DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 161 SP 035 584

AUTHOR Gottlieb, Esther E.
TITLE Foundations of Education: Texts and the Canon.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-10, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Content; Educational Change; *Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; *Foundations of Education; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; Preservice Teacher Education; Required Courses; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Textbook Content; Textbooks
IDENTIFIERS *Columbia University NY Teachers College

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to outline the textual canon of the foundations of education in U.S. teacher education programs. Background research for the project included a review of selected texts and samples of course syllabi. Analysis of the contents and prefaces of the two volumes of "Reading in the Foundations of Education" (published in 1941 by Columbia University Teachers College in New York) reveals that the authors were not as concerned with teacher education as an academic/professional field as they were with the conditions of society at large and their belief that teachers could affect those conditions. The volumes reflect the views of an influential group of social reconstructionists and were intended to introduce future teachers to an organic model of life, to replace mechanistic models. The volumes comprise brief excerpts from literally hundreds of writers including educationists as well as "classic" writers from a variety of fields. From these early texts to the early 1990s, texts written or edited by George F. Kneller, James A. Johnson, and A. Ornstein and D. Levine moved away from the interdisciplinary approach and the "classic" writers and moved toward a more lively, graphic presentation. Thomas Jefferson came to be presented as a figure of historical interest rather than a canonical writer; by contrast, John Dewey does have canonical status in the field. (Contains 24 references.) (JDD)

FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION: TEXTS AND THE CANON

ESTHER E. GOTTLIEB

Seminar Hakibbutzim, Tel Aviv
and
West Virginia University,
Morgantown WV 26505-6122

Paper presented at the

AERA Annual Meeting New Orleans, April 4-8, 1994
DRAFT

This preliminary analysis attempts to outline the textual canon of the Foundations of Education in U.S. teacher education programs. This project, although still at its very beginning, differs from the many attempts to delineate the field of the Foundations of Education (FE). It differs most sharply from the continuing effort to discover a consensus or 'standards' for the teaching of 'foundation of education' or over the meaning of the term itself.

The notable work in this direction was that of the seven-member Council of Learned Societies in Education (CLSE), published under the title, *Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction in the Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies*. The first set of *standards* was developed by an AESA (American Education Studies Association) task force in 1978, and republished by CLSE in 1986 (see Borman 1990, for a review). The second committee on Academic Standards and Accreditation of AESA (1989-1992), chaired by Steve Tozer, presented their proposed definition of Social Foundations of Education for Teacher Education Programs, its purpose of study, and content and processes, in the journal Educational Foundations (Fall 1993). The entire issue is devoted to an extensive dialogue surrounding the new *standards*, with contributions by R. Freeman Butts (Teachers College, Columbia University), Donald Warren (Indiana University), and Alan Jones (Caddo Gap Press), among others.

Data and Analysis

A review of the literature is out of question here. The overwhelming volume of written materials on FE is well beyond the scope of this study. The present project aspires to investigate and substantiate a notion of a selection of texts constituting a "canon" of FE. I have not developed a set of criteria similarly to Tozer & McAninich (1987) in their analysis of three Foundation Texts, which allowed them to conclude that current texts lack an understanding of "the unique possibilities and responsibilities social foundation of education can claim...."(p. 31). Instead I read and was influenced by some of the current thinking about canon-formation in literary anthologies, such as Tompkins, 1985, and Golding (1984).

The two volumes of Reading in the Foundations of Education published in 1941,(Rugg, ed.) were analyzed as FE "founding" text. To follow the disciplinary shift in the Foundations of Education two edited volumes from the 1970s were examined and compared to the TC Readers.

My background research included examining the syllabi of FE at one large university over the course of six years (1988-1993), together with some 60 samples of course syllabi from Foundation courses taught throughout the U.S., devoting special attention to required readings. This overview of FE syllabi enabled me to conclude that most current courses in Foundations or Introduction to Education in teacher education programs use a FE textbook, written by one or more authors rather than an edited text of selections such texts are what I would call 'integrated texts.'

For this project I will analyze the contents and prefaces of two texts and relate the findings to the TC Readers.

Foundations of Education at Columbia Teachers College: the Readers

Most writers on Foundation (to name a few, Tozer & McAninch, 1987; Johanningmeier 1991; Butts 1973 and 1993; Tozer 1993) begin with the evolution of the Foundations of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University (TC). And for good reason: Columbia Teachers College was always something of a special case, the "closest thing to a true, national professional school" in the sample of schools of education studied by Clifford and Guthrie (1988, p. 232), successfully maintaining its advantage as a large multidepartment school well after the postwar boom period for other schools of education.

During the 1920s faculty at TC discussed the need for "a new approach to teacher education" (the so-called "Kilpatrick Discussion Group"). The 'foundations' requirement for the Master's degree in TC was satisfied by the completion of eight credit points of work in separate "departments" -- history of education, philosophy of education, psychology, educational sociology, educational economics, and comparative education. This has the "merit of providing toughness of study in certain technical fields" according to Harold O. Rugg (1941), yet it had the disadvantage of students completing their residence in the College "without having really explored the foundational conditions and problems of contemporary society" (p. vii). In 1934 the first

integrated course in social foundations, Education 200F was created and largely developed by Kilpatrick, Rugg, Childs, Cottrell and Counts, among others. This was part of the new Foundation Division that had been founded during the overall reorganization of the College by William Heard Kilpatrick in 1934/35. It brought together historians, philosophers, and social scientists, who where professionally oriented toward interdisciplinary and social ideals such as intellectual freedom, democratic education, social responsibility, and secular humanism. They believed that the "proficiency in the design, construction, and operation of schools" can be developed "only through a thorough study of American culture itself" (Rugg 1941, p.viii).

With the publication of their, the two volumes of Reading in the Foundations of Education published in 1941, the TC faculty in did created not just a new course but a new field. Here we have the "founding" text (to use the foundation course metaphor which is used so routinely as to be by now a dead metaphor).

The Foundations course (200F) at TC founded the knowledge base for teachers education and launched the academic discipline of FE. The genealogical priority of this course is reflected not only in the scholarship about FE (e.g. Beyer & Zeichner 1982; Roth, 1993) but also in successive redefinitions of FE right down to the recent (1992) CLSE Standards (see Tozer 1993).

The founders of FE at Columbia Teachers College were not as concerned with teacher education as an academic/professional field as they were with the conditions of society at large and their

belief that teachers could affect those conditions. As they say in their introduction to their two-volume Reader:

> Any effort to understand the work of the school must begin with the fact that it is most emphatically and unequivocally a social institution .... Organized education cannot be understood in terms of its own traditions and procedures. It is always a function of time, place, and circumstance. In its basic philosophy, its essential purposes, and its program of instruction, it inevitably reflects in varying proportion the experience, the conditions the hopes, fears, and ideals of a particular people or cultural group at a particular point in history. (Rugg, 1941 Vol. I p. xi).

This view of schooling and society was shaped by the experience of economic depression. Schooling was seen as the means by which social injustice could be redressed and the evils of capitalism corrected. The Readers reflect the views of an influential group of social reconstructionists at TC, among them Kilpatrick, Counts and Butts. The integrated social foundation course was designed to play a key role in preparing so-called "Frontier Educators," intellectuals equipped with the tools to intervene in social reality (see Kilpatrick 1933, p. 17). The first volume of the Reader centered on the study of "the total culture -- the crucial problems of American life; the second deals more directly with the technical problems of education -- the principals of educational philosophy and psychology, of curriculum and teaching, of organization, administration, and the like" (Rugg 1941, p.viii). The Readers were constructed in such a way as to foster a

> new organic outlook on life and education. This outlook is the result of a century-long struggle of thousands of scientific and imaginative workers on several creative frontiers. (Rugg, 1941 Vol.II p. xix).

Thus, among the "scientific and imaginative workers" represented in the Readers were excerpts from philosophers, psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists and other social scientists, as well as poets and other artists who projected an image of life "as *organic form, as integrity of expression, as self-cultivation*" (ibid.). The selection in the Readers was intended to introduce future teachers to an organic model of life, to replace mechanistic models. This ambitious agenda had somehow to be delivered to some 2000 students a year, in two semesters. The introduction voices a kind of an apology for the "substantial amount of reading," yet it insists that this reading ideally must be done from "a wide range of sources -- historical documents and classic interpretations, reports of scientific investigations, commentaries of contemporary students and publicists, digests of journals of current events and opinion -- to name a few" (Rugg, 1941 Vol.I p. vi).

Consequently, the Readers' two enormous volumes (vol. 1, 1001 pages; vol. 2, 672 pages) comprise brief excerpts from literally hundreds of writers -- 299 excerpts in vol. 1, 210 in vol. 2. The excerpts are not necessarily from educationists, but include "classic" writers from a variety of fields, such as Thomas Jefferson (on the Federal Constitutions, 1787), Alexander Hamilton (on "the People" vs. "the Rich and Well-born," 1788), Abraham Lincoln (on equality, 1863), Walt Whitman (on democracy, 1882), and so on. Each of these excerpts runs between a page and three pages in length. The effect is that of a kind of "sampler" of materials conducing to a new way of viewing and intervening in

life. This practice is atypical of anthologies in the Anglo-American tradition, where complete texts are normally anthologized rather than excerpts, but in other cultures, e.g., French, exposure to classical canonical literature is mediated by sampling from the "great writers" right through to tertiary education.

These materials are organized in categories -- sociological categories in volume one, "technical" categories (e.g., psychology, curriculum and teaching, organization, administration) in volume two. These categories, in particular the ones in volume two, persist into later readers and 'integrated' textbooks. Each category has its own general introduction, written by one of the TC Foundation teachers responsible for that material. Moreover, each category is divided into sub-categories, and each sub-category in turn has its own brief introduction. Thus, the "samples" are organized analytically and surrounded by explanatory "packaging" material. This packaging material serves to integrate the disparate excerpts into a new whole, pre-empting and shaping the students' reception.

Thus, for example, vol. 1, part II, section II of the Reader, on "Society and the Individual," comprises ten brief excerpts, including samples from Ruth Benedict (one and half pages), Margaret Mead (two and half pages), John Dewey (two excerpts, one page each), and Karl Mannheim (two pages). Each excerpt has an interpretive or analytical title, supplied by the editors. This editorial titling is tendentious, not neutral, and forms part of the editors' conscious efforts to help students interpret the sampler "correctly" and to give it coherence.

Somewhat of this 'sampling' tradition surfaces again in the current publication "Annual Editions" used as a supplemental text in a few courses of the 60 syllabi I examined (e.g. The University of Pittsburgh; West Virginia University). "Education" (92/93 and 93/94) is published annually featuring reprints of short articles (4-6 pages each) from magazines, newspapers, and public press. In contrast to the edited volumes examined in the next section, where each article is written by an academic expert in a sub-discipline ,"Education" relies on professional\academic authority in the decision making process of choosing what is included and what is excluded. In addition to the editor Fred Schultz (University of Akron) an advisory board composed of 17 professors from colleges and public universities (no Ivy League or large research universities appear in the list) "are instrumental in the final selection of articles for each edition" (Schultz, 1993). The same sort of committee effort to cut up what goes in and what is excluded has been used by the TC faculty. The introduction to the Readers is very explicit as to the procedures

> The steps in the making of the present volume were these:
> First: A General Editorial Committee was appointed....
> Second: The Editorial Committee succeeded in drawing up an outline of the major topics and themes which formed part of the content of all or most of the syllabi used in the various Sections of 200F.
> Third: The readings were then organized in parts to fit the major categories into which the themes fall, and a sub-editorial faculty committee was appointed for each one.
> Fourth: The seven committees took the chief responsibility for the original choice of readings.
>
> Fifth: The General Editor and the General Editorial Committee made the final decisions concerning the excerpts to be

included in the book and organized them into the book's present form (Rugg, 1941 Vol. I p. vii).

This is not just a division of labor but also an authority-building mechanism, so we know that the consensus on the Foundation canon does not rest merely on assertion. The reason we can assume that this was an intentional move, is the disclaimer that follows right at the end of this passage named, "How the present volume was made." It is as if the Committee was afraid of its own power not only to structure what to read and what not to read, but also what to think.

> One caution should be stated. In assembling the materials of this book, the editors are concerned most of all that each student shall build his own point of view, not accept those ready made that may appear to inhere in the content and organization of the book (ibid.).

This decision of how the universe of FE is cut up and whose 'taste' is accepted becomes even more acute for the 'integrated texts,' by a unified authorial voice. This is resolved by multiple authorship (two authors and four in my case study), and by having multiple reviewers, 22 in the Johnson et al. case (1991), 14 in the Ornstein/Levine case. As one of these authors has told me in a personal communication these reviewers and the publishers' editors have great influence over the make-up of the table of contents.

The Next Generation: Two Edited Texts

By 1948 the consensus around the 200F and the text had developed a few cracks, mostly concerning the inflexibility of the FE requirements, the broad reading from a variety of sources, and

the claim that the course taught students how to think rather than what to think. How could this be done outside the "content" (what the students would teach) the critics questioned (Simpson, 1987 p. 217)?

As the original generation of Foundation faculty at TC was succeeded by another, the **Foundation Department** became, in 1964, the **Department of Philosophy and the Social Sciences**. The change of name signified several dimensions of a nationwide shift in thinking about education. A fairly abrupt devaluation of interdisciplinary, school-oriented teaching and writing in the foundations of education was coupled with a rise in the value of disciplinary linkages between professional schools faculty and colleagues in the cognate academic departments and scholarly societies. Bruner's claim to the importance of the structure of the disciplines, and to the uses of knowledge, set the agenda for educators.

The most influential changes were the recruitment of faculty from academic departments (history, sociology, or economics) rather than from schools of education, and new approaches to educational research, like the Teachers College's program in applied anthropology. The new breed of foundation scholars carried their orientations beyond their departments and into the graduate faculties and the learned societies in education (Clifford and Guthrie (1988).

The "revisionism" of the 1960s linked the foundations disciplines more closely with university scholarship, especially New Left historiography (i.e. Cermin's *Transformation of the*

School, 1961) and sociology. During the 1960s there was a clear attempt to hide or minimize the difference between educational research and research in the disciplines. "During this era, social foundations was all but disassembled and gave way to specialized work rooted in one of the disciplines. Anthropology of education, sociology of education, and economics of education were obviously better than a course the base of which consisted of a little from many disciplines and not very much from any one of them" (Johanningmeier 1991, p.22).

The 1970s witnessed the absorption of foundation faculty into policy-oriented units. Programs in social and philosophical foundations of education were particularly susceptible to being merged with policy studies, a new, more theoretical specialty which was taking over doctoral programs in school administration. The Competency/Performance Based Teacher Education funded by the U.S. Department of Education during the 1960 and 1970s adopted a narrow behavioristic conception of training, emphasizing the acquisition of specific and observable skills of teaching which are assumed to be related to student learning. The accountability movement which insisted on transporting attitudes and practices from business and engineering to education, further reduced the teacher's role to that of technician.

The notion of who counts as a "classic" writer, appropriate for inclusion in a Foundations sampler, indeed the very concept of "classic" writer, has altered dramatically since the 1941 Teachers College Readers. To illustrate this point, I examine two edited texts in wide use in Foundations course from the late '60s through

the '70s: Foundations of Education, edited by George F. Kneller (1st edition 1963), and Foundations of American Education: Readings, edited by James A. Johnson et al. (1st edition 1969).

The Kneller text represents the reaction against the interdisciplinarity of the Readers model of FE, and relies on experts from distinct branches of inquiry, including history, philosophy, and social sciences (psychology having separated itself from FE and constituted itself as a separate educational psychology course). Accordingly, the book is organized into five parts, each devoted to a different "foundations" discipline: historical foundations, social foundations, philosophical foundations, scientific foundations, comparative education and "structural" foundations (corresponding in effect to vol. 2 of the TC Readers, and including curriculum, organization administration, etc.). None of the "classic" writers from the TC Readers figure in Kneller's reader. Its contributors are "among the foremost authorities on American Education today" (preface, p. v), that is, professional educationalists (among them, in addition to the editor, C. W. Fawcett, Sol Cohen, John Goodlad, and Andreas Kazamias). This reflects a shift from the Readers' orientation toward reconstructing life and society at large to an orientation toward training future professionals.

The Johnson et al. Readings, starts with the usual declaration: "This book contains a wealth of resources on a variety of educational topics from an impressive array of contemporary authorities." Since the very idea of "wealth of resources" and the "variety of topics" is so different from the TC

Readers we have to examine this claim in comparison with the TC text and the Kneller's text. As far as catting up the field the three 'foundational' disciplines philosophy, history, and sociology are still in evidence also they are some time packaged under different names.

As opposed to Kneller's text which had none of the classic writers figuring in the Readers Johnson et al have six pages from Dewey's Experience and Education (1938) in the philosophical section under "contemporary views," in the 2nd edn.; and a reprint of no. ix in Dewey's series "My Pedagogic Creed." in the 4th edn. also in the philosophical bases of education. This and the fact that a few of the 60 current course syllabi from Foundation courses still require reading a Dewey text (most often Experience and Education, 1938) shows that Dewey is part of the FE canon. It will be interesting to see what happens to his corpus in the 'integrated texts.'

'Integrated' Foundations Texts

Background

As problems of relevance and major concerns with equality, inequality, low achievement, integration, desegregation, and special problems of minorities, became central in the debate following the **Coleman's Report** (1966) and subsequent studies, it became apparent that "contemporary social condition" are changing rapidly and the Foundation texts were hard at work to catch up.

The 'great' teacher education reform reports (i.e. Holmes Group, 1986 and 1990; Carnegie Forum 1986), ignore the role of

educational foundations in teacher education. Both groups of reformers suggested the practice as primary source of content for teacher education curriculum. Reorienting teachers as practitioners, relays on models of the teacher as an apprentice, and a technical expert with more 'clinical experience,' and with early exposure to schools i.e. 'teaching Hospitals.'

The social efficiency tradition of the Competency/Performance Based Teacher Education is still viable in current debates on teacher education reform, this time under the label of "research based teacher education" (Zeichner, 1993). Proposals such as the Holmes Group, have argued that during the past two decade research on teaching has produced a 'knowledge base' that can form the foundation for a teacher education curriculum.

This new 'knowledge base' challenges the dominance of the TC Foundations perspectives within the academic teacher education tradition, and has resulted in work on subject matter knowledge, strongly affiliated with cognitive psychology (e.g. Shulman 1987). According to Berliner (1984, p. 94) "we have only recently developed a solid body of knowledge and a fresh set of conceptions about teaching on which to base teacher education. For the first time, teacher education has a scientific foundation."

Texts

The two most widely used "integrated texts" required for FE courses in recent years are Foundations of Education by Ornstein and Levine (1st edn. 1987 and four subsequent editions) and Introduction to the Foundations of American Education by Johnson

et al. (1st edn. 1969 and eight subsequent editions). The texts I have examined are the 1994 9th edn. of Johnson et al. and the 1993 5th edn. of Ornstein & Levine. Both are large volumes, Ornstein & Levine (henceforth "O&L") 658 pages long, Johnson et al. (henceforth "J. et al.") 574 pages long. One of the striking differences between these texts and all those I have discussed so far is their physical presentation: multi-colored graphs, charts and pictures abound, pages are divided into main text and marginal highlights and helps, with frequent sidebars and framed special features, etc. Obviously these texts have been designed to catch and hold the attention of students raised on TV; these are, in a sense, the textbook equivalent of MTV. Alleyn and Bacon, publishers of J. et al., even offer along with the instructor's manual text a CNN video, special edited and featuring "actual news stories on research and applied topics related to education straight from the file of Cable News Network" (text from the order form). The "sampler" technique used by TC in 1941 surfaces again in a new form appropriate to the end of the twentieth century, that of brief video segments instead of short readings excerpted from "classic" writers.

What happens to these "classic" writers in the new integrated texts? The author indexes to the two integrated texts reveal a substantial overlap with the tables of contents of the TC Readers, in the sense that many of the same names appear, e.g., John Adams, Aristotle, Counts, Dewey, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Karl Marx, Mary Montessori, Pestalozzi, Plato, George Washington, Ruth Benedict, etc. Yet when we turn to the

pages to find the context in which these "classics" are mentioned, they appear either in a list of other names (e.g., Jefferson appears in a list of "men of the Enlightenment" along with Diderot, Rousseau and Franklin; O&L p. 112), or are mentioned strictly in passing, or receive a one-page treatment. For instance, the one page on Jefferson bears the title, "Jefferson: Education for Citizenship" (O&L, part 5, on the historical development of American education, under the sub-category "The Early Period of Nationhood"). This passage gives a few sentences on Jefferson in general, on his educational belief, and on his proposal on education to the Virginia legislature. By comparison, the TC Readers, introduce their samples from Jefferson's writings -- excerpts from his 1801 Inaugural Address, a 1787 letter to Madison, two pieces from his Notes on Virginia, and a 1787 letter to Carrington -- in their section on "The Liberal-Democratic Heritage." Each sample receives a title invented by the editors, indicating the editors' own interpretation of the piece and their "instructions" for its use.

Thus, the TC Readers use Jefferson's words to construct a particular point of view on democratic education, while the O&L text presents him as a figure in the history of American education. However, the main difference between the TC Readers and the O&L text is obviously that whereas the TC text reprints Jefferson's own words, albeit cut and pasted into a new form, the O&L text quotes exactly one phrase from Jefferson himself, and otherwise "digests" and paraphrases Jefferson using their own language. The question here is, with what authority do the

textbook authors report Jefferson's ideas? and, whose views are they presenting? To protect themselves from this kind of criticism, the textbook authors refer in footnotes to expert academic "authorities" on Jefferson. Apart from narrating the Jefferson "story" for the student, the authors note highlighted issues in the left margin of the text (e.g., "State responsibility for education," "Jefferson's plan," "Scholarships based on merit," "Education to promote citizenship"). This enables the reader to use even this one-page summary in a selective way, by using the highlighted issues to identify specific paragraphs to read for specific topics.

The way the integrated texts use Jefferson confirm that he is no longer a canonical writer in FE, if he ever was, but only a figure of historical interest. By contrast, John Dewey obviously does have canonical status in the field. Dewey's Experience and Education (1938) continues to be required reading in FE courses (see above). In the integrated texts, in addition to his name being mentioned multiple times (10 mentions in J et al., 14 in O&L), passages from Dewey are reprinted in sidebars or specially set-off blocs. J et al. quote 11 lines from "My Pedagogic Creed" in the context of a discussion of pragmatic philosophers in part 5, on "Philosophical Concepts, Educational Views and Teaching Styles." Dewey also features in one of the special exercises interpolated in the J et al. (1994, p. 416) text (on a colored page) in which the student is asked to reflect, from his/her own experience, on an educational issue. Here half a page of Dewey's 1916 Democracy and Education is reprinted for the purpose of

stimulating reflection on the link between education and democracy.

Dewey in the O&L text is one of the "Pioneers in Education" meaning he features in the Historical foundations, as well as in the Philosophical foundations, as in the J. et al. text. In O&L, Dewey is discussed in greater length than in the J. et al. text. Similarly to the J et al. text, Dewey is used is one of the special pedagogical features of the text, its "Taking Issue" feature, presenting the student with controversial issues in the field of education and offering arguments pro and con (1993, p. 139). The question posed in this case is, "Should Dewey's experimentalist method of inquiry be used as the basis of teaching and learning in American schools?" Whereas in the TC text reading John Dewey was part of almost every section of the book, being a major philosopher let alone the TC educational philosopher in residence, now Dewey's philosophy is introduced as a controversial issues. This observation from the O&L text is reinforced by another text use as a supplementary reading in FE courses, Noll's (ed.) Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Educational Issues. The first issue in the 2nd edn. (1983), "is social experience the key to quality education" is introduced by Dewey's Experience and Education (1938).

A Concluding Remark

No framing can claim neutrality, since the choice of what to include and what to exclude is never made in a vacuum, but from within a particular perspective that determines what is chosen.

This is obviously true for edited books, but it is also true for authored, 'integrated' texts which emanate from one or more authors, and are written in a single unified voice, and give the students a framed picture of the subject. Yet these FE texts claim to be "multiple" in their perspective. One factor that helps them sustain this claim are the multiple editions of each text, every new edition of the text being able to boast "new content coverage which reflects the rapidly changing... American society and American classrooms" (O&L 1993, p. xiii).

As far as contents are concerned, even though I could not outline a canon of the kind that preoccupies contemporary literary researchers, I seem to have identified some suggestive trends in the intellectual history of Foundations of Education. There has always been an insistence on readings from a wide range of sources -- historical documents and classic interpretations, reports of scientific investigations and research, commentaries by contemporary scholars and publicists, digests of journals of current events and opinion, etc. This ideal of a "wealth of resources" and "variety of topics," set forth by the TC faculty, is still mirrored in most course syllabi I reviewed. The "sampler" technique used by TC in 1941 surfaces again in supplementary texts designed to expose students to a variety of materials. The only important difference is that now these sources are not necessarily "classic" or even academic, but can come from the mass media and popular culture.

References

Berliner, D. (1984). "The half-full glass: A review of what we know about teaching." In P. Hosford (Ed.), Using what we know about teaching (pp. 51-77). Alexandria, VA.: Association of Supervision & Curriculum Development..

Borman, K. M. (1990). "Foundations of Education in Teacher Education." In W. R. Houston (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teachers Education. N.Y. Macmillan.

Beyer, L. E. & Zeichner, K. M. (1982). "Teacher training and educational foundation. A plea for discontent." Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (3), 18-23.

Butts, R. F. (1973). "Reconstruction in Foundations studies." Educational Theory. 23, 27-41.

Butts, R. F. (1993). "A rejoinder to Tozer's draft position paper." Educational Foundations. 7 (4), 23-33.

Clifford, G. J. and Guthrie, J. W. (1990 [1988]). Ed School. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kneller, G. F. (Ed.). (1971). Foundations of Education, 3rd edn. N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Golding, A. C. (1984). "A History of American Poetry Anthologies." In R. von Hallberg, Canons.Chicago: U. of Chicago Press. 279-309.

Johanningmeier, E. V. (1991). "Through the Disarray of Social Foundations: Some Notes Toward a New Social Foundations." Educational Foundations, Vol 6, no 1, 5-39.

Johnson, J. A., H. W. Collins, V. L. Dupuis, and J. H. Johansen. (Eds.). (1972 and 1979). Foundations of American Education: Readings. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Johnson, J. A., H. W. Collins, V. L. Dupuis, and J. H. Johansen. (1991). Introduction to the Foundations of American Education. 8th edn. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Johnson, J. A., V. L. Dupuis, D. Musial, and G> E. Hall. (1994). Introduction to the Foundations of American Education. 9th edn. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Noll, J. Wm. (Ed.) (1983) Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Educational Issues. 2nd. edn. Cuilford, Conn.: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.

Ornstein, A. C. and Levine, D. U. (1993). Foundations of Education. 5th edn. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Schultz, F. (Ed.). (1990). Education 90/91. 17th edn., Cuilford, Conn.: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.

Schultz, F. (Ed.). (1993). Education 93/94. 20th edn., Cuilford, Conn.: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.

Simpson, D. J. (1987). "Teacher education reform and Social Foundations of Education: An analysis of major reports on teacher education." Educational Foundations, no. 3.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform." Harvard Educational Review, 57 (1),1-22.

Roth, J. (1993). "Teacher preparation and Social Foundations: Specifying their relationship." Educational Foundations. 7 (4), 49-56.

Rugg, H. (Ed.) (1941). Reading in the Foundations of Education. Vol. I and II. N.Y.: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Tompkins, Jane (1985). Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction 1790-1860. Oxford: Oxford U. Press.

Tozer, Steve. (1993). "Toward a New Consensus among Social Foundations Educators." Educational Foundations. 7 (4), 5-22.

Tozer, S. & McAninich, S. (1987). "For texts in social foundations of education in historical perspective. Educational Studies, 14, 13-33.

Zeichner, K. M. (1993). "Traditions of practice in U. S. preservice Teacher Education programs." Teaching & Teacher Education. 9 (1), 1-13.