Public Profession of the Law* (New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1921).
- 2 The Welch curriculum is discussed in Donald Fleming, *William H. Welch and the Rise of Modern Medicine* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1954); and Alan M. Chesney, *The Johns Hopkins Hospital and the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine* (3 vols.: Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1943-1963), I-II. The Mall quotation is from Franklin P. Mall, "The Value of Research in the Medical School," *The Michigan Alumnus*, X (1903-04), 395.
- 3 The Russell curriculum is discussed in Kenneth H. Toepfer, "James Earl Russell and the Rise of Teachers College, 1897-1915" (unpublished doctoral thesis, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966), and Lawrence A. Cremin, David A. Shannon, and Mary Evelyn Townsend, *A History of Teachers College, Columbia University* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954). For the historical context of Russell's curriculum, see Merle L. Borrowman, *The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education: A Historical Survey of American Thought* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956), Walter S. Monroe, *Teaching Learning Theory and Teacher Education, 1890-1952* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952), and Geraldine Joncich, *The Sane Positivist. A Biography of Edward L. Thorndike* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1968). The Russell quotation is from his *Annual Report to the Trustees of Teachers College for 1900*, pp. 13-14.
- 4 James E. Russell, "The Function of the University in the Training of Teachers," *Columbia University Quarterly*, I (1898-99), 323-342.

- 5 *Teachers College Announcement* (1909-10), pp. 76, 78, 80.
- 6 *Harvard University Catalogue* (1920-21), pp. 474-477. For the historical context of the Harvard program, see Arthur G. Powell, "University Schools of Education in the Twentieth Century," *Peabody Journal of Education*, LIV (1976-77), 3-20.
- 7 *Teachers College Announcement* (1934-35), pp. 6-8.
- 8 *Teachers College Announcement* (1941-42), p. 15
- 9 Harold E. Moore, John H. Russel, and Ronald G. Ferguson, *The Doctorate in Education: An Inquiry into Conditions Affecting Pursuit of the Doctoral Degree in the Field of Education*, Volume II: *The Institutions* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teachers Education, 1960) and Neville Robertson and Jack K. Sistler, *The Doctorate in Education: An Inquiry into Conditions Affecting Pursuit of the Doctoral Degree in the Field of Education—The Institutions* (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1971). For the sociological context of contemporary teacher education, see Dan C. Lortie, *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975)
- 10 These ideas are developed in Lawrence A. Cremin, *Public Education* (New York: Basic Books, 1976), and *Traditions of American Education* (New York: Basic Books, 1977).
- 11 The Russell quotation is from his *Annual Report* for 1900, p. 20. For Simon's formulation, see Herbert A. Simon, *The Sciences of the Artificial* (Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1969). For a recent discussion of the changes that would be required for schools (and, by implication, other educative agencies) to become centers for creative inquiry into the nature and processes of education, see Robert J. Schaefer, *The School as a Center of Inquiry* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967). For the classic formulation, see John Dewey, "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education," *Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education*, Part I (Chicago: Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1904).
- 12 On the tendency of faculties of education to vacillate between an overconcern for relevance to practice and an overconcern for academic respectability, see Nathan Glazer, "The Schools of the Minor Professions," *Minerva*, XII (1974), 346-364.
- 13 For Schwab's formulation, see Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical A Language for Curriculum," *School Review*, LXXVIII (1969-70), 1-20, and "The Practical Arts of Eclectic," *ibid.*, LXXIX (1970-71), 493-542. See also Neil Gage, *The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1978).

The Hunt Lectures

1960

The Dimensions of Professional Leadership
Laurence DeFee Haskew

1961

Revolution in Instruction
Lindley P. Stiles

1962

Imperatives for Excellence in Teacher Education
J.W. Maucker

1963

Africa, Teacher Education, and the United States
Karl W. Bigelow

1964

The Certification of Teachers: The Restricted State Approved Program Approach
James B. Conant

1965

Perspective on Action in Teacher Education
Florence B. Stratemeyer

1966

Leadership for Intellectual Freedom in Higher Education
Willard B. Spalging

1967

Tradition and Innovation in Teacher Education
Rev. Charles F. Donovan, S.J.

1968

Teachers: The Need and the Task
Felix C. Robb

1969

A Consumer's Hopes and Dreams for Teacher Education
Elizabeth D. Koontz

1970

Realignments for Teacher Education
Fred. T. Wilhelms

1971

The Impossible Imperatives: Power, Authority, and Decision Making in Teacher Education
Fvan R. Collins

1972

Beyond the Upheaval
Edward C. Pomeroy

1973

Time for Decision in Teacher Education
Lord James of Rusholme

1974

Ferment and Momentum in Teacher Education
Margaret Lindsey

1975

Drumbeats and Dissonance: Variations on a Theme for Teachers
Calvin Gross

1976

Now you shall be
REAL TO EVERYONE
Robert B. Howsam

1977

The Real World of the Teacher Educator: A Look to the Near Future
David L. Clark

1978

The Education of the Educating Professions
Lawrence A. Cremin