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Problem

Many educational foundations scholars claim that teacher education programs focus on the how of instruction (student teaching and methods courses) instead of the why of education (foundations studies), and that preservice teachers’ pre-college perspectives about education are not questioned or challenged. Their programs’ foundations studies have made little or no impact on preservice teachers.

Method

An interview-based case study methodology was employed and Schwab’s
(1978) concept of the four "commonplaces" of education (teacher, student, curriculum, and context) was used to categorize questions about the meaning and purpose of education. Nine interviewees were selected from among students in two teacher education programs in the midwestern part of the United States. In the first two interviews, open-ended, semi-structured questions were used to explore the interviewees' backgrounds: families, growing-up years, K-12 experiences, ideas about the commonplaces of education, and teacher education programs. The third interview focused on the use of matching and multiple choice questions to probe where the interviewees would look for answers to what are called the "commonplace questions"—inquiries into the meaning and purpose of the four commonplaces.

Results

Foundations studies are on the periphery of the interviewees' consciousness. The real core of their programs is student teaching, teaching methods courses, and psychology-type courses. However, when introduced to the philosophical commonplace questions, the interviewees' responses indicated they consider foundations studies useful, but not central, in answering those questions.

Conclusions

Preservice teachers will consult foundations materials for answers to the commonplace questions if their perceptions of the commonplaces of education are challenged or unsettled. Foundations studies will prove themselves a vital and cherished part of teacher education programs only if it can be demonstrated that educational issues are far more complex than preservice teachers think.
DEDICATION

The old Hebrew Psalm, Number 23, introduces a Shepherd and ascribes to Him several admirable qualities. One of those qualities is the ability, and apparently also the willingness, to "restore souls." I do not comprehend the full implications of this capacity to restore, but I suspect it may include "restoring sanity," "providing coherence to cognitive processes," and "imparting endurance."

The virtues of the Shepherd of that Psalm, fortunately, are not held in a static state. Rather, the implication is that there are sheep who need and would benefit from the skillful attention of that Shepherd. And, indeed, I must confess that without the tender, patient work of that Shepherd, I would not have had the sanity, coherence, and endurance to be approaching the point where I can echo the report of Julius Caesar:

Veni, Vidi, Vici: I came, I saw, I conquered.

However, in all honesty, I give that Shepherd the credit for the conquest. Actually, it was He, who when he came, saw disorder, incompetence, and faintness. It was He who conquered all three, replacing them with sanity, aptitude, and steadfastness.

He came, He saw, He conquered!

Thank you, Good Shepherd!
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Context of the Study

Some educators claim that since about the turn of the century the field of teacher education has become increasingly positivistic, behaviorally oriented, mechanistic, vocational, and/or technical (Broudy, 1982; Eisner, 1983; Finkelstein, 1982; Greene, 1981; McMahon, 1970; Nash, 1970). Some believe that teacher education has become survival-oriented and its focus is on field experiences as opposed to theory (Beyer & Zeichner, 1982).

A generation ago Paul Woodring wrote "The Decline of Educational Philosophy" (1958b) in which he argued that "we have ceased to give proper attention to philosophical problems" (p. 6). Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) and Dennis (1977) assert that teacher education is now far more concerned with the how of instruction than it is with the why of education.

At least three reasons have been advanced for this alleged situation. First, from its beginnings teacher education has appeared to suffer from poor self-esteem because of its perceived low status when compared with the Arts and Sciences faculty in universities (Schwebel, 1985). Teacher education felt compelled to become more scientific in its planning and practice in areas such as setting objectives, planning
instruction, managing the classroom, and measuring achievement.

Second, and related to the first, since the early years of this century, Auguste Comte's work in sociology, Edward Lee Thorndike's work in measurement, and B. F. Skinner's work in behavior have found strong acceptance from sometimes self-conscious educators (McMahon, 1970; Prakash & Waks, 1985). Educational leadership found in the work of Thorndike and Skinner the means to become more scientific—and thus respectable.

Third, the Great Depression, World War II, the demise of the Progressive Education movement, the Russian success with launching Sputnik, and the resulting criticism of schools, fostered a robust essentialism in the "back to basics" movement (DeYoung, 1979). In spite of scattered revivals of interest in progressivism, perennialism, humanism and other orientations, the back-to-basics movement has exhibited amazing staying power. Naturally, the competency movement for both students and teachers is an inevitable complement to this essentialism.

Many educators and the general public may be satisfied, even pleased, with the perceived essentialist and competency focus. However, as implied earlier, many foundations scholars are not happy with this mindset.

Overview of Foundations Studies

A possible wrong conclusion needs to be addressed at this point: not all foundations scholars are united in their perspectives. To conclude that foundations scholars are a philosophically oriented, monolithic block would be to form a seriously flawed stereotype. Indeed, they have varying positions on what the content of
foundations courses should include and what the course objectives should be. However, they do generally stand together in opposing the technical, positivistic state of current teacher education.

At this point, the meaning of "educational foundations studies" should be given. While there is hardly universal agreement about what foundations courses include, the literature indicates that the following courses of study are generally considered foundational: history of education, philosophy of education, psychology of education, and sociology of education. Each of these four titles may have a name, or content, which varies somewhat: educational philosophy (for philosophy of education), social issues in education (for sociology of education), etc. Also included in foundations may be materials or courses, such as comparative or international, economics, political science, anthropology, and theology as they relate to education. The literature also indicates much interest in racial and gender issues.

At the turn of the century, history of education was the most popular and common foundational study, with psychology of education being in second place. However, by the 1930s psychology of education had taken the lead (Amstine, 1973). Today, many schools, colleges, and departments of education group history, philosophy, comparative education, and sociology of education together and refer to them as the social foundations of education.

Psychology of education is often taught as a discrete course of its own for a number of reasons, one being the difference in how its scholars view teacher education as compared to the social foundations scholars. While the former may
often tend to relate to education from a developmental, cognitive, or behavioristic perspective, the latter are apt to view education in its broader historical, philosophical, and social setting. For the purposes of this study, psychology of education is considered to be one of the foundations courses, as indeed it is listed by many foundations scholars.

**Goals of Foundations Studies**

While foundations scholars would not want to be identified as disparaging academic achievement, most would insist on looking at a larger picture regarding the purposes of education and the meaning of student achievement (Conrad, Nash, & Shiman, 1973). They argue that it is vital for educational leaders to have not only the skills, but the disposition as well, to question the assumptions of the status quo and the direction of current trends. Foundations scholars tend toward asking philosophical-type questions regarding education. "A Plea for Discontent" (Beyer & Zeichner, 1982) and "The Restoration of Vision to Teacher Education" (Conrad et al., 1973) are not only article titles, but mottos as well, ones which portray the sentiments of foundations scholars as they view teacher education.

All human beings would do well to ask questions such as, Who are we? Where did we come from? How did we get here? Why are we here? and Where are we going? Though some, probably many, perhaps most, of us do not think deeply about such issues, the majority of us would doubtlessly agree that these questions are worthwhile, even important. Foundations scholars assert that if human beings in general should consider the answers to the kinds of questions listed just above,
certainly those charged with shaping the next generation should ponder them thoughtfully. In other words, questions about life in general should become some of the questions which educators ask as they formulate education’s mission, objectives, and activities in particular.

An example of an area in which foundations scholars raise philosophical-type questions is that regarding the concept of excellence. There is virtually universal agreement that we need excellence in education. However, there is definitely no consensus on what educators mean by excellence. Prakash and Waks (1985), for example, have cited four different conceptions of excellence which may focus on cognitive development, promote social action, or have some other goal. The hard reality is that while all educators believe in excellence, they define it in many different ways and have many different expectations for it. What this means is that while teachers are being urged to achieve excellence in their classrooms, there is no consensus on what just what is meant by excellence.

**Framing Education’s Foundational Questions**

There are a number of frameworks in which the basic issues and questions in education can be organized and stated. Berlak and Berlak (1981) have formulated a set of 16 “dilemmas.” Perdew (1969) asked, "What are the foundational questions?" in an article with the same name, then formulated a list of 12 foundational questions. Miller and Seller (1990) cited six issues that beg for clarification. Schwab (1978) proposed a map for the field of education, using the concept of "commonplaces." Four of the commonplaces he listed were the teacher, the
student, the curriculum, and the milieu or context—four things that are common to most educational efforts. However, not only are the four commonplaces four things, a thoughtful consideration of them could serve as a reminder that different educators would doubtlessly have different perspectives about what would be ideal for each of them.

Whatever the name given to the heuristic device which frames the fundamental concerns of education, foundations scholars feel that "philosophical" questions need to be addressed. Using Schwab's four commonplaces as a framework, foundations scholars might ask four series of "commonplace questions" which would probe the meaning, purpose, and goal of each of the commonplaces:

1. The teacher—To what extent should he or she control the scheduling, the activities, the rules, and the academic standards? Should only state-certified teachers be hired? Which educational decisions should teachers make?

2. The student—To what extent should he or she help determine the scheduling, the activities, the rules, and the academic standards? What is his or her nature morally and ethically? What are the characteristics of a truly educated person?

3. The curriculum—What, and who, should determine its content? What should be its purpose? Should awareness, appreciation, and acceptance of a common culture be emphasized, or should it focus on celebrating cultural diversity?

4. The context—What should be the environment within the classroom? Should there even be a classroom? Should the mood be businesslike or casual? Is the best classroom highly structured or one that allows for great individuality and choice?
Foundations scholars believe that the preceding questions, along with numerous other similar ones, should be asked. They assert that someone must lead out in continual examination of the goals and purposes of education. Otherwise, thought would stagnate and "mindlessness" (Silberman, 1970) would certainly result. Furthermore, they believe that preservice teachers (individuals who are not yet certified and/or who have not yet begun teaching) should not only learn how to ask and answer those questions, but should also be disposed to ask them (Siegel, 1980). Foundations scholars argue that foundations courses fulfill a vital function in teacher education by instilling the disposition and the critical thinking skills for an ongoing analysis of the bigger questions.

Siegel (1980) discussed the meaning of critical thinking and asserted that critical thinking is really "principled" thinking, thinking based on an "objective, impartial, nonarbitrary" use of evidence (p. 8). He defined a critical thinker as "one who recognizes the importance, and convicting force, of reasons" (p. 8). Jones (1982) called these dispositions and skills the "interpretive, normative, and critical" function of education.

Given the alleged technical mindset of teacher education, it may be important to insist on answers to the questions regarding the meaning and purpose of education. Foundations scholars assert, "Somebody must address the meaning of education. If we don't examine the larger issues and ask the bigger questions, who will?" And, they might also ask, "Is an unexamined educational program worth conducting?"
Purpose of the Study

Do preservice teachers address the meaning of education, concern themselves with the larger issues, and ask the bigger questions? Foundations scholars claim that studying foundations materials can give preservice teachers broadened perspectives on questions regarding purpose and meaning of life in general and education in particular. Thus, they may be expected to assist teachers in answering these important commonplace questions. But do they?

Where do preservice teachers' ideas about education originate—what, or who, has shaped their thinking? For example, is it largely the thought and writing of some thinker like Rousseau? Dewey? Bestor? or Adler? Or, is it preservice teachers' mothers and fathers? Their previous teachers? Their involvement in religious activities? Or, their years in youth organizations such as 4-H or the Scouts? Do certain facets of their teacher education program impact preservice teachers perspectives in some remarkable manner? Doubtlessly, preservice teachers' ideas are affected and shaped by their early socialization in their homes, their neighborhoods, their churches, their schools, and the larger society, including the media. The perspectives, regarding the nature of education, which are learned in these organizations and socializing agencies appear to have amazing staying power.

It is a species of naïveté to assume that a preservice teacher's mind is a Lockean tabula rasa. Students entering teacher education enter their program with many ideas, opinions, and perspectives already well formed. The foundations courses are thus taught to students who already have been "in" education for a dozen or more
years and already have some definite ideas about what the answers should be to education's commonplace questions. Preservice teachers often feel that they already "know" all about education and already have a fairly good understanding of what is taught in foundational studies. Often, their sentiment is, "This all sounds so familiar" (Leean, 1979, p. 5). Foundations instructors would be well advised to take into account the student's existing worldviews or paradigms and the resulting perspectives (Weinstein, 1989). Thus, the question becomes, Do foundations studies really broaden teachers' perspectives and understandings, or, do they in some way merely confirm students' pre-existing ideas regarding education?

The assertions of the philosophers Thomas Kuhn (1970) and Karl Popper (1965) support the latter possibility. Their work on scientific paradigms and theories suggests that once a worldview is adopted, further information about a field of study is often seen as further evidence which only confirms the established worldview.

Thus, it would appear that foundations faculty and foundations courses have competition, that they are only one of several players in the game of education. Then why attempt to teach foundational studies at all? If everyone were willing to be content with their perception of the status quo—all were satisfied with continuing to do everything the way we have always done it—there might be no need to study educational issues—there would be none. However, once we question anything we do in education, a comprehensive examination of everything is the end result. Studying foundations materials, the scholars assert, gives insights for that examination.

As already noted, the natural query which arises from this discussion is
whether an academic quarter's or semester's worth of exposure to the content of a
typical foundations course will provoke thoughtful examination of one's perspectives,
instill the critical attitudes and skills to weigh educational issues, and promote an
openness to change. It certainly is plausible that preservice teachers might be swayed
by the reasoned positions of some great educational thinker, provided the preservice
teacher studied that individual's works at length and in depth. However, it is likely
that most teachers-to-be have studied very little, if any, primary source materials from
historians, philosophers, psychologists, and sociologists of education. Most students
probably read only an unrepresentative sampling of the available literature in the form
of short articles or excerpts written by various individuals. Moreover, the
relationship between preservice teachers' ideas about education and those of the
recognized shapers of educational thought and practice has probably been a nodding
acquaintance as the former scan a brief textbook discussion of the ideas and reasoning
of the latter, a discussion in which the textbook author's personal biases have shaped
the presentation found in the textbook.

Can this type of exposure persuade preservice teachers to examine and/or
adopt ideas different than ones they already have? It is believable that while
superficial reading and passing exposure may broaden their understanding somewhat,
it may also serve to confirm in their own minds what they already have adopted for a
worldview in general and for ideas regarding the commonplaces of education in
particular. Somewhere before their exposure to foundations materials and
independent of the arguments of the "authorities," the preservice teacher may have
I discovered and developed his or her own paradigm and his or her own ideas about the commonplaces of education and his or her own answers to the commonplace questions. *Who, or what, has shaped those presuppositions and how do they interact with foundations materials?* Searching for answers to these questions is the purpose of my study—those inquiries, its guiding light.

**Definition of Terms**

For the reader's understanding, certain words or terms are defined in this section of the report. The first term relates to foundations—the words "studies," "courses," "classes," and "materials" somewhat interchangeably. The word "studies" refers to the *whole field* of study, while "courses" refers to an *academic term's* worth of work. The interviewees sometimes use "classes" to refer to "courses," though I prefer to reserve "classes" to refer to the *individual sessions* or *class periods* of a course. "Materials" refers particularly to *facets* of foundations studies which may be included as a part of some course, such as Introduction to Teaching, etc.

The next term relates to the "human subjects" who were interviewed during the research process. These persons were "preservice teachers" and I define that to mean individuals who have not yet obtained state certification and/or those who have not yet begun teaching on a regular basis. Since these preservice teachers were my "interviewees" or "respondents," they are sometimes referred to as such. The word "origins" refers to the pre-college background or biography of the interviewees.

The term "program" is merely a shortened form of "teacher education program" or "teacher preparation program, though the former is preferred." An
"instructor" is a teacher or professor in the teacher education program.

Joseph Schwab's (1978) work was introduced in the preceding pages. In this study, his "commonplaces" of education paradigm is used as a framework for organizing the questions I ask about educational issues. I refer to these questions as "commonplace questions," questions that are asked about teachers, students, curricula, and contexts or milieu.

**Delimitations**

First, in this study I make no pretense of, or attempt at, undertaking a psychological analysis of the interviewees' responses—what each subject has stated regarding his or her experience and perspectives is taken at face value. This does not rule out what Spradley (1979) calls "making inferences from what people say" (p. 9). However, there is no speculation whether he or she may have meant something other than what was said—each person's statements are considered to be an accurate account of what he or she in reality actually thinks or feels.

Another delimitation of the study is that the findings are not presented as representative of the universe of preservice teachers. This case study is presented as a set of glimpses into the experiences of the nine preservice teachers interviewed. Each reader compares and contrasts the case study to his or her own situation and then makes whatever application that he or she considers appropriate.

To provide a broadened perspective for this study, an overview of the historical development and the philosophical rationale of the field of foundations studies is presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER II

SELECTED HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Purpose of the Chapter

The purpose of this chapter is threefold. First, the procedure used in the search for relevant foundations literature is explained. Second, the plan for reviewing the foundations literature is explained. Third, selected foundations literature which provides an overview of the development of thought and practice in the educational foundations field is reviewed. It could be argued that by the early 1970s, the field of foundations studies had taken the basic form it now has. Thus, the review of the literature, which is pertinent to this study, ends with the literature of the early 1970s.

My purpose is not to study education in general, and furthermore it is not even to examine the content of the field of foundations studies itself. My focus is to review what has been said about foundations as foundations.

Literature Search Procedure

The first step was to use the ERIC CD-ROM disc to search the literature for the past decade. This system reviews almost 800 education-related publications, including the most popular ones in the fields of foundations and teacher education.

I used the descriptors "education" and "foundations" in this initial search
and was rewarded with 76 document listings. The document were designated either "EJ" (educational journal) or "ED" (educational document—available on microfiche). After printing out the abstracts of these articles, I studied them, highlighting those which were pertinent to my topic. I chose to read many articles which discussed the various foundations of education, but my focus was on those which discussed foundations studies as foundations.

My practice was to obtain photocopies of each article which I had decided to read, whether it be in journal or microfiche form. My university's library had perhaps between 90% and 95% of the articles which I selected; the balance I obtained through the library's inter-library loan system.

As I read each article, I studied that article's bibliography carefully to note the books and articles which the author cited, and obtained and read those which appeared relevant. This cycle was then repeated a third time. Of course, I obtained not only articles from the literature, but promising books as well.

As I worked, I developed my bibliography and thus could constantly check the literature's bibliographic citations against my own bibliography. By the time I had finished, I could be reasonably confident that I had obtained the most promising articles from the past several decades.

Plan for Reviewing the Literature

The literature appears to fall naturally into at least five categories. First, there is the apologist type which contains a general advocacy or promotional for the value of foundational studies—that category of literature was introduced in the first
chapter. Second, there is a category of foundations literature which tells of the relationship of foundational studies to preservice teachers. It is important to note that this category of the literature is *not* discussed in this chapter. Rather, I have chosen to review this category of literature in later chapters in order to directly connect this category of literature and my findings.

A third category of foundations articles attempts to show how to teach the foundational studies in more effective ways. Fourth, there are articles which are very strong in their social action advocacy. The literature from categories three and four is not central to my study; thus, its mention is incidental.

Finally, the fifth category of foundations literature provides information about the history of foundational studies. Though the focus of this study is not on tracing the development of thought in the area of educational foundations, I have chosen in this chapter to review the literature chronologically. My belief is that in providing a sketch of the historical development of the educational foundations studies field, a better perspective of this field of study will emerge.

An instructive benefit that comes with a chronological review of foundations is the understanding that the development of this field is reflected in the literature, and the literature mirrors the development of the field.

A final qualification is noted here. In the literature review which follows, it is inevitable that a sampling of all of the categories mentioned above will appear. However, the intent and thrust of the review will be on tracing the historical roots of the field of foundations studies.
Beginnings of Foundational Thought

A broad framework for understanding the development of educational foundations studies can be gained by a very brief note concerning the history of teacher education. Although the first teacher training (normal) school was established in Massachusetts in 1839 (Borrowman, 1956), a college degree for entering teaching was not generally a requirement in most states as late as the 1920s (Lortie, 1975). Thus, the discussion which follows can be put into a larger perspective.

Borrowman (1956) observes that before 1865 many of the social sciences were not well developed. However, he states that during the earlier portion of the 19th century, history was a staple in the curriculum of many public schools, and by about 1860 history of education began establishing itself as a central part of teacher education. Borrowman suggests that after the Civil War, history of education had "an unchallenged place in the professional curriculum," though it was "essentially a study of comparative educational philosophy" (p. 106). This was true, he argued because teacher educators felt that it was vital to introduce preservice teachers to the thinking of the great educational thinkers of the past.

During the last quarter of the 19th century, the rationale of foundations courses was established. Borrowman (1956) recalls that some teacher educators asserted that a proper teacher education program must provide, among other things, a complete understanding of mankind—psychologically, physically, socially, and historically. He recalls that in 1894, Edward Shaw of New York University expressed the need in teacher education for a "middleman" who could take the
findings of the social sciences and introduce them to prospective teachers. However, some teacher educators argued that the social sciences, even when related to education, might not produce explicit techniques for classroom teaching.

According to Brauner (1964), in 1896, W. T. Harris, U.S. Commissioner of Education, reasoned that education was founded on sociology. Brauner also states that by 1897 John Dewey was arguing that physiology, biology, psychology, and sociology should form the basis for what teachers studied.

According to Arnstine (1972), the first years of the 20th century saw history of education being the most popular and common foundational study. He states that psychology of education held second place, though philosophy of education was a strong contender. Educational sociology (not to be confused with sociology of education, which was later to replace the former) also began receiving strong attention. Arnstine also states that in 1914 the three most popular courses in the teacher education curriculum were practice teaching, history of education, and psychology, in that order. According to Arnstine, however, by the 1930s psychology of education had taken over the number one spot. He noted that during the depression, the humanistic foundations "all but disappeared . . . represented only—if at all—by occasionally required catch-all kinds of courses." He added, perhaps gloomily, "The situation is much the same today" (p. 3).

During the early years of this century, there was much discussion and debate as to whether foundational studies should be closely related to their parent disciplines (academic) or be explicitly practical (professional) to preservice teachers.
Developments at Teachers College

During the late 1920s, a very significant development occurred in teacher education—a group of professors at Teachers College, Columbia University (and other professors of education from around the country), began meeting together to study the relation of the academic social sciences and the professional preparation of teachers. Brauner (1964) refers to these meetings as the "conversational origins" of formal educational foundations studies. The individuals involved in these meetings included the well-known educators Kilpatrick, Rugg, Counts, Childs, and Dewey. One of the results of their study was that in 1934 Teachers College reorganized and formed several departments, one of them being the first "foundations" department.

Butts (quoted in Brauner, 1964), in a 1957 letter, recalled that

the origin of the term [foundations], I believe, grew out of the social and educational setting of the late 1920s and early 1930s. The two most influential aspects of the setting were (1) the depression and . . . (2) the great specialization in professional liberal arts courses" (p. 202, emphasis his).

Continuing, Butts reasoned that the "social crisis [of the depression] led to the belief that we needed courses that would deal with social issues and education" (p. 202). Furthermore,

course offerings in most higher institutions had become highly specialized as a result of rapid increases of knowledge and the use of the elective system. The idea thus grew that we needed course offerings and administrative arrangements that would bring several different fields together. This is an interdisciplinary idea. Educators should see society as a whole and see education as a total enterprise in relation to the society and culture.

So foundations courses were designed to overcome the specialization represented by separate courses in the history of education, philosophy of education, psychology of education, sociology of education, comparative education, and educational economics. (p. 203, emphasis his)
Butts (quoted in Brauner, 1964) stated that Teachers College set up two departments for foundations studies: the Department of Social and Philosophical Foundations and the Department of Psychological Foundations. Butts (quoted in Brauner, 1964) concludes: "I like to think of the foundations as the bridge or linkage between the university disciplines of scholarship and the professional training for specialized jobs. It is thus both general and professional" (p. 204, emphasis his).

Another outgrowth of the Teachers College events was Rugg’s 1947 text, The Foundations of American Education, which Brauner (1964) suggested was Rugg’s "interpretation of the worth, basis, content, and uses of the concepts implicit in those early ['after-dinner'] conversations" (p. 205). Rugg’s text continues to be noted, thus implying that the volume is considered a landmark work in foundations literature.

**Developments in the 1950s**

The Teachers College group had conceptualized, and implemented, changes in teacher education. By 1950 the group’s arguments had influenced at least six programs, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign being perhaps the most notable of the six. According to Brauner (1964), most of the Illinois foundations scholars had received their training at Teachers College. Illinois developed a Division of Historical, Comparative, Philosophical, and Social Foundations in their College of Education. This division, in the planning stage since 1947, was implemented in 1950 (Anderson, Benne, Smith, McMurray, & Stanley, 1951).

The five foundations scholars just noted, Archibald W. Anderson, Kenneth D. Benne, B. Othanel Smith, Foster McMurray, and William O. Stanley, were from
the University of Illinois, and wrote *The Theoretical Foundations of Education* which was published in 1951. In their foreword, one of the first items of business was to clarify the terms "educational sociology" and "social foundations." They saw Educational Sociology as a scholarly discipline which "applies the methods of sociological study to the institutions of deliberate education, and to the interrelations between educational and other institutions" (Anderson et al., 1951, p. v). However, social foundations, as a field, is concerned with those aspects and problems of society which need to be taken into account in determining educational policy, especially as this policy concerns the social role of the school, and in determining broader social policies which affect educational policy. (p. 212)

Following this line of thinking, the University of Illinois teacher education program used the term "social foundations," as already noted, to refer to any of the four theoretical foundations which the faculty designated as historical, comparative, philosophical, or social (Anderson et al., 1951). The Illinois group felt that "the theoretical foundations would spread a tent of abstractions over the separate areas of teacher training" (Brauner, 1964, p. 216).

A case could be made for the perspective that foundations literature is sometimes written as a reaction to other literature. An example of this possibility would be Arthur Bestor's (1953) *Educational Wastelands*. Though this classic work is not foundations literature, per se, the book reproached teacher education in general, thus affecting foundations studies in particular. This historian of education attacked the Progressive Education movement, calling it a "regressive education" movement. Bestor allowed for the possible necessity of a department of pedagogy, but not for the need of a department, school, or college of education. Education, he argued, was the
business of the whole university and teaching methodology for a given field of study should be taught by the scholars in those respective fields.

It may be that the writing and publishing of Bestor's book became a turning point in American education. At any rate, since 1953 the criticism of education appears to have escalated exponentially. Of course, each serious criticism has aroused its respondents. One of the first to react to Bestor was R. Freeman Butts (1954), a Teachers College professor. Butts begins his book review of Bestor's work with these words: "This book is made to order for controversy" (p. 340). While Butts is considered one of the foremost of foundations scholars, the arguments in his response to Bestor do not address Bestor's implicit position regarding foundations per se, but rather his stance on teacher education in general.

In the spring of 1956, an issue of the Harvard Educational Review contained a number of articles about philosophy of education. In one of these articles, Frankena (1956) declared that philosophy of education should be three facets: the speculative, the normative, and the analytical. He explained that the speculative might be educational experimentation and would look for hypotheses; the normative might propose recommendations for education because it discovers the appropriate goals; and, the analytical might be concerned with evaluation and attempt to make educational concepts more clear. The normative facet, asserted Frankena, "seems to me to contain the heart of the philosophy of education" (p. 97), but it was his hope "that all philosophers of education will take part in all three sorts of enquiry" (p. 98).

Another article (Ducasse, 1956) introduces a discussion of "the philosophy
of the philosophy of education," that is, metaphilosophical questions about the philosophy of education (p. 104). Ducasse later suggested that "the root problem of the philosophy of education is What is Education?" (p. 106). He stated that education was a purposive activity and that wisdom would enlighten education's purpose. In his conclusion he argued, "Wisdom is knowledge of what, in given circumstances, it would on the whole, be best to do" (p. 110, emphasis his).

In the same issue of the journal that contained the article cited just above, Feuer (1956) wrote an article that opened with these words: "Philosophy of education arises from the sustained effort to answer two questions, what should we teach, and how should we teach it" (p. 112). Feuer believed that what was most important in the philosophy of education was awareness of how social groups function and thus provides a tool with which to study social and psychological situations.

Perhaps it was a perceived need to summon teacher educators to take a larger look at educational issues that resulted in a fair number of articles about philosophy of education in the latter part of the 1950s; however, only two of these articles are examined. In the first, Woodring (1958a) set educational foundations into a teacher education framework composed of four facets:

1. Liberal education
2. Scholarly knowledge of the subject to be taught
3. Professional knowledge
4. Professional skills.

Woodring later distinguished between professional knowledge and
professional skills. By the former, he referred to "theoretical" courses such as psychology, history, sociology, and philosophy of education and comparative education. He paid a special tribute to philosophy of education, viewing it as the "bridge" over the "gap between liberal and professional education" (p. 19).

Professional skills, of course, referred to being able to manage a classroom, deal with children, and plan and conduct the teacher-learning process.

A final note regarding Woodring's (1958a) arguments is helpful in understanding his position. In defense of the importance of theoretical courses, he noted "Dewey's wise statement that 'theory is, in the long run, the most practical of all things',' and then added, "it is the most practical because it has the widest implications and the most long-range applications" (pp. 16, 17).

The following article is chosen because it represents much of the thinking of foundations scholars both before and after its publication and because it was destined to become another landmark in foundations literature. In keeping with the intellectual climate of seeking to understand education's bigger picture, Woodring (1958b) wrote "The Decline of Educational Philosophy." In this article, destined to be cited many times in the literature of later years, Woodring began thus:

It is my thesis that educational philosophy in America has fallen upon evil days. The difficulty is not so much that we have accepted false philosophies, or even that we have no philosophy at all, though that is true of far too many educators, but that we have ceased to give proper attention to philosophical problems. (p. 6)

After giving examples of four teachers' simplistic responses to a questionnaire which asked for his or her philosophy of education, he noted that these
teachers' replies were merely cliches regarding education, not philosophies of education. Furthermore, Woodring declares that "reform movements, however necessary and useful, are usually much more clear in what they oppose than in what they stand for" (p. 7). Woodring would have every teacher be a philosopher, in that he or she would wrestle with questions regarding educational realities, truths, and what constitutes the good life, though there might emerge no complete unity of thought. Woodring makes this challenge:

A philosophy of education should be related to actual experience with children in a learning situation, but it will not stem directly from such experience. A teacher may spend forty years with children and yet never achieve anything even remotely resembling a philosophy. The development of a truly philosophic point of view requires intellectual activity: reading, thinking, discussion, and critical evaluation—activities most likely to be found in a college classroom in the company of one's intellectual peers. (pp. 9, 10)

Thus, Woodring builds a case for philosophy of education in every teacher education program.

Developments in the Early and Middle 1960s

Observers of the educational scene witnessed little apparent interest in foundations studies in the late 1950s and the early 1960s. This might not be completely unexpected due to the American interest in broader curriculum issues during this time and the American response to the successful launching of Sputnik by the U.S.S.R. in 1957.

During this era, however, two voices reminded educators of the importance of philosophy of education. One voice was Woodring's, as discussed above. The other voice was that of Hardie who wrote "The Philosophy of Education in a New
Key." Hardie (1960) wrote that "many of those who work in the field of education like to feel that they are helping to change the world," but "some people who are interested in education do not realize the extent to which changes in the world and in our knowledge of it produces changes in education" (p. 255). Hardie agrees with Bertrand Russell who saw philosophy as something between theology (dogma) and science (definite knowledge). Philosophy is like theology in that it speculates about matters that cannot be proved and it is like science in that it appeals to reason rather than authority. "Between theology and science there is a No Man's Land, exposed to attack from both sides; this No Man's Land is philosophy" (p. 255).

After much discussion, Hardie asserts, "Philosophy, therefore, is not a subject which provides knowledge about the universe—either about the physical environment of man or about man himself" (p. 257). Furthermore, "the task of philosophy is much more modest, but at the same time much more useful. It is to develop methods which lead to the clarification of different kinds of knowledge" (p. 257). Hardie concludes, "Philosophy has no direct message for education" (p. 257), but adds,

although philosophy has now no direct bearing on education, it is probably much more important than before because of its indirect bearing. Whatever subject one is studying and proposing to teach it is true, I think, that there are problems or puzzles, not so much in the subject as about the subject, which have to be tackled by the methods developed in recent philosophy. (p. 258)

Hardie argues that "the philosophy of education which students ought now to study is therefore something which might properly be called 'the philosophy of the curriculum'" (p. 258).
In his summary Hardie suggests that preservice teachers can be shown how to approach problems in teaching their particular subject matter. Thus, they can be taught quickly to realize the hollowness of traditional philosophical claims. They will see that it is misleading to say that education must have a sound philosophical foundation, that rather the reverse is true. For with sound education people should be able to think themselves out of any philosophical tangles in which they may occasionally be trapped. (p. 260)

During this time period, foundations studies were apparently being taught each as a discrete field or subject matter. Jones (1963) attempted to show the need and benefits of integrating them. The conclusion of his closely reasoned, highly philosophical piece was a call for an "integrating or unifying concept" (p. 81).

However, 1963, like 1953, was destined to become an important year for foundations studies. Two volumes appeared that attempted to discredit teacher education as it was to be found in the status quo. The most widely cited book was by James Bryant Conant, *The Education of American Teachers*. Like *Educational Wastelands* 10 years earlier, it became the subject of much debate. Born in 1893, Conant had been educated at Harvard University, worked as a chemistry professor there, and then for 20 years (1933-1953) served as its president. After retiring from Harvard, and performing a couple of political assignments, he undertook to study American public education for a number of years. *The Education of American Teachers* came at the end of this time.

Conant (1963) recalls the awareness that had come to him, during his years as a professor of chemistry, "of the hostility of the members of my profession to schools or faculties of education" (p. 1). He admitted that he had shared the views of
his colleagues: "I felt confident that I was an excellent teacher and I had developed my skill by experience, without benefit of professors of education" (p. 1). After Conant became the university president, he began to see the importance of bringing understanding between the two groups. This he undertook with mixed results.

After Conant and his colleagues had visited many institutions of learning in many states, he was ready to make quite a number of recommendations regarding education. Some of these observations concerned teacher education in general. However, what he specifically recommended concerning educational foundations studies is noted in the following. Referring to "eclectic" courses such as Introduction to Teaching, Conant made this ire-raising argument:

The eclectic courses may be said to be a conglomeration of bits of the history of American education, the philosophy of education, educational sociology, the economics and politics of the school, together with an introduction to education as a profession as well as a glimpse at the application of psychological phraseology in the observation and teaching of children. From the point of view of education, I see no reason for the existence of these courses. (p. 129)

Conant continued his attack with such statements as: "The future teacher, as I have said, would do well to study philosophy under a real philosopher. . . . The same is true of a course in the history of education" (p. 131). Referring to "general methods courses," he queried, "And now I come to a red-hot question: How about those terrible methods courses, which waste a student's time?" (p. 137).

If Conant had sincerely wanted to bridge the chasm between teacher educators and the arts and sciences faculty, his engineering produced a span which collapsed, at least to many foundations scholars. A widespread verbal discussion,
more correctly a storm of protest, quickly arose which has apparently not yet been
forgotten. One of the first to object was Harry S. Broudy (1964), who observed,

Dr. Conant's prestige is implicitly and explicitly used as a guarantee of the truth
of what the book says and of the wisdom that it prescribes. If anyone other than
Dr. Conant were the author of this volume, it would have created no tempest,
even in a teacup. (p. 199)

Broudy observes that Conant has re-introduced a quarrel between teacher
educators and the arts and sciences faculty. Furthermore, Broudy notes that Conant
admits to being an adherent to the perspective of the latter group. Conant's
"appreciation" for teacher educators is "an acquired taste, or shall one say, an
acquired tolerance" (p. 199). Broudy views Conant's book as having been written for
the laity and has provided them with "misunderstandings, oversimplifications, and
distortions" (p. 200) for which Conant must take responsibility. Broudy accuses
Conant and the philanthropic foundations of using their resources in ways that have as
their goal the demise of teacher education.

Broudy asserts that many democratic ideals are learned from education
professors. He especially notes that the reinforcement of these ideals is one of the
goals of the social foundations courses—the courses that Conant classes as worthless.
Broudy feels The Education of American Teachers is simple-minded, its prescriptions
puzzling, and its recommendations represent "a new high in naivete" (p. 203).

Many other voices reacted, a number of them in a special issue of The
Journal of Teacher Education, which published a 45-page symposium on the debate.
Teacher educators also gathered at the College of Education, University of Illinois, to
study the situation. Though some of Conant's observations were considered valid, he
received wide-spread and well-reasoned rebuttals. If Conant had hoped to stimulate
discussion, his wishes may have been granted far beyond his expectations. In his
preface to Borrowman (1965), Lawrence A. Cremin mentions Conant's volume and
reflects, "It was merely the latest skirmish in a war that has gone on for generations"
(p. vii). Indeed, the continued opposition to Conant’s and Koerner’s views attested to
the depth and duration of the reaction against them.

Conant's *The Education of American Teachers* had been published in 1963.
It may be worth noting that *The Miseducation of American Teachers* by James D.
Koerner was also published in 1963. Like Conant, Koerner criticized many aspects
of teacher education. He was unhappy with foundations courses, foundations
textbooks, and foundations teachers. However, though he was provocative, Koerner
did not receive the tremendous response that Conant did, and Arnstine (1972)
provides a possible explanation. Writing almost 10 years later, Arnstine declared that
Koerner was "representative" of a class of critics who were "immoderate,
uninformed, and often petulant." (p. 7). To Arnstine, however, Conant’s work was
in a different genre: "Conclusions about teacher education were based upon extended
inquiry and consultation with professionals in the field" (p. 9).

American Educational Studies Association (AESA)

As noted above, educational foundations scholars had not ignored the
assaults on their stronghold. One of them, John A. Laska (1968), had written a letter
dated February 5, 1968, which opened by stating, "As a possible basis for our
discussions in Chicago, it has seemed useful to prepare a short statement reflecting
the views of a number of colleagues and myself . . . A copy of this statement is enclosed." Laska had circulated this letter along with this statement—what has come to be known as "AESA's Founding Document." Later in February, a group of foundations scholars met in Chicago and formed the American Educational Studies Association.

In 1970 the AESA began publishing *Educational Studies*, composed of some articles, but conceived as a "journal of book reviews" which had the potential of providing "a basic reference source for the entire foundations of education field" (Lantz, Laska, Rich, & Hackett, 1970). In 1986 AESA began publishing *Educational Foundations* which focused on articles written by recognized foundations scholars. It could be argued that, out of perceived necessity, their original mood may have been defensive and protective. However, though their current membership is said to be under 1,000, currently the collective mindset could be described as aggressive, even militant at times. Their collective concern could be described more as one of social action and political change than conveying *traditional* foundations perspectives and information.

**Developments From the Late 1960s Through the Early 1970s**

During this time, Broudy (1968) was examining the term "foundations." He demonstrated his dissatisfaction of the term with these memorable words:

"Inevitably the word makes one think of the building trades, or those great philanthropic geese that lay the golden eggs for educational reform, or the art of corsetry" (p. 30). He argued that the imagery of "foundations" is both distracting and
productive of "unrealistic expectations" (p. 31). Broudy’s alternative is to think of foundational materials as "methods" or "rules for applying the generalizations of educational science" (p. 31). He would prefer that an educator think of foundational materials as "professional interpretive knowledge" regarding "the total field of which his specialty is a part." He concludes that "it is precisely this type of interpretive professional knowledge that the foundational studies, especially the humanistic ones, supply to the professional worker in education" (p. 35, emphasis his).

Shields (1968) addressed the problem of the relevance of foundations studies. He observed that the past 10 years had witnessed much discussion in regard to the part social foundations courses should play in teacher education. He argues that if foundations courses are to really be foundational in teacher education, they must become more relevant, analytical, and integrative. Furthermore, he felt that if educational foundations studies wanted to establish "a strong scholarly base" (p. 84), they should plan on recruiting "most of their staff from graduate departments devoted to the humanities and the social sciences" (p. 84).

Howell and Shimahara (1969) defended foundational studies as vital to the preservice teacher. They asserted that such courses are necessary for teachers to gain a perspective that will enable them to deal with the challenging, emerging social problems. These perspectives will exceed a mere "vocational view" and help to produce a "professional view" (p. 211). This professional view will nurture educational "statesmanship" because teachers will develop "an orientation encompassing the totality of education and grasping its overall structures, processes,
and functions, and furthermore, a posture of attitudes and action to force recognition of the social problems with which education must cope" (p. 213). Teachers may need to be craftsmen, but social challenges require them to be statesmen, as well, having "a comprehensive awareness of the educative process and social realities affecting education" (p. 214). Writing 6 years after Conant’s book, Howell and Shimahara remember Conant’s reference to “worthless, eclectic courses.” They respond, "The view that foundational studies are eclectic is myopic and unreflective" (p. 215).

There are two reasons why this is true: first, foundations courses have their own content and second, their autonomy is focal; that is, education is dependent on data it obtains from other sources.

Laska (1969), the catalyst of the AESA, also wrote in the shadow cast by Conant’s book. He observed that foundations scholars have “obviously been unwilling to follow Conant’s dictum . . . [to] relinquish their role in teacher preparation to representatives of the traditional disciplines” (p. 179). The response, he stated, had been to objectively look at their field, evaluate its weaknesses, and make any needed changes. Laska discusses foundations studies using the terms "academic" and "professional." An academic field is one in which knowledge is pursued without the primary concern being application. A professional field, on the other hand, is one in which knowledge is given a definite application. Laska notes that physics, economics, and sociology are academic fields; engineering, business administration, and social work are professional fields which have their roots in the respective academic fields. The same could be stated about the relationship between
political science and government service, as well as religion and the ministry. Thus, he implied that society should recognize the place and importance of both fields. Laska concludes by suggesting that educational "studies," as opposed to educational "foundations," would be the appropriate name for the academic study of education.

Perdew (1969) attempted to avoid the perennial quarrel over educational foundations courses by examining what, really, were the foundational questions to be asked. After suggesting 5 criteria for selecting the really important educational questions, he proposed 12 that he felt were basic:

1. How important is education?
2. How educable is man?
3. What differences are there between groups of people and among individuals?
4. Is growth continuous or sporadic?
5. What is the description of the educated man?
6. Who should go to school?
7. What should be studied?
8. Who should educate?
9. Who should make educational decisions?
10. What is the human potential for progress?
11. Does education have its own ends, or are the ends of education subservient to other ends?
12. Is education a discipline?

In 1968, Shields had addressed the problem of relevance in foundations
A year later (1969), he penned "Foundations of Education: Relevance Redefined." He observed that the focus in education is upon the average pupil in an average school. However, given the social challenges of the 1960s, he asserted that it is vital that teachers learn to recognize and analyze the differences between educational ideals and the reality of educational practices. The various disciplines which are represented in foundations courses can serve such a need. After discussing a number of books that sensitize society to urban problems and the quantitative research methodologies that are used in educational research, he states, "Those who try to be completely scientific in matters relating to education commit the worst kinds of crime against science. . . . Science is reduced to assigning numbers to the unquantifiable" (p. 193). Shields adds, "Finally, the question for educational studies is . . . in finding the proper balance between the scientific and the 'non-scientific' in dealing with educational issues" (p. 193). He concludes his article with these words: "There has been enough experience with reform and reform-failure to give credibility to the belief of the young revolutionaries that this kind of sensibility on a wide scale is the sine qua non [that, without which there is nothing] for a significant qualitative as well as quantitative change in American education" (p. 198).

In the same issue of *Teachers College Record*, Urban (1969) responded to both Conant's 1963 book and Shields's 1968 article. After quoting Shields's opinion that foundations studies instructors should come largely from graduate departments in the humanities and the social sciences, Urban made this pronouncement:

The Shields argument is really a milder form of the argument developed by Conant. . . . The Shields argument differs from the Conant argument in that
foundations courses and programs will not be abolished, but will be turned over to those in the "disciplines" and made scholarly. (pp. 201, 202)

Urban reasoned, "In other words, how can a social foundations man exist? Shields lets him exist if he is not actually this, but really a respectable disciplined scholar" (p. 201). Urban continued,

The reliance on the methods and orientation of the traditional social science disciplines as the destroyer (Conant) or rebuilder (Shields) of social foundations seems to rest on the assumption that the scholars in these disciplines know what it is they are about. (p. 201)

At this point, Urban examined a recent issue of the American Sociological Review, then suggested that there is a group of sociologists outside the mainstream of sociology "who are giving their colleagues a long, hard, critical look" (p. 202). He referred to these individuals as part of a "New Sociology" who have an orientation much different from that in the mainstream of sociology. Urban then provided an additional example found in political science. He then suggested that both Conant and Shields had been naive in looking to the traditional disciplines and stressed that there is a need for generalists in these areas.

One of the first voices of the 1970s to address, in a negative way, educational foundations studies was that of Charles E. Silberman. Among other things, his Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education (1970) has been remembered for its concept of "mindlessness" (p. 36). His concern was the mass media. However, he had other concerns such as education and wrote in a non-complementary way about teacher education. In a section of the book which deals with foundations studies, he buttresses his remarks with frequent references to
Conant's work of 1963, and to a lesser degree Koerner's work of the same year.

Although Silberman quotes Conant, Silberman had a few things of his own to add.

Certification requirements have provided even more protection to the faculties of education, guaranteeing them a large and steady demand for their course offerings. The results have been stultifying; while there are notable exceptions, of course, the intellectual level of most education courses and programs borders on the scandalous. . . .

The intellectual puerility [childishness; silliness] of most foundation courses is matched by most courses in educational psychology, history, philosophy, and sociology. . . .

. . . More often than not, the professors teaching the courses contradict their own dicta—for example, delivering long, dry lectures on the importance of not lecturing. Indeed, there can be no greater demonstration of the irrelevance of most methods courses than the way the methods professors teach. (pp. 439-443)

Silberman cited an anecdote involving a young graduate of the Harvard Graduate School of Education who wrote Dean Theodore R. Sizer about difficulties she was having in her classroom and complained about the inadequacy of her teacher education program. She made it through only the first semester, then left her teaching position—to join the faculty of the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

John I. Goodlad had worked with Conant during the study on which The Education of American Teachers was based. Goodlad (1970) recalls that many teacher education students reported being disillusioned with their programs. These students had entered teacher education wanting to "get their hand dirty" and their "feet wet" in "real classrooms with real children" (p. 63). Goodlad continues,

Instead, they find themselves to be largely passive recipients of learning fare not too unlike that in psychology, philosophy, history, or whatever. Consequently, they condemn their education courses, not so much for their intellectual impoverishment as for their failure to bring them into the nitty-gritty of teaching itself. (p. 63)

Goodlad criticized courses in educational psychology as offering principles
of learning without providing opportunities to use those principles in teaching. He may have touched the heart of the matter when he observed, "Conscientious professors are troubled by a schizophrenic situation in which they see little possibility for research productivity if they give to future teachers the attention professional development deserves" (p. 65).

This dilemma has been voiced by others in regard to the educational foundations studies. On the one hand, there is the lure of scholarly work that will bring the applause of the arts and sciences. On the other hand, there is the plea of field-oriented colleagues in teacher education for the translation of theoretical principles into practical applications.

In the second issue of *Educational Studies*, published by the AESA, Brameld (1970) calls for foundations of education to become multidisciplinary. This will provide for "cross-fertilization of ideas and experiences" (p. 55). A particular object of his dissatisfaction is noted thus:

Probably the most disturbing example of specialization and subdivision within the foundations area is, however, educational psychology. Indeed, with one partial exception among the several universities where I have taught, this field has occupied its own domain as separated and even as quite isolated from other foundations. . . . This situation appears . . . extremely unfortunate. . . . Even more serious is the endemic habit among numerous educational psychologists to circumvent if not simply ignore the philosophical or, in Freud's favorite term, the metapsychological aspects of both intelective [sic] and affectsive experience. (p. 55)

Reasonable expectation and stark reality are contrasted by Lipkin (1970). Referring to "the profound social changes of the post-World War II era" (p. 486), Lipkin observed,
One might logically assume that foundations studies, whose primary focus is the relationship between education and society, would be catapulted [sic] into a position of prominence as a result of these events. Instead, however, the field seems to be undergoing a crisis of identity, as evidenced by the lack of agreement on a name; a common frame of reference; or for that matter, its very reason for being. (p. 486)

Lipkin argued,

Having established the entire universe as legitimate territory for the foundations, it should be apparent that our study cannot be restricted to a single discipline. Instead, the findings and methods of history, philosophy, and the social sciences would be utilized insofar as they are relevant to the school-society relationship. (p. 487)

Lipkin pointed to what he feels is the source of the problem:

Perhaps the foremost obstacle to the establishment of integrated foundations studies lies in the widespread and deep-seated resistance to a multidisciplinary approach. It is argued that such an approach inevitably leads to a decline in academic rigor or, in a similar vein, that it is impossible to obtain adequately qualified personnel to carry out the required instruction and research. (p. 487)

Lipkin did express hope that the traditional gulf between scholarly thinking and practical doing is narrowing. He urges that "the understanding of the relationship between the school and society, which is unique to foundations studies, is a sine qua non for the resolution of the most fundamental and complex issues confronting education today" (p. 488).

Following on the heels of Lipkin's article, and in the same issue of the same journal, is a piece by Wagener (1970). Under "Trends in Foundations Offerings," he summarizes four possibilities that have emerged in designing and teaching foundations studies: (1) having liberal arts instructors teach them; (2) having joint appointments of faculty both to schools of education and to other schools; (3) specializing foundations departments, that is, having them deal with issues such as
urban, racial, and comparative issues; and (4) making foundations studies the academic study of education, separate from actual teacher training. Wagener, however, offers an alternate possibility:

The thesis of this paper is that foundation courses should deal with the phenomenon of knowledge, which here means the configuration of noetic [based on the intellect] claims made at any given time. . . . The shape of knowledge refers rather to meta-knowledge or knowledge about knowledge. (p. 491)

Attempting to preview the shape of the future, Wagener argues that "a fitting task for foundations courses" (p. 492) is to achieve a "conceptual reorientation in how the new knowledge shapes the knower and his intellectual universe" (p. 492). He feels that "the knowledge of knowledge approach is the direct opposite of theoretical imperialism, which tries to draw implications for educating from experimentalism, realism, behaviorism, or some other system" (p. 492). It is Wagener's view that "knowledge is now becoming the shaping agent of society" (p. 493).

Amstine (1972) argues the need for foundations studies in these words: "They [teachers] need more than a simple, practical training. They need breadth and perspective on what they're doing. They need theory to enable them to vary their practice intelligently" (p. 1). Amstine notes that there are many different studies that are considered foundational, but he prefers to call history and philosophy of education and the social foundations of education the "humanistic" foundations of education. The rationale for this is because the humanistic foundations of education "do not depend primarily on the gathering of empirical data" (p. 1).

Nine years after Conant's and Koerner's controversial books were written,
Arnstine (1972) refers to their arguments, that it was not vital for preservice teacher to study the history and philosophy of education. Arnstine states that his paper was designed to answer that claim. Arnstine also forwarded three hypotheses for why the humanistic foundations receive such little attention:

1. "Teacher educators themselves are inadequately prepared to train teachers."
2. "The general antipathy that nearly everyone has for theory."
3. "Teaching is an occupation to which nearly all laymen have been exposed for a great many years." (pp. 4, 5)

The theory found in the humanistic foundations, according to Arnstine, releases teachers from "habit, prejudice, and tradition and creates the possibility of establishing new procedures to meet new situations" (p. 16). He asserts that for teachers to be able to solve problems in the classroom, they need both theory (knowledge) and technology (application). Arnstine notes that theory provides for interpretation, enlightenment, and judgment. He would like to see teachers able to function as educational statesmen, not only as specialized experts. This is especially true as teachers join administrators in decision making.

Conclusion

This completes the historical overview of educational foundations studies. Later, however, some of the themes first introduced in this chapter are discussed further.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Who, or what, has shaped preservice teachers' thinking? How have foundations studies influenced their perspectives? A number of studies have been conducted which explore these, and related, questions from various angles and using different methodologies. One of these studies is reviewed in the next part of this chapter because its methodology, as well as its content, furnishes an important and useful precedent and perspective for this study. Following that review, the procedure used in this study will be presented.

A Relevant Study and Its Methodology

Few, if any, studies have been conducted to explore the relationship between the origin and content of preservice teachers' pre-college worldviews and the interaction of those ideas with foundational studies. An exception to this sparsity is a study reported by Spatig and Bickel (1993). They used ethnographic research methods to study a freshman-level foundations class of 28 students which was taught by "Bill Kelly" at a medium-sized state university in West Virginia. The researcher chose to act as a participant-observer in the class and also to conduct semi-structured,
tape-recorded interviews with the instructor and his students. These interviews were transcribed and analyzed using Spradley's (1979) guidelines. The students also responded to written questionnaires which inquired about their family and educational background, as well as their perceptions regarding teaching.

In summary, the study found that the course heightened students' awareness to other perspectives than their own on various issues, issues which the students had not before considered or else had taken for granted. The students described themselves at the end of the semester as more inclined to think critically about educational thought and practice. . . . They may respond to the remainder of their teacher education coursework and to the conditions of their future teaching positions in a similar fashion—raising questions. (p. 62)

However, the possible benefits of the class were moderated by the use of a "language" that students did not understand well and the fact that they were often passive during the class discussions. It should be noted that "on those occasions when Bill invited students to speak about their own personal schooling experiences, students responded more actively" (p. 61).

Spatig and Bickel suggest that one of the "Implications for Practice" is the importance of making the course content "accessible" to students who otherwise "may find the ideas, as well as the language in which ideas are presented, foreign. Failing to do so may result in students feeling confused and intimidated" (p. 63). The authors also note the importance of students questioning their own experience in light of the foundations materials and then making connections between the two. This would give preservice teachers the "experience of being knowledge creators, rather than simply being the consumers of knowledge provided by authorities" (p. 63).
Rationale Behind and Procedure Used in the Study

Introduction

At this point I wish to review my guiding questions:

1. Who, or what, has shaped the ideas of preservice teachers regarding education?

2. How do these ideas interact with foundations studies?

During the proposal stage of this project, I had decided that those two questions would guide my research. I had further determined that I would seek their answers within a qualitative research framework, using the procedures of and the results from an interview-based, case study methodology. The rationale of the several facets of the procedure followed are presented in the discussion below.

The Rationale for Using Qualitative Inquiry and the Case Study Methodology

Yin (1989) frames a succinct statement regarding the applications of qualitative methodologies: "The essence of qualitative research consists of two conditions: (a) the use of close-up, detailed observation of the natural world by the investigator, and (b) the attempt to avoid prior commitment to any theoretical model" (p. 25). Though there are a number of different types of qualitative inquiry, this study uses the qualitative methodology which is known as a "case study," because, as Yin (1989) explains, "Case studies are the preferred strategy . . . when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context (p. 13)."
Yin points out that "systematic interviewing" (p. 19) is one of the characteristics typically found in case study methodology, and certainly using interviews would be effective in asking "how," "why," and "what" questions. Yin asserts that although "how" and "why" questions are well-served by case study methodology, "what" inquiries also fit well into that methodology (p. 17).

Though there were nine interviewees, they are treated as a single case. Yin (1989) would term this type of methodology an "embedded" (p. 46) single-case design. Yin reminds his readers that "a single-case study is analogous to a single experiment" (p. 47). He states that, in a single case, "more than one unit of analysis" may be involved (p. 49, emphasis his).

The Rationale for Using Interviews to Gather Research Data

I felt that the interview was the logical approach for my research purposes: I wanted to visit several times with a few preservice teachers, as opposed to an extended series of interviews with one or mailing a questionnaire to many of them. My plan was to interview six preservice teachers and that choice was strictly a matter of personal preference—I wanted some breadth and some depth, as opposed to having an emphasis on one or the other. The interview procedure of gathering data would also permit me to use follow-up questions and to focus my questions more sharply as the data gathering proceeded, if that appeared to be necessary. I did not choose, however, to employ techniques such as participant observation and documentary study which are often used in connection with interviews.
Spradley (1979), speaking of ethnography in general, but of interviewing in particular, declares that asking questions and interviewing informants is for the purpose of "learning from people," as opposed to "studying people." Then he adds, "The researcher must become a student" in order to discover "the insider's view" of his or her world (pp. 3, 4, emphasis his).

Since the study was focused toward understanding preservice teachers' perceptions and attitudes toward foundations studies, I chose to use a "purposive sample"—my interviewees would be those who were in the student teaching stage of their programs and thus had likely completed their foundations courses. I wanted to know how they felt about their teacher education programs and how they viewed their foundations studies. In fact, mid-way through the interviewing process, I began to state the following to the interviewees: "I am your student; you are my teacher. I consider you the world's leading authority on what you think!" Taking the sincere role of a learner and letting preservice teachers instruct me by answering the questions I would ask, appeared to simply be the best way of searching for answers to my guiding questions.

The Rationale for Using Two Universities and Nine Interviewees

As a matter of convenience, I sought interviewees from two institutions of higher learning close to my home base in the Midwest. One of the universities was a small, private, religiously affiliated university and the other one was a mid-sized, regional, public university. Though there was no attempt to select universities that
would be a random sample of the universe of universities, I was pleased that the two
universities were diverse because I was interested to observe if any distinctive patterns
of responses would emerge, though that was not a concern of my study. Wolcott
(1992) asserts, "I have never studied more than one of anything," but allows for "the
importance of multiple observations that enable us to identify patterns" (p. 6,
emphasis his). Yin (1989) matter-of-factly states that "case studies, like experiments,
are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes. In
this sense, the case study, like the experiment, does not represent a 'sample'" (p. 21).
"The investigator's role," Yin continues, "is to expand and generalize theories
(analytic generalization) and not enumerate frequencies (statistical generalization)" (p.
21). Wolcott's and Yin's statements apply not only to my selection of two
universities, but also to my use of nine interviewees.

Though I had selected the universities from which my interviewees would
come, I did not select the interviewees themselves. I wanted to do a series of three
interviews with six preservice teachers. My committee chairperson introduced me to
personnel in each of the universities who were themselves either intimately acquainted
with their preservice teachers or who could introduce me to someone who was.

I requested each of these individuals to identify four preservice teachers
whom they considered representative of those who completed their teacher education
program. The final selections of my interviewees were made by a program instructor
and a field experiences coordinator, respectively. I note here that I make no sort of
claim that the preservice teachers I interviewed were, in fact, representative, though a
layperson would probably think of them as "fairly typical" or "average". Though the interviewees were a personal representation of the ideas I wanted to explore, I leave a pronouncement of their "degree of representativeness" to the reader and his or her assessment of the biographical data which is given for each interviewee.

I estimated that it was reasonable to expect that out of four contacts, a series of interviews would actually materialize with three of them. One institution provided exactly four names, the other provided eight. As it turned out, all four contacts from the one institution and five of the eight contacts from the other institution agreed to cooperate. I began with nine, and was able to have their cooperation through the entire sequence. Again, I chose to have several interviews with a few preservice teachers rather than many interviews with just one.

A final note would be that I sought, and obtained, permission from the respective "human subjects" boards to conduct my research at the two institutions.

The Interview Procedure

After obtaining the names and phone numbers of the requested preservice teachers, I contacted them each by phone to briefly explain my work and to solicit his or her participation in a series of about three 1-hour interviews. Due to the timing—the end of the school year was approaching, as was graduation time—a number of the contacts respectfully declined, but I was able to secure the participation of nine of the 12 students and to set up appointments to meet each of them personally. During the first face-to-face meeting, I was able to establish rapport and to transact several preliminary items of business:
1. Have them read a letter of introduction from my committee chair
2. Have them read a copy of my "Proposal Abstract"
3. Let them examine the approval document from their university
4. Read, sign, and receive a copy of the "Informed Consent" form.

After the required formalities were completed, I spent the balance of that first hour with them in an attempt to obtain an understanding of the general contours of their family and educational backgrounds, as well as their perspectives regarding the same. Generally, I followed the "First Interview" questions noted in "The Study in a Nutshell" (see Appendix 1, Questionnaire 1), which employed semi-structured, open-ended questions. At the end of that first interview, I attempted to schedule a second one-hour interview with them for about a week later. During the second interview I was guided by the "Second Interview" questions as found in Appendix 1, Questionnaire 1. I tape-recorded both of these first interviews and transcribed them as soon afterwards as my resources of time and endurance would allow.

I did not seek to schedule the final interview with the preservice teachers at the completion of the initial interviews. By the end of the second interview, I felt that I needed opportunity to reflect on the responses I had obtained to that point and to examine them in light of my proposal and guiding questions. As a result of my literature search, I had formed some assumptions about preservice teachers: (1) that they would be very conscious that foundations courses were an integral part of their teacher education programs, (2) that they would know foundations courses by that name, and (3) that they considered foundations courses, if not indispensable, at least
useful, for helping them to understand educational issues.

As the interviews progressed, I could see that these assumptions were false. Therefore, I was finding it impossible to find satisfactory answers for my guiding questions. It became evident that I needed to use questions in my final session with the interviewees that were far less general and far more structured. Thus it was that I came to develop the questions that appear on the "Where I Would First Look for Information," "Phynul Kwestyons," and "Shapers of Educational Thought and Practice" forms (see Appendix I, Questionnaires 2, 3, & 4).

The final set of interviews with the preservice teachers was not tape-recorded. Rather, I gave them a copy of the appropriate form to follow while we went through the questions together and I recorded their answers in my own handwriting on an identical form. The information obtained from the interviews have become the basis for chapters 4, 5, and 6. The responses are discussed a final time during my final chapter.

Spradley (1979) has made a useful contribution to qualitative research with his work of systematizing ethnography and participant observation procedures. He suggests a number of guidelines on planning, conducting, and analyzing interviews, including the importance and necessity of discovering "domains" and "themes." In my study, however, I arbitrarily selected, then introduced, the domains and the themes that I felt were important to explore with the interviewees. However, I let them give their own meaning to the domains and themes I introduced, and of course, the interviewees had some "sub-domains" and "sub-themes" of their own and these...
surfaced, anyway. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 of this project are organized around the responses which the interviewees provided during my several interviews with them.

Transition to the Study

And now, as the curtain begins to rise and the drama prepares to unfold, may I announce our cast . . .

Amos, Dee, Gerry, John, Leah, Lena, Rhea, Sam, Tony

. . . and permit each to tell you his or her own story.
CHAPTER IV

PERSPECTIVES ON ORIGINS

Introduction

In this chapter I present a report which is based on the transcriptions from my first interview with each of the nine preservice teachers. First, I give a brief biographical sketch of each of the preservice teachers. These accounts are arranged alphabetically according to their pseudonyms: Amos, Dee, Gerry, John, Leah, Lena, Rhea, Sam, and Tony. The rationale for including these sketches is to assist the reader in determining the representativeness of each preservice teacher.

Next I present a discussion of their early educational experiences, especially as these experiences relate to the development of the interviewees’ interest in teaching. Finally, I offer some reflections regarding the nine lives presented.

Biographical Sketches

Amos

Amos is a clean cut, athletic-looking, handsome young man in his middle 20s, courteous, quiet, and serious. He is the youngest child in a family with six children—five boys and a girl. Amos’s next older sibling is 8 years older than Amos is, with the oldest sibling being about 40 years of age. Amos’s father was a factory
worker at a large automobile manufacturing plant, earning a good living for his family, while Amos's mother was a homemaker. His parents had a strong sense of responsibility and made sure the family's needs were taken care of.

Until age 12 he grew up in the inner part of a large eastern city. While Amos's family lived there, his chief play activity involved getting together to play games on a vacant lot with the other kids on his block. However, when busing became a strong possibility, Amos's parents decided to move to the country so he would not have to ride a bus for an hour twice each day.

Neither of Amos's parents graduated from high school, his family had few intellectual pursuits, and their interest in the outside world was marginal. Amos is the only one to graduate from college. Amos is married and his parents-in-law are well educated, which causes real anxiety for Amos whenever his own parents and his wife's parents are together. His father-in-law is well-informed, enjoys intellectual discussions, and is not only fairly outspoken on various issues, but sometimes a little tactless, as well. Amos feels that his job is to be a peacemaker, and he feels the need to guide the conversation of the two families.

It seems that Amos has always been heavily involved in sports. In high school he was an important team member, and often went to summer sports camps. Amos remembers that his family seldom ate their evening meal together, since there was much going and coming as the result of the hurry of after-school activities. His Dad took an early retirement so he could attend the sports functions that Amos was involved in. Amos had an ambition to play college basketball and had scholarships
offered to him at several smaller colleges, and was also accepted as a member of the practice team at a large university. However, Amos did not make it through the final cut, perhaps because he was only six feet tall and needed just a little more quickness. In addition, he had a neck injury which sealed his fate on the basketball court. He took up golf, instead, and played that at college for a year.

Though his parents were moral people, they chose not to be involved in church attendance and used Sunday as a day to just relax. However, after the family moved to the country, they regularly began attending a church. Amos is married now and has accepted his wife's beliefs—a respected religion, though it is not part of mainstream Christianity. Amos's own ideas about life have been shaped not only by his family, but by his church, as well. This has not been a problem for Amos's parents.

Dee

Dee is an enthusiastic, fun-loving Canadian in her mid-20s. She has a rich cultural heritage: her Estonian mother, uncle, and grandfather escaped from Estonia to Germany, then later came to Canada; her father was born in Canada of parents who had both been born in Germany. Dee says she is "very German." Both the German and Estonian languages were in evidence at home because her parents read and wrote their respective languages.

Dee was born in Saskatchewan and spent many of her growing-up years in various communities where she had lots of cousins. Dee is the oldest child and has one sister and one brother. When Dee was very young, her parents adopted a Cree
Indian boy, and then later a Cree Indian girl.

Dee had taken swimming lessons, earned her instructor's certificate, and taught swimming lessons for several years. Her whole family spent many summers at summer camps, her mom being the camp nurse, her dad teaching classes, and Dee working as a counselor, swimming teacher, and waterfront director.

Besides swimming, she learned to enjoy reading. Her family was a close one and enjoyed reading books together in the evenings. Her parents would give their children a certain amount of money for reading books. When Dee was her father's student, he promoted reading by having reading contests. The family's television-watching policy may have also encouraged reading—Dee had to give her parents a weekly plan for watching TV. In this plan, she had to list which days and which programs she was going to watch—and she could not save up her time and watch double the next week.

Dee's mother is a registered nurse and her father is a teacher. In a one-room school, she took grades 1 through 4 where her own father was the teacher and Dee spent many hours with him, before, during, and after school hours. Thus, it is not surprising that she credits him with being the principal moral and spiritual influence in her life. She also gives tribute to her grandmother. Dee was one of 20 grandchildren—and was the favorite. Her grandmother was "one of those very proper people—she was always saying thank you to everybody for everything." Her grandfather was an influence on her in a different way—he did more "preaching" to her than did her dad.
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When he first started teaching, Dee's father did not have his bachelor's degree. However, he was always taking night classes somewhere and when Dee was in the seventh grade, he took a year off and finished his bachelor's degree.

Dee feels that her parents have shaped her outlook on and ideas about life more than anyone or anything else. However, her years of teaching swimming lessons have also affected her outlook. It was the experiences connected to this latter activity that forced her to define her own values and then stand for them. For example, at a pool Christmas party, she demonstrated her decision to enjoy the festivities without drinking alcoholic beverages. Other people noticed and followed her example.

Gerry

Gerry is a lively, energetic lady in her early to middle 20s. She was born and raised in a small town in a midwestern state. Her dad is involved in trucking and her mother is in real estate office work. She has a younger brother who is a college student. Gerry has had a number of work experiences including working at a large department store and doing secretarial work in her mother's office.

She has been to Disney World in Florida two or three times and declares, "I love Mickey Mouse." She enjoys reading, preferably fiction, and reading about horses and collecting model horses is a favorite pastime. Her father seldom reads, but her mother is a "big reader." Gerry thinks her parents, especially her mother, must have read to her a lot when she was young. She notes that the family has lots of books and "they're really worn out." However, reading on her own did not
become important to her until the seventh grade. She had some extra time that year and started reading horse stories in her spare time. After she got into the reading habit, she read just about every book in her room.

Gerry tells that one of her favorite books was about a rabbit who worked in a botanical garden and found great enjoyment in taking care of the flowers. One day it was noticed that something or someone was eating the flowers at night. Determined to catch the culprit, the rabbit set up a camera that would take a picture when a string was pulled. Imagine the rabbit’s chagrin when he himself appeared in the photograph when it was developed. It seems that he had been sleep walking and eating the flowers while doing so.

Gerry tells who has shaped her ideas about life: "That’s easy—Mom and Dad!" She feels that she is a lot like both of them.

John

John is an athletic, nice-looking, tall young man in his early to middle 20s. He has a well-developed sense of humor, appears to have great self-confidence, and is a thoughtful, reflective individual. He was born, raised, and still lives on a farm near a large town in the midwest. He has an older sister who is also a college student. His father is a retired police officer, and his mother is a pharmacist. John says he looks exactly like his father and concludes that this makes him feel good because he knows "I'll be good looking for the rest of my life." John also says his father is a very intelligent man.

John was active in basketball and football in high school, and as a
freshman he led his basketball team in scoring, rebounding, and assists. He became the student commissioner of intermural sports at his university.

John remembers that his fourth-grade teacher encouraged him to read and at one time he was reading a book every night. Also, his parents had a rule that he could not watch television at all during the week. When they got home from school, John and his sister would not turn on the television but would read instead. His parents also took them to the library a lot. He was also involved in Boy Scouts and 4-H during his growing-up years.

John recalls that his father did not bring his work home with him, but it was common for the family to talk about things that were in the news. Even as a boy, John says he enjoyed thinking. He remembers taking vacations with his grandparents. While his grandpa, grandma, and sister rode in the cab of the truck, John liked to sit in the camper by himself and think about things. He would "fiddle with things in the back" or he might "just look out the window and think."

John feels grateful for the farm work he had to do. He feels strongly that kids need work to do instead of just watching TV or playing video games. He calls this situation ridiculous. He also feels strongly about inner-city schools that are passing students on to the next higher grade level—when they simply are not doing passing work. When these poor students not only hold themselves back, but distract their classmates as well, John feels this is a depressing situation.

John's parents encouraged him in educational matters, but did not pressure him to make top grades. John never tried to be the most intelligent guy in class—he
was average and that was all right with them. If he brought home a grade below a C, his parents would raise an eyebrow—they were not \textit{that} lenient with him.

John knows that his parents have molded the way he looks at life. His family was never religious and never went to church—his parents felt there was too much politics involved. John states that his sense of right and wrong and learning to be streetwise may have come from common sense more than anything else.

\textbf{Leah}

Leah is a bright, spunky lady who grew up in Ontario, Canada, as the oldest child in her family. As a girl, Leah enjoyed athletics and practically lived on the softball diamond. Both of her parents had been born in England. Her father was a railroad man who never went beyond the eighth grade in school. However, Leah declares that she never had a math problem in high school which her father could not solve. He was also a perfectionist—in her seventh grade she brought home a math test on which she had made 98\% and her father immediately wanted to know how she had lost those two percentage points. Her mother went to the 10th grade and was a full-time homemaker. Leah remembers that her parents were not ones to show affection; at meal time there was little conversation.

Canada had 13 years of school, the last year of which Leah felt would be roughly equivalent to the first year of college in the United States. After high school, Leah went to college for 1 year and got a license to teach. She taught for a total of 3 years, during which time she got married and had her first child. At the end of that 3-year period, however, she decided to become a full-time homemaker.
After she became a single parent at about the age of 40, she worked for 5 or 6 years as an accountant. However, she decided to quit that line of work—she had come to dislike it very much—and to go back to college.

Although Leah believes that probably her parents shaped her ideas about life more than anyone else, she feels that her aunt was the major shaper of her moral and ethical values, even though her parents exerted an influence, also. However, Leah states, "I would not have ever wanted to disappoint my aunt." This aunt was an individual from whom Leah felt unconditional love.

Lena

Lena is a vibrant, expressive lady in her early to middle 20s. She has lived practically all of her life in a midwestern state. Since she was about 7 years old, the same house has been home. Except for two school years (she went to another school for one year and also skipped the seventh grade), she went to the same two-room elementary school every year. Reading was an important facet of the family’s life; she remembers with fondness *Swift Arrow* ("I love that book!") and *The Little House on the Prairie* series. She feels that the extra time parents spend with their children really makes a difference.

She was the youngest of five children, three boys and two girls. During many of her growing-up years, Lena was the only girl in the neighborhood and claims that she was a tomboy. Her older brothers loved to tease her, but they would not let other boys do the same—they would stick up for her.

Though Lena’s father was an elementary teacher and she attended the same
school where he taught, he was never her teacher, at least in the formal sense. Her mother, besides being a homemaker, worked with children as a teacher’s aide and a bus driver. Lena had a high estimation of her parents: “I thought they knew everything.” Lena’s father had two sides—besides being a teacher, he was also very practical and was heavily involved in farm work such as putting up hay and cutting firewood. Her parents are now officially retired, but they “always have a project going on.”

Though Lena’s affections and loyalties appear to run deep, she has a bit of daring. For example, in her high-school days, she believes that some of her teachers were "duds" and she would sometimes push them to the limit. Was this out of character for her? With a twinkle, she smiles, "I have a side to me, though."

Lena’s ideas about life have been shaped by three major forces. The first was her parents, the second is her husband, and the third has been her college experience. But, she also likes to think for herself. At one point she faced a situation where the apparently best solution might mean going against some of her conservative background. Her anguish was matched by her relief as her parents demonstrated their unconditional acceptance of her yet another time.

Rhea

Rhea is a kind, thoughtful, sensitive lady in her middle 30s. She was born and raised in a large midwestern town which has become notorious for its violence, though Rhea says, "It wasn’t always that way." Of the two girls and three brothers in the family, Rhea is the second oldest. Even though they are all grown and away from
home now, she feels that her family was very close-knit and that there was continuity and stability there. They did a lot of things together (outdoor-type activities were popular) though she says, "I don't like camping." Brownies, Girl Scouts, and 4-H were a part of her childhood.

Rhea's father worked mostly in factories, while her mother did some domestic work. Both were, and continue to be, very involved in church activities. Though they did not have extensive formal education, they have encouraged Rhea in pursuing a college education. "They instilled in us that we could do anything that we wanted to do."

As Rhea was growing up, religion played a very important role in the family's life: "Church was very significant in our family." More recently, Rhea has felt a divine "call" to a pastoral ministry, in addition to her teaching ministry, and will be soon be receiving her final ordination. She attributes to her home, her parents, and her church, the values she holds in life. Though she did not always see eye to eye with her parents, she states that she was not a disrespectful child. Though her parents did not always agree with her views, they always accepted them.

Books were important to Rhea as a child and they continue to be now. There were sometimes bedtime stories, and then she would read "in between." There were regular weekly trips to the library and Rhea was in the book club which encouraged young people to see how many books they could read in a month.

Sam

Sam is a confident, personable man in his mid-20s, the oldest of four
children—three boys and one girl. Sam's early life was full of activity—4-H, Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, Indian Guides, Little League baseball, and swimming at the YMCA. Sam plays the saxophone and claims that he and the two siblings just younger than himself were in band together at one time. The youngest brother is a musician, also.

Sam's family took "inexpensive" vacations together when he was young, meaning that they lived out of a tent and had a styrofoam sailboat. After several years, they "moved up" and stayed in motels. A later stage of outdoor recreation ("the" vacation) came as the family chartered a 32-foot sailing yacht. But, in what turned out to be their final major vacation together, the family decided to resort to the camping scene when they took a backpacking trip to Colorado.

The family's allowance policy made an impact on Sam. Each child received 5¢ per week for each year of their age. This was "their" money and they could spend it for whatever they wanted to. Sam watched his playmates spend money for candy and discovered that if he saved his money he could buy something that would last, like a small car. He adds, "I could eat cookies at home." Sam feels that the reasons the other children would not save the money they had was at least partially because it was not "their" money—it belonged to the parents and the children had merely obtained it by begging for it.

His parents are both experienced teachers, one in elementary school, the other in college. Books were important to the family. Sam remembers being read to—Dr. Suess and a story about a horse named Blaze. The family took trips to the
public library and returned with "tons" of books. When Sam was in the second or third grade, he would look not only in the section of the library designed for his age group, he would also go over to the middle-school section and pore over the science books. Some of these books were taken home, for their pictures alone. Though Sam has pursued some philosophical-type books, this was not until fairly recently. His favorite books are those on such subjects as computers, ham radio, or photography—his main hobby.

The two siblings just younger than Sam are pursuing graduate work to prepare them for professional careers. Sam's youngest sibling (he is 12 years younger and the "caboose" of the family) is "talking" college, although he is still in high school. Education was unquestionably important in Sam's family. However, his parents (one has a doctorate) have never pushed him to either get top grades or to pursue a profession.

Sam's view of life in general and education in particular have been molded by his parents. He still seeks their counsel and appreciates their insights. Sam's parents, however, not only let him make his own decisions, they never want to pressure him to make decisions in a certain way.

**Tony**

Tony is a gentle, friendly, caring young man in his middle 20s. He was born and grew up in Bermuda. His father was not a part of Tony's growing-up years and his only siblings are two half-sisters (from his father's side) whom he seldom sees. Tony's mother worked in a private home as a housekeeper and also did
seamstress work on the side. He states that he was basically raised by his grandmother, and she may have been the major shaper of his perceptions of life. She was a strong woman (she had 10 children), but gave Tony love, acceptance, and guidance. He states that he presently lives with his mother and grandmother and that "it's been that way for many years." He had an aunt who was an influence in his life, encouraging him to take an interest in following Bible principles. Tony considers that his immediate family is not very academically oriented, though he did receive encouragement to go to college.

Tony was in Boy Scouts for a short period of time. Later he may have joined a similar youth group at his church, but he always had to work when the group was having its meetings. He recalls that his "godpa" (godfather), a close friend of his grandmother, was a leader in the Boy Scouts and helped get Tony involved in the program. However, Tony states that his godpa was never really a male mentor or model for him.

Tony related a development after his high school years which has strongly influenced his life. He was employed by a large tourist hotel where he worked as a pool attendant for about 3 years. For a year he decided to work at another hotel as a painter, but after about a year, he decided to return to the first hotel. After being the pool attendant for about 6 months to a year, an unusual opportunity presented itself.

The hotel where he worked needed a child's counselor, a service which was offered to the guests. While the parents would golf or fish, the child counselor would take charge of the children and entertain them. Tony had always had an
interest in children, and asked to be considered for the opening. Tony wondered if people would trust him with their children, especially little girls. However, he stated simply, "They knew I was a Christian, and what kind of a person I was. Plus, I was dependable—I had never been one to call in sick when I wasn’t. They knew they could trust me." Tony got the job, and even though he eventually came to an American university to pursue a degree, he still works as a child counselor at that hotel every summer. This summer will be his seventh summer!

Development of Interest in Teaching

Introduction

Lortie (1975) in his landmark work, *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*, suggests two major categories of reasons why individuals decide to become teachers. The possible relationship of these reasons with each of the preservice teachers is briefly explored.

Under the category of "Early and Affective Decisions" (pp. 42-46), Lortie notes the first three reasons:

1. Identification With Teachers and the Marginality Hypothesis. A person may choose to become a teacher because he or she identifies strongly with a particular teacher for a number of reasons, including the perception that a teacher represents something admirable or desirable which the child has not found in his or her own family. All of the interviewees except Leah and Sam stated that they identified with one of their K-12 teachers. Leah once stated, however, that she knew how not to teach because of her early schooling experience. And, Sam did identify with two teachers—his parents. Of the nine interviewees, Tony may be the best example of the marginality hypothesis. As with Leah, Tony knew the role he wanted to play in his classroom, because of his not having a male role model in his early life and because he came to realize that he could provide that to his students.
2. Continuity Within the Family. A person may choose to become a teacher because one or more relatives have been a teacher and the child views the role in a positive light. Dee, Lena, and Sam had parents who were teachers.

3. Labeling by Significant Others. A person may choose to become a teacher because some adult whom they trust or admire has communicated to the child, either implicitly or explicitly, that he or she would make a good teacher. John said that his grandmother believed that he would be either a minister or a teacher. None of the other interviewees noted explicit encouragement by someone significant, except Sam. When he mentioned to his father that he was considering doing some substitute teaching, his father encouraged him to try it. Later his father encouraged him to consider getting certification.

In the category, "Entry Under Constraint" (pp. 46-51), Lortie lists four additional reasons why individuals enter teaching:

4. Socioeconomic Constraints and Undergraduate Education. A person may choose to become a teacher because he or she had an interest in a college which emphasized teacher education, because of financial opportunities, or because some classroom field experiences were enjoyable. Dee and Tony came to college unsure of their major, but considering something other than teaching.

5. Parental Prohibitions and Dutiful Daughters. A person, especially a female, may choose to become a teacher because his or her parents in some way discourage or even forbid the first occupational preference of their child. None of the interviewees appeared to be in this subcategory.

6. Blocked Aspirations and Convertibility. A person may choose to become a teacher because he or she is for some reason not able to enter the occupation that would be his or her first choice and this individual’s formal education was reasonably easy to adjust to the requirements of teaching. Leah’s experience has some elements of this subcategory.

7. The Mixed Case of Second Careers. A person may choose to become a teacher because he or she, for some reason, has to make a career shift. Leah and Sam had begun to pursue another occupation, but decided to shift to teaching.

In the discussion which follows, under four headings, I briefly describe
some of the milestones on each of the interviewee's road to teaching.

**Early Interests and Late Bloomers**

Four of the interviewees made specific statements about the origins of their interests in teaching. Gerry stated, "Being a teacher was something I have always known I wanted to do." John remembers that his grandmother thought he would be either a minister or a teacher. Lena echoes this sentiment: "Ever since I can remember, I've always wanted to be a teacher." Rhea was strongly influenced to become a teacher by her fourth-grade teacher—she is still teaching and Rhea still sees her occasionally.

Five of the preservice teachers had their teaching interests develop somewhat later. Dee was not sure when she started college that education was what she wanted. (Interestingly, during the final academic term of her program, she was selected as "Student Teacher of the Year.") Tony came to college knowing he wanted to work with children, but thinking that study in psychology would be the best route to take.

Sam's entry into teaching was certainly not by the most direct route. He attended a large midwestern university and had thought seriously about majoring in music. However, he graduated with a major in telecommunications, which he now feels was not an education, that is, in the broadest, classical sense. He began working for a TV station and one of his duties was to prepare announcements for broadcast. Some of those tapes promoted teaching—"If you want to be a hero, teach!" His interest was aroused and he decided to try being a substitute teacher in
his spare time. Finally, he decided to begin a Master's degree, taking the education classes necessary to become a certified teacher in secondary science.

Leah’s path to teaching has been far more unusual than the rest of the interviewees, and some of her story has already been told in the biographical sketch earlier in this chapter. After completing the 13 years of her Canadian elementary and high-school work, she had taken a 1-year intensive training program. She recalls that there was a teacher shortage and smiled as she asserted, "At that time, if you had a pulse they would hire you. They crammed you full of methods classes within one year, shot you out the door, and welcomed you with open arms to be a teacher." She then taught for 3 years—during which time she got married—then became a full-time homemaker. Quite a number of years later, and after being away from teaching for many years, her marriage ended. She then worked for a number of years as an accountant, but began to realize that she enjoyed working with people more than numbers. She worked as a teacher’s aide for a time; then in her late 40s she decided to return to college and get her bachelor’s degree in education.

In a way, Amos’s feelings toward teaching show the most uncertainty. Although he has completed his teacher education program, Amos is not sure he wants to be a teacher in the usual sense—being with 30 kids for 180 days a year—though he is actively seeking a teaching position. Amos thinks he could eventually be involved in the counseling field or some educational setting where he can help people.

Family Influences

Lo-tie (1975) claims that only about 6% of the respondents in one survey
said they chose teaching because it was a tradition in their family. Though my interviewees are not a random sampling, they certainly do not mirror Lortie's findings. Only one preservice teacher cited direct family influence to take up teaching. As noted earlier, John's grandmother thought he would be either a minister or a teacher.

However, indirect influences were strongly present in the cases of three of the nine interviewees—they came from families where at least one of the parents was a teacher. Dee's case is exceptionally illustrative of this. Dee's own father was her teacher in grades 1 through 4. This was in a community where she had several uncles, her father's brothers, who both farmed and taught school. Dee's aunts and uncles on her mother's side are mostly teachers, also.

Lena's father was a teacher in the school she attended, though he never taught her. Sam's father is a college instructor and his mother is a first grade teacher. Thus, in three cases the preservice teachers had at least one parent who was a teacher. However, none of the interviewees noted any pressure from that parent to follow in his or her footsteps.

By contrast, several of the interviewees appear to have come from family settings where at least one parent of the interviewee had not finished high school. In each case, at least one of the parents worked in a factory, industrial, or domestic setting. Of the 18 parents of the nine interviewees, about half had not finished high school and about half had some college work. Lortie (1975) cites an NEA study which claims that "the social backgrounds of teachers come close to representing a
cross-section of the American public" (p. 35). However, this is a generalization which has many qualifications.

The development of Tony's interest in teaching provides some valuable insights. He did not have the presence of a father in his early life, but wants to fill such voids that may be present in the lives of the young people with whom he works. "I'm trying to meet an unmet need. I didn't have much of a childhood and I'm trying to compensate for that, I guess." He feels that there were no strong male mentors or models during his growing-up years. In fact, he cannot remember a single male role model during his childhood. He reflects. "Somewhere along the line you have to break that cycle."

Though his mother and grandmother did not have much formal education and there was no big push for him to go to college, his church and his pastor, and even some of the hotel guests, encouraged him to consider obtaining formal education in working with young people. Tony's government has helped to sponsor him financially—they saw promise in the young man and gave him a teacher's training award. He will repay them with 3 years of teaching. At first, Tony thought the best preparation would be found in studying child psychology, though when he came to college he saw that a teacher education program would be better for his goals.

K-12 Influences

Lortie (1975) says that about 6% of those who become teachers do so because of the modeling of a favorite teacher. As I stated in the Family Influences section just above, my interviewees are not a random sampling and cannot be
compared with Lortie's percentages. Nevertheless, it is interesting to notice that they certainly represent a sharp contrast to Lortie's findings. Dee, John, Lena, Rhea, and Tony specifically mentioned teachers in the elementary grades as examples with whom they yet identify to some degree as role models. Dee was taught in grades 1 through 4 in a one-room school by her own father. When she was ready for grade 5, the family moved to where there was a two-room school, and she took grades 5 and 6 from a teacher she still remembers as having a classroom and style of teaching that has become a model for her in many ways. "We were always doing fun activities and he was enthusiastic about everything all day long!" In addition, many of Dee's pre-college ideas about education, she claims, were shaped by the hands-on things she did in school and "the things I liked." Dee appreciates the role of a teacher more now than she sometimes did when she was a student. She remembers that much of the time she would have been content just to be left alone and to get her work done on her own.

John became interested in teaching through his fourth-grade teacher who pushed him to do well in school. Later teachers, especially certain males, influenced his decision to become a teacher. John feels that he will bring strong assets to whichever school he is hired to teach in. He feels that he can relate to children well, and he also knows that he has the ability to understand how to make and repair things. His preference would be to teach the elementary intermediate grades.

Lena, as noted, claims to have always had excellent teachers. But, the teacher for whom she holds the fondest memories was her first- through fourth-grade
teacher. Since her father was the principal and upper-grades teacher, Lena came to school early and stayed late. One of her delights was to help the lower-grades teacher grade papers, do bulletin boards, and decorate the room for Christmas or Easter. Her recollection is plain: "I just loved it!"

Rhea notes that there was a fourth-grade teacher that she really liked, one who was a strong influence in Rhea's decision to become a teacher. Rhea states that she still sees this teacher occasionally. With a smile, Tony recalls one of his teachers: "I think I had a crush on her."

Amos, Gerry, Lena, and Tony noted secondary teachers who were role models for them. Though the age group he prefers is the middle-school level, Amos gives credit to his high-school science teacher and his high-school coach for his interest in helping young people in an educational setting. However, Amos feels that he cannot think of his high-school science teacher as a model. This is not because that teacher was not an excellent instructor; rather, it is because what that teacher taught and the way he taught it would no longer be the best way, because of the tremendous advances in knowledge and especially technology.

Although Gerry had both very good and very bad teachers during her elementary years, she believes that it was the good teachers she had who have shaped her general ideas about education. At the beginning of her ninth grade, she took a test which showed that she would likely do well as a teacher. Later, she had a history teacher who not only made the subject interesting, but modeled good teaching for her, as well.
In keeping with Gerry's opinion about some of her former teachers, Lena said that although she had "always" had excellent teachers, some of the secondary teachers were "duds." However, Lena still occasionally talks by phone with one of her secondary teachers. Tony recalls his high school math teacher: "I felt she really cared."

Leah's school experience provided a negative benefit. She felt that her early experiences were very regimented and did not allow much individuality or opportunity to think for herself. This was difficult for an "ornery tomboy."

However, Lean knows what she does not want to do when she becomes a teacher.

Pre-college Teaching Experiences

Four interviewees noted pre-college teaching experiences. Dee taught swimming lessons at a pool for a number of years. Gerry stated that her first teaching job was teaching a youth Bible class at her church.

This was true for Tony, also. He stated that he had attended church fairly regularly as a child, and when he reached his later teens he began working as an earliteen Bible class teacher. He did not think, however, that he was equipped to properly teach. He remembers feeling that whoever taught a class like this should have several qualities: really caring about children, giving the job one's best effort, having some understanding of children, and knowing some basic teaching principles.

Tony's deep interest in helping children, especially through teaching, is more than a mere professional pursuit. Even during his teacher education program, he has continued to teach in church earliteen classes. In addition, he has been active
in the Big Brother/Big Sister program.

The most animated story in this regard is Lena's, who remembers that she could not wait to go to school. In fact she was so anxious for school, that her mother worked with her at home, and Lena not only knew her ABCs before starting school, she had learned to read, to add and subtract. Lena remembers loving to "play school." "Ever since I can remember, I've always wanted to be a teacher." She had a niece just 7 years younger than herself: "I was the teacher and she was the student." But, it was not all just "pretend" play—under Lena's tutelage, the niece learned to read and to do math when she was 4 or 5 years old. Lena also recalls that she had found a piece of chalk and used her own bedroom's closet door for a chalkboard, that is, until her mother discovered the misuse of the residence. Lena laughed, "That was the end of that!" Her interest in helping young people was fostered by her years at summer camp as a counselor.

Reflections

Though the reasons why these nine preservice teachers decided to become teachers is not a major focus of my study, I yet wish to reflect on the phenomena.

Though they are generous with their time and congenial in their spirit, there is nothing remarkable or extraordinary about the preservice teachers whom I interviewed. Lortie (1975) noted that teachers come from a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds. This was certainly true of my interviewees. In addition, they entered teaching by a number of different doors. I had noted earlier that perhaps half of the 18 parents represented by the interviewees had not even finished high school, yet their
children are becoming teachers. But how about those interviewees whose parents had more formal education? These parents did not urge their children to become teachers. It did not appear so.

Why did the nine choose teaching? The work of teaching is sometimes fiercely embattled and many in society argue that it is not even a "real" profession. I wonder if the answer may be discovered in the influence exerted by those who taught the teachers-to-be. It appears to me that when the interviewees said they liked school during a given year, what they really meant was that they had liked their teacher. Apparently, it was not the classroom itself, the peers, the activities, the textbooks, etc., that the interviewees remember with fondness, though these certainly were important factors to them.

Thus, when I related the K-12 experiences that may have influenced the interviewees to want to become teachers, I am really telling the story of K-12 teachers whose lives were a strong positive influence on the nine interviewees. It appears that the teachers of the past who taught the teachers of the future have left a present impression that cannot be erased. While it is true that, for some of the preservice teachers, the K-12 teachers may have filled a need unfulfilled by the home, most of the interviewees came from functional homes. The influence of their K-12 teachers appeared to follow the interviewees, providing a powerful, and perhaps inescapable, influence to follow in the footsteps of their former teachers.

I propose that the interviewees became willing to work for less money, while meeting the challenges and demands of classroom teaching, in order that they,  
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to students of their own, could become the kind of mentors which they themselves had had! Thus, the family of teachers continues to do more than merely survive—it reproduces itself with thriving vitality.

The unique appeal of teaching may be captured by Harry K. Wong on the dedication page of his book *The First Days of School: How to Be an Effective Teacher* (Wong & Wong, 1991):

Dedicated to my Father and Mother, who wanted me to be a brain surgeon.
I exceeded their expectations.
I became a scholar and a TEACHER.

Teachers—may they always flourish, may their tribe ever increase.
CHAPTER V

PERSPECTIVES REGARDING PROGRAM

Introduction

In this chapter I present and discuss the responses I obtained from the preservice teachers, largely during the second and third interviews. I have grouped this material into three sections and in each section the perspectives of the interviewees are compared, contrasted, and discussed.

Overview of Program Experience

Perceived Typicality of Program

I asked the preservice teachers the following question:

*Do you think that your experience in your teacher education program is typical of or different from your peers?*

Only two, Gerry and Lena, felt that their experience was typical of their peers; the rest noted some differences. Dee said her experience was fairly typical, but qualified her answer, saying, "I probably looked for different things than my peers—I looked more for concepts than facts."

Amos felt his experience was different because "I wasn’t a typical student in the last years of my program [he had transferred from another university]." He added that he had some work experiences (unrelated to education) and that he had
seen children in settings outside of the classroom.

John saw his experience as being different and explained: "I participated more and felt that I was an asset because I brought up important questions."

Leah felt that her experience had varied from her peers because the parents of the students she had worked with, although they were poor financially, were good parents. She added that her students were younger than those with whom most of her peers worked. Although Leah did not mention the fact in connection with this question, she had taken a 1-year teacher training course many years previously.

Though Lena did not mention the fact when I raised this question to her, she had taken her first 2 years at a college other than the one in which she completed her teacher education program.

Rhea had always attended public schools, but had come from a family where religion was considered very important. Thus, when some of her program instructors explicitly related program materials or concepts to spiritual values, she felt that the resulting experience was probably more meaningful to her than to her peers.

Sam reflected that his experience was different—in a sense. He stated, "I have some background and interest in the philosophy of teaching; I see teaching as an art. No one else in the teacher education program seems to think this way."

Previously, I recorded Sam's statement that he had gone to another university and taken a major in telecommunications. The courses he took to gain certification for teaching were done as a part of the coursework for a master's degree in education, though Sam is intentionally delaying the completion of his program.
Tony thought he had an experience different from most of his peers. His program had traditionally placed just one student teacher per classroom. However, for the first time his college allowed a team of two student teachers to work together. This was a bonus to him, and he felt that he was able to receive extra benefits from his student teaching.

Reflections

Seven of the nine interviewees said their program experience was in some way different from the experience of their peers. This could have affected the interviewees' attitudes toward foundations studies in more than one way. On the one hand, their feelings of diversity could have made the preservice teachers appreciate foundations materials less, because those materials might not apply to them as preservice teachers since their experiences were different from their peers. On the other hand, the interviewees could have sensed in foundations materials something of a common denominator, that is, a universally applicable method of making sense of educational issues regardless of their own personal, diverse experiences.

In my own mind, I wonder whether my inquiry was designed so that it clearly probed how the interviewees related their experience to that of their peers. The answers also, it would seem, reflect what human beings consider typical or different when they compare their lives with the lives of others—what boundaries dictate typicality or difference.
Program Instructors

I asked the preservice teachers this question:

Which of your teacher education program instructors have you identified with the most? Why?

When I asked Amos this question the first time, he mentioned "a first-year biology teacher," then added, "I know he's not even in the education department." Then I asked him, "Is there a teacher or professor in your teacher education courses who is a remarkably good educator?" Amos responded with, "I've never had one." When I responded, "Really?" he qualified his answer: "I'm not saying that they're not out there, but I haven't had one. I've heard of a lot of good education people, but I've just never experienced one." At a later interview the same question was posed and Amos then said he liked a program teacher who was "laid back" and did not pressure the preservice teachers to "correct" classroom situations "right now." He encouraged preservice teachers to inquire into the causes of things so that they could learn from the children's behavior.

Dee mentioned two instructors. The first one was appreciated because of her beliefs, philosophies, and "hands-on" emphasis. The second one was noted "because I just like him." He is "flexible, meets our needs, and does not give us a lot of busy work."

Gerry had one instructor who "made sense." She "got out into the schools and knew what was going on." Another instructor got high marks because "we saw things alike."

John recalls a particular teacher and makes this assertion about her: "She
simply understands that teaching is a gift that cannot be learned in a book."

Leah's nomination was a program instructor who made good use of class
time. In addition, what he taught was practical—"you could use it right away."

I asked Lena this question on two separate occasions, with the same results.
The first choice was an instructor from the communications department who was an
"excellent teacher" whom Lena often thought about as she "went about her business."
Lena wonders, "How would she do this?" and "How would she do that?" Lena
declares her "a great mentor" who is "excited about and loves what she does." The
second instructor was from the English department who "keeps up on research and
tries new methods." However, Lena did later cite two program instructors. She
ascribed no traits to one of them, but the other was seen as "personal, helpful,
caring."

Rhea mentioned the names of three instructors in her program and grouped
them together by saying they were "sincere, concerned, dedicated, and inspiring."
Additionally, they "do extra" and "go the extra mile." Rhea singled out one
instructor and gave an example of what she meant. This particular instructor was
teaching a methods course and there was something Rhea did not fully understand.
Here is Rhea's brief account: "She came to the school at 7:00 o'clock in the morning
to make sure I understood how to teach this lesson." Rhea added, "And it was not
just for me—she would do this for any of her students."

Sam named a high-school teacher who had "very practical advice" and then
added, "also, she had us teach in class."
Tony picked two instructors, saying he liked them for very different reasons. The first was "very professional." The second instructor was "very personal and interested." Tony asserted that both "have high expectations, yet make you feel confident." The message both convey is "You can do it!"

Reflections

Four of the preservice teachers all mentioned one particular instructor. This instructor was seen as likeable, flexible, meets the students’ needs, and does not give a lot of busy work (Dee), personal, helpful, and caring (Lena), sincere, concerned, dedicated, and goes the extra mile (Rhea), and personal, interested, has high expectations, and makes you feel confident—you can do it (Tony). Apparently, there was no single instructor trait which the preservice teachers admired. However, demonstrations of caring, interest, and enthusiasm were important to the interviewees.

When I asked which program instructors the interviewees identified with the most, I was interested in whether or not any instructors would be appreciated for a perceived ability to challenge the thinking of the interviewees. Amos had cited a program instructor who encouraged his students to inquire into the meaning of children’s behavior. Aside from that, there were no instructors cited who challenged the preservice teachers to examine, to analyze, or to critique. In her study, Weinstein (1989) concluded that teacher educators need to know what preservice teachers’ beliefs and preconceptions about teaching are and then teach them to examine those beliefs. When Leean (1979) wrote "Making the Known Unknown," she said, "We should initiate undergraduates to the educational field by turning upside down the
notion that experiential familiarity with schooling equates with knowledge about schooling" (p. 5). Whether to do this or not is a philosophical issue. Regardless, it would seem that Weinstein's and Luean's challenge went unmet in the teacher education programs represented. What foundations scholars hope to see happen in teacher education programs generally, and what actually did happen in some aspects of the two programs represented by my study—these are two different things.


Perspectives Regarding Coursework

Foundations Courses Taken

Of the following two questions, only the first was included in my original interview plan:

\textit{Which foundations courses have you taken? What is your definition of an educational foundations course?}

I wish to relate how I came to ask the second of the two questions, one which I had not planned to use or would not have thought even necessary. Having reviewed the literature, I knew what was considered the broad, central core of foundations studies: history of education, philosophy of education, psychology of education, and sociology of education. I also knew that though most programs do not offer complete courses in all of those areas, most programs do at least introduce preservice teachers to material from each. So, when I asked, "Which foundations courses have you taken?" I basically "knew" what the answers would be.

The first time I asked that question was during my second interview with Tony. He gave the following response: "Well, all of them—I'm finished, really. I've
taken all of the foundations classes." My mental response was something like, "Great! Now we can talk about them." However, Tony turned to me and asked, "When you say foundations classes, what do you mean, specifically? Are there any particular classes you're wondering about? You mean classroom management? Core courses? What do you mean? Educational Psych?"

Finally, after hundreds of journal articles, thousands of pages of reading, the development of my proposal and research procedure, I had completed the initial "get acquainted" interviews. At last, I had begun to approach the nerve center of my whole project—talking to preservice teachers about how their foundations courses had influenced their perspectives regarding education. And, at that moment Tony asked, "When you say foundations classes, what do you mean, specifically?"

To say I was surprised at his question would be to make an understatement. In fact, my initial feeling was, "You're going to graduate in a few weeks from a teacher education program, and you don't know what a foundations course is?! Everybody knows what a foundations class is!"

At that critical moment with Tony, I know that my research suddenly became more sharply defined and focused. I am grateful for the flexibility of qualitative research, a quality that permits an evolvement, development, and refinement of understanding and procedure during the research process. My entire purpose had been to probe the perspectives of preservice teachers, and I will always be grateful that at that moment I remembered that my interest was not in imposing the weight of the literature on Tony, but in discovering
how he perceived this facet of his program. It was at that moment that I took
ownership of a concept emphasized by Spradley (1979): when doing ethnography, the
interviewee is the teacher of the interviewer. Therefore, the preservice teachers were
not on trial. Assuming they were honest with me (and I believe they were), whatever
answer they gave would be the correct answer because they were telling me what they
thought and that was precisely what I was trying to discover. Consequently, an
expression was conceived, began to mature, and finally was born: "You are my
teacher. I consider you the world's leading authority on what you think. Tell me
how you see this." Thus, I was able to turn to Tony and respond, "I want to turn it
around, if you'll permit me. What is your definition of foundations classes?"

So—that is how I came to ask the second of the two questions, "What is
your definition of an educational foundations course?"

In my search of the literature, I did not find any studies where preservice
teachers were asked to describe or define "foundations" studies, courses, or materials.
Usually, the research inquires about attitudes or relationships with a particular
foundations course. I do not know how my study would have diverged from its
present path if I had told the interviewees what foundations studies were. I am glad I
didn't, as I have implied above, because I was permitted to discover attitudes and
relationships I otherwise would not have. It is interesting to compare and contrast
each of the preservice teacher's responses to both questions. Therefore, in Table 1
the personal response of each interviewee for "Definition of Foundations" is set
parallel to his or her response for "Foundations Courses Taken."
### TABLE 1

**FOUNDATIONS: DEFINITIONS AND COURSES TAKEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition of Foundations</th>
<th>Foundations Courses Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>Reinforce or build upon ideas that you already have; take you to knowledge that is a little more abstract</td>
<td>Introduction to Teaching, Curriculum &amp; Instruction, Developmental Psychology, School and Society, methods, Principles of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>Classes everybody has to take; in education, they're the first classes you take like educational psychology, but my junior and senior years are more my foundations because they're what I'm using now in the classroom: classes I go back and refer to; to me personally, they are the methods classes; classes in your major; the foundation for your career; give you an overall picture of a broad view</td>
<td>All of the methods classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>Prepare you to be a teacher; the methods; educational psychology; teach you how to do the things that you need to be a teacher</td>
<td>All of my teacher education courses, except the first one I took—kind of an introductory course where they try to weed people out if they're not going to like it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Methods classes: where you learn to teach a specific subject (you're not learning about a specific subject)</td>
<td>All the courses in the teacher education program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Classes such as educational philosophy and theory; legal aspects; provide me with a look at what I'm getting into</td>
<td>One course that went into the history of teaching and into the early philosophies about education, the philosophy class, Exploring the Personal Demands of Teaching, two reading classes, methods classes, art and music appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>Just getting or laying down a framework for teaching certain classes; different methods; giving us ideas; tell us this is how we do it; show this is what the latest trends in education are, but also knowing what they used to be</td>
<td>Methods, Intro to Teaching, Classroom Management, The First Days of School Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea</td>
<td>Teach you basically what education is about, what's expected in education: show the anatomy of teaching</td>
<td>All my methods courses, Introduction to Teaching, Principles of Teaching, The Exceptional Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>A survey course which covers the issues of education and the history and philosophy of the field</td>
<td>An introductory course which included historical, philosophical, and sociological aspects of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Give you general ideas, principles; give you building blocks that will help you in your development in teacher education</td>
<td>Methods courses, Educational Psychology, Human Development, Introduction to Teaching, Student Teaching Seminar, Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflections

Most interviewees appear to understand the generally accepted conceptual definition of foundations studies. Amos refers to "abstract," Dee to "overall picture or broad view," Gerry to psychology, Leah to philosophy and theory, Lena to a framework and to trends, Rhea to "anatomy," Sam to "survey," issues, history and philosophy, and Tony to principles.

The more curious thing is the noteworthy dissonance between the two columns. Amos and Sam demonstrated close correlations between their definitions and the foundations courses they claimed to have taken. Gerry, Leah, Lena, Rhea, and Tony showed varying degrees of correspondence. Dee and John appear to have offered the least correspondence.

Again, the preservice teachers are not on trial. Without exception, I perceive them to be bright, conscientious, hardworking students. Thus, I must conclude that other factors than intelligence were at work. Perhaps the pressure of the moment worked against them—they were asked to formulate a definition of foundations courses and the situation pressed them to do so within a few seconds. Our interview could easily have been on an "off" day when they had a lot on their minds or at a time when they were simply tired. Even though they were always helpful and courteous, they would have been less than human to sometimes not feel, "Let's just get this over with." Several of the preservice teachers carried heavy academic and/or work loads and agreed to work the interviews into their busy schedule. Usually the interviews were late in the day, and I could tell that often the
interviewees were tired. They simply could not always be at their best, even though I think they always genuinely tried to be. I remember in particular that Dee and John were very tired when we had the second interview, the one on which much of the material immediately above was based.

Whether the interviewees would have answered differently under different circumstances is an unknown. It is always possible that they simply had not been given the opportunity or shown the value of occasionally stepping back to obtain a sweeping view of their program and their profession. A valuable exercise might be an examination of the mission and goals of the two teacher education programs represented by this study. Do these programs work to provide for their students a clear, organizing framework of how the various facets of their program fit together? Should a program expect preservice teachers to understand that some things are "foundational"? These questions and others might be worth studying.

Interviewee perceptions toward foundations studies are discussed later in this chapter and also in chapter 6.

Grouping of Courses

I asked the preservice teachers to do the following:

Please group the courses in your teacher education program by how they are alike.

The interviewees, for the most part, put their teacher education program courses into two similar categories. The courses in one grouping were referred to by such terms as "book education" classes, theory or theoretical classes, "knowledge
classes," background classes, "miscellaneous" classes, foundations classes, and "understanding the concept of teaching." Dee coined a phrase for this grouping of classes: "Ones that are not 'classroom things'." Gerry viewed them as "classes that give the definitions and all the ideas that go behind everything."

A second grouping was described using words such as methods, "hands-on," "how-to," and practical. Leah said student teaching was in this category.

According to Gerry, Lena, and Rhea, student teaching was in a group by itself. Gerry declared that it was not a class—it was "everything all rolled into one." Lena asserted, "It's totally in its own group—let me tell you!"

Leah felt that "useless" and "useful" would be appropriate names for two groups. Sam created a third group which he designated, "The ones I just would rather have not taken." Tony grouped the courses into "how to transfer subject matter knowledge," and, "how I can relate to students."

Reflections

Preservice teachers may not be accustomed to categorizing the various facets of their program. This is bad news if the situation indicates a lack of unawareness of the purpose of and the benefits to be gained from each of the various facets of their programs. However, if their responses demonstrate that they view their programs in a holistic manner, then that may be good news. Finally, it is unfortunate that some courses were considered useless, though it may be too much to expect that every course will be exciting to everyone. However, active, motivated involvement must be the goal of any program. A lower aim is simply unacceptable.
Program Valuing and Focus

Ranking for Contribution to Preparedness

I presented the preservice teachers with the following assignment:

You have taken classes in the following five areas: (a) general college courses such as English, science, art, etc., (b) foundations materials such as philosophy of education, history of education, and sociology of education, (c) psychology/development-type courses, (d) teaching methods courses, and (e) student teaching. Though all areas are important, which area will have helped you the most in becoming a good teacher? Please rank the areas in order of importance: most important, second most important, etc.

Table 2 provides a summary of frequency by rank of each of the five areas. Table 3 reports the ranking of the five areas by each of the interviewees.

| TABLE 2 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of College Program</th>
<th>Frequency by Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching (42 points)</td>
<td>1. xxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods courses (30 points)</td>
<td>1. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology/development-type courses (28 points)</td>
<td>1. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations materials (16 points)</td>
<td>1. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General college courses (19 points)</td>
<td>1. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. xxxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points Explanation: an incidence in ranking position one is 5 points; an incidence in position two is 4 points; in position three, 3 points; in position four, 2 points; in position five, 1 point.
### TABLE 3

**RANKING OF FIVE AREAS OF COLLEGE PROGRAM FOR IMPORTANCE IN LEARNING TO TEACH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ranking by Interviewee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amos  | 1. Student teaching  
|       | 2. Psychology/development type courses  
|       | 3. Teaching methods courses  
|       | 4. General college courses  
|       | 5. Foundations materials |
| Dee   | 1. Student teaching  
|       | 2. Teaching methods courses  
|       | 3. Psychology/development type courses  
|       | 4. Foundations materials  
|       | 5. General college courses |
| Gerry | 1. Student teaching  
|       | 2. Teaching methods courses  
|       | 3. Psychology/development type courses  
|       | 4. General college courses  
|       | 5. Foundations materials |
| John  | 1. Student Teaching  
|       | 2. Teaching methods courses  
|       | 3. Psychology/development type courses  
|       | 4. General college courses  
|       | 5. Foundations materials |
| Leah  | 1. Student teaching  
|       | 2. Teaching methods courses  
|       | 3. Psychology/development type courses  
|       | 4. Foundations materials  
|       | 5. General college courses |
| Lena  | 1. General college courses  
|       | 2. Psychology/development type courses  
|       | 3. Student teaching  
|       | 4. Foundations materials  
|       | 5. Teaching methods courses |
| Rhea  | 1. Teaching methods courses  
|       | 2. Student teaching  
|       | 3. Foundations materials  
|       | 4. Psychology/development type courses  
|       | 5. General college courses |
| Sam   | 1. Student teaching  
|       | 2. General college courses  
|       | 3. Teaching methods courses  
|       | 4. Psychology/development type courses  
|       | 5. Foundations materials |
| Tony  | 1. Student teaching  
|       | 2. Psychology/development type courses  
|       | 3. Foundations materials  
|       | 4. Teaching methods courses  
|       | 5. General college courses |
Reflections

As a whole, the nine preservice teachers clearly viewed student teaching as the single most important part of their preparation to teach. Teaching methods courses and psychology/development-type courses were seen as moderately important. The least valued areas were foundations materials and general college courses. The notable exception to the ranking trend was Lena who insisted, "To be a good teacher you gotta know the subject areas." This is interesting because Lena is an elementary teacher and it is commonly accepted that it is the secondary teachers who are more concerned with content. Also, she was one of only three who placed psychology second: "You have to know students and how they grow."

Joels's (1985) NCATE (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education) "follow-up" study is relevant. She used 667 graduates from a college of education. One of her conclusions was that beginning teachers appear to view the foundations courses, except for psychological foundations, as having less importance than traditional college courses. This approximates the general pattern here.

Focus: Technical or Liberal?

I gave the interviewees the following assignment:

There has been a longstanding debate in teacher education: (a) should it emphasize technical expertise in managing a classroom and providing instruction? or, (b) should it focus on helping preservice teachers to understand educational issues by providing broad insights and informed perspectives about those issues? Which side of this debate have you leaned toward or taken? Why do you think that is the case?

A summary of their responses is presented in Table 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interviewee Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>Technical—prior to student teaching; liberal—after student teaching because I have seen the need to have a broader view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>Technical, because it tells how to manage a classroom; liberal is important but in day-to-day routine, it’s not important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>Technical, because those are the things that you do in the classroom—real world things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Liberal, because I did case studies in student teaching—we were given real situation and by working with other student teachers, we found possible solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Technical—it would be technical for teachers; but, you need to know what the issues are, also, because it’s a big job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>Liberal, probably, if I had to choose: I see the importance of both; why not have a balance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea</td>
<td>Technical, more so. However, I’d want to have a mixture. Books give you a theory, but sometimes it doesn’t work the way it’s supposed to. I would want to talk to my colleagues, then go to the books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>I have not leaned either way; to manage a classroom and provide instruction, one must understand educational issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Liberal, because it’s a more “open” situation and students will/can be taught to think for themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflections

The interviewees were fairly well split in how they responded to this issue, with a slight tilting toward the liberal perspective. Two of the nine respondents (Dee and Gerry) seemed to stand decisively on the technical side and only three of the nine (Amos, John, and Tony) were firmly on the liberal side. Leah, Lena, Rhea, and Sam saw the importance of both the technical and the liberal in understanding education and in preparation for teaching.

In relation to this technical-liberal topic, I was interested whether or not the interviewees were acquainted with any of the traditional thought leaders in education. I used the form, "Shapers of Educational Thought and Practice" (see Appendix 1, Questionnaire 4), to explore this inquiry. Five of the nine interviewees identified with Benjamin S. Bloom, two with Maria Montessori, two with John Dewey, and one with Mortimer J. Adler. (The reason these numbers do not add up to nine is because two of the interviewees noted two of these shapers and one did not identify any of them.) As a group, the big question that came to their minds was how Bloom came up with the six levels in his cognitive domain. The conversations between the interviewees and myself indicated that they were not at all well-acquainted with those thought leaders. I do not attempt to draw any profound conclusions from this, or in any way discredit the preparedness of the preservice teachers for classroom teaching. However, it would not be difficult to make a case for the argument that the thrust of the interviewees' programs did not include a strong emphasis on the various ideas of the traditional shapers of educational thought and practice.
An interesting question comes to mind when two factors are overlapped and compared. First, the interviewees believe that student teaching is the most important part of their total college program in helping them prepare to be good teachers. Second, they lean slightly toward a liberal position. It could be argued that the interviewees see student teaching as having furnished them with a broader and more-informed perspective regarding issues and dilemmas related to teaching. Yet, when the interviewees were placed in a situation where more challenging questions were asked, as I demonstrate in chapter 6, they indicated they would not first consult their student teaching experience itself for answers to these questions.

At the very beginning of chapter 1, I noted the concern of foundations scholars that teacher education had become technically oriented with a focus on field experiences (Beyer & Zeichner, 1982; Broudy, 1982; Dennis, 1977; Eisner, 1983; Finkelstein, 1982; Greene, 1981; McMahon, 1970; Nash, 1970; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). The brief account of the perspectives of the nine preservice teachers certainly seems consonant with the concerns and claims of the literature cited just above.

I personally think that preservice teachers tend to place greater value on the technical—unless they are challenged to face those philosophical-type questions whose answers are not to be found in empirical research. Evidence of this assertion is presented in the coming pages—the very heart of my study. I invite the reader to approach those pages with the same interest and anticipation which I feel.
CHAPTER VI

PERSPECTIVES REGARDING COMMONPLACES

Introduction

The material in this chapter represents my arrival at my destination: understanding of the impact of foundations materials on my interviewees. As noted earlier, as the interviews with the preservice teachers progressed, I became aware of the need to design my questions such that the interviewee’s responses in the final interview would be sharply limited. Most of this chapter is an account of my interviewees' responses to those questions.

Shifts in Perspectives

I had previously introduced Schwab's (1978) concept, the commonplaces of education, and had asked the interviewees to briefly state their ideas regarding each of the four. Since their responses are not central to my study, I do not discuss them here. However, I was curious whether their responses represented some new way of viewing various aspects of education. Thus, after listening to the interviewees' conceptions of the four commonplaces, I would inquire of them,

*Do those ideas represent a shift in your thinking from your pre-college ideas?*

Table 5 summarizes the responses of the interviewees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interviewee Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>It’s not really a shift. It’s more of an expansion or refinement of the ideas which were already in my mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>I probably will pay more attention to the curriculum and I’m probably more aware of the teacher’s role now. In high school I just wanted to do my work on my own. My ideas about classrooms haven’t changed much—I’ve always liked nicely-decorated classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>Some ideas have changed. A lot of them have changed because of college and things I’ve done when I’ve been in college, including my field experiences. What you learn and what you see that works has a lot of influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>I believe my previous ideas were more textbook-oriented. Now it’s hands-on, more cooperative learning, more technology. This has impacted my ideas about all four commonplaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>My student teaching supervising teacher has shown the benefits of positive reinforcement. This was the opposite of my own early experiences in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>One big shift comes to mind and that’s the whole language approach. I had viewed education as very traditional. My ideas on discipline have changed and also seeing the need for not letting people get to you. I now view education as needing to continue after school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea</td>
<td>I’m seeing that some parents are neglecting their responsibilities and teachers have to cover for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Learning about the Paideia Proposal concepts was a big turning point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>I don’t think there’s been much of a shift in my attitudes concerning the student and the teacher. My program has possibly reaffirmed those things.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflections

I note the singular responses of Sam. In a field of fairly general responses, he specifically noted that learning about the Paideia Proposal became a turning point in his educational perspectives. The intriguing thing is the fact of where he learned about those concepts: not from his teacher education program, but from his father—he has a Ph.D. in Philosophy of Education. Sam had a major shift due to his reading the Paideia Proposal. Yet that shift probably came because the right person, at the right time, introduced him to the right material.

Overall, there simply is not anything remarkable in the interviewees’ responses. Nobody’s world has been turned upside down—if that was the goal for either of the teacher education programs represented.

Source of Current Perspectives Regarding the Commonplaces

My first interaction with the interviewees had been for the purpose of learning the general contours of their lives. I considered it important to not only become acquainted with the interviewees, but to get them to begin reflecting on their past and on their perspectives. I extended their reflection to a consideration of their perspectives on education, using the rubric of the commonplaces. After asking them if these perspectives represented a shift in their thinking, I was ready to ask them the following question:

Who, or what, has shaped your ideas regarding the commonplaces of education?

Though Appendix 2. Table 1 provides a complete presentation of the interviewees’ responses, a summary is presented in the following section.
Reflections

The answers are not at all surprising. By far, the most common response indicates that what the interviewees have seen and experienced—rather than what they have been told or read, or any theoretical model—is the source of the interviewees' perceptions regarding the commonplaces of education. I think again of the thoughts of Leean (1979), that, for preservice teachers, "experiential familiarity with schooling equates with knowledge about schooling" (p. 5). Of the 36 responses (nine interviewees times four responses each), only 6 mention sources such as program courses and authority unrelated to the school setting. Certainly, these findings indicate that the interviewees refer to practical, field-based experiences for insights into educational issues and dilemmas. "What works carries a big stick."

However, Sam’s responses indicated perspectives that were different from his peers. As noted earlier, there is a plausible explanation—the influence of his father. Though he did not pressure Sam, the father’s personal influence was nevertheless present when he introduced Sam to the Paideia Proposal.

Answering the Commonplace Questions—General

Indeed, I was nearing the very heart of my study’s intent and my excitement was growing. As I had noted earlier, I had discovered that the preservice teachers were simply not thinking about foundations studies from my perspective. Being a graduate student and having exposure to foundations studies and philosophical concepts had led me into a new country where the citizens all appeared to be interested in the big issues, the challenging dilemmas, the grand debate, the great
conversation. My visits with the preservice teachers at approximately the mid-point in the interview sequence had reminded me that I was now a citizen of a different country and spoke a different language.

Thus, my final steps involved designing and administering three pages of questions that would call for more specific answers. For each of the four commonplaces, I asked a number of questions. I purposely attempted to use only philosophical questions—questions which could not be answered by research. I was curious if the preservice teachers would recognize the questions as ones which could have more than one answer, depending on an individual’s philosophical perspective. My purpose was not to have them answer the questions, but to have them tell me where they would search for the answers. In an open-ended question of this type would foundations materials come to mind? The answer to that was my point of interest. Here are the directions I gave the interviewees for answering the questions:

The commonplaces of education (according to Schwab) are: teacher, student, curriculum, and context. Listed below are a number of questions about the four commonplaces of education. After reading each of the four sections, please state briefly the major source where you would look to find the answers to the questions about that commonplace. Possible answers may include: family influences, religious/moral training, youth organizations, personal K-12 classroom experiences, handouts and/or notes from a particular class, the influence of a particular professor, textbooks, other books (such as biographies), professional colleagues, the classroom experiences related to your teacher education program, etc. Also, please feel free to qualify your answers or explain your rationale in any way you may choose.

A complete presentation of the commonplace questions and the interviewees’ answers may be found in Appendix 2, Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5. However, the following section contains a summary of the interviewees’ perspectives.
Reflections

The preservice teachers had indicated previously that their general perspectives regarding teachers, students, curricula, and contexts had been formed by their own previous experiences in education. Yet, when faced with more specific questions about each of those four commonplaces, the interviewees had indicated that they would ask someone else—colleagues, principals, superintendents, communities, or well-informed parents, as in the case of Sam. He feels his parents provide insights that are more valid and meaningful than other sources.

The interviewees' answers showed knowledge of the politics and structure of education and that it is important to address the larger community when debating educational issues. That awareness is certainly a laudable goal of a teacher education program and appears to have some fulfillment here.

Answering the Commonplace Questions—Total College Program

Still, overall, my interviewees had not shown a strong relationship to foundations materials. I had wondered if, in reading the commonplace questions, they would recognize issues, dilemmas, and debates that research and/or authority could not resolve. Did they place a high value on foundations materials? If so, why?

Birkel conducted two studies which explored how preservice teachers viewed foundations materials. The first (1975) randomly canvassed 652 undergraduate secondary-education students regarding their attitudes toward the philosophical, historical, and sociological foundations. None of the students had previously taken work in the three foundations areas and were administered the rating
scale on the first day of three different academic quarters. The students responded to six statements for each of the three foundations areas, giving a rating of 1 ("no value"), 2, 3, or 4 ("much value"). An overall mean response of 3.195 indicated fairly high regard for foundations courses.

Birkel's second study (1983) followed the same procedure but questioned 367 junior or senior preservice teachers. The 18 items were the same, although changed somewhat in their ordering. The overall mean response of 3.170 was almost identical to Birkel's earlier study which appears to confirm the notion that preservice teachers do indeed view foundations courses of genuine value.

What is missing in Birkel's studies is information how preservice teachers would rank foundations studies in comparison to other fields when it comes to finding answers to commonplace questions. This very comparison is my next consideration and comes very close to being at the very heart of my inquiries. To that end, I introduced yet another question which would intentionally limit their answer options, yet permit the choice of foundations materials to be one of the options:

You have been introduced to a number of questions regarding each of the commonplaces. Overall, which of the following five areas of study would help you the most in answering those questions? (a) general college courses such as English, science, art, etc., (b) foundations materials such as philosophy of education, history of education, and sociology of education, (c) psychology/development-type courses, (d) teaching methods courses, and (e) student teaching. Please rank the five areas as most important, second most important, etc., in dealing with those "commonplace questions."

Table 6 presents a ranking of the five areas by the interviewees as a group, while a discussion follows the table. Appendix 2, Table 6 shows the interviewees' individual responses.
TABLE 6

RANKING OF FIVE ASPECTS OF THE TOTAL COLLEGE PROGRAM FOR THE IMPORTANCE OF EACH IN ANSWERING THE COMMONPLACE QUESTIONS BY FREQUENCY OF RANK POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Total College Program</th>
<th>Frequency by Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General college courses (10 points)</strong></td>
<td>1. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. xxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundations materials (32 points)</strong></td>
<td>1. xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychology/development-type courses (28 points)</strong></td>
<td>1. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching methods courses (31 points)</strong></td>
<td>1. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student teaching (34 points)</strong></td>
<td>1. xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points explanation: an incidence in ranking position one is 5 points; an incidence in position two is 4 points; in position three, 3 points; in position four, 2 points; and in position five, 1 point.
Reflections

I note that the interviewees demonstrated a distinct difference between the coursework that they believed had most helped them to become good teachers and the coursework that would best help them to answer the commonplace questions. When I used a multiple-choice question with five options, as opposed to an open-ended question, four out of nine chose foundations materials as being most important or very important. However, when the weight of evidence is considered more fully, the foundations studies do not show any dominance. Table 6 showed the accumulated ranking points for each of the five areas of the total college program. It is not foundations materials which leads the field, but rather student teaching. True, foundations materials are running a close second, but methods courses and psychology are in contention, as well.

Though the literature provides no explicit insights for this situation, one reasonable conclusion could be that the interviewees, as a group, look to every aspect of their teacher education program for answers to the commonplace questions. This may indicate a balanced appreciation for every aspect of their programs. However, while the interviewees display some sensitivity to and awareness of philosophical-type issues, there appears to be limited philosophical discernment. In no way does this place their general intelligence and technical classroom expertise under suspicion. The situation is probably a function of their programs’ failure to prepare them to differentiate between the questions that can expect answers from empirical research and issues that call for the informed perspective available from foundational materials.
Answering the Commonplace Questions—Foundations Materials

My last question about answering the commonplace questions was designed to narrow the possible answers to one of four foundations areas:

In your teacher education program you have studied material from the following four areas: (a) history of education, (b) philosophy of education, (c) psychology of education, and (d) sociology of education. Which area would help you the most in understanding educational debates, issues, or dilemmas? Please rank them in order of importance: most important, second most important, etc. If you could teach any of this foundational material, which area would it be? How would you teach it?

Table 7 presents a group ranking summary, and a discussion follows it. Appendix 2, Table 7 shows the respondents’ individual ranking of the four areas.

### TABLE 7

RANKING OF FOUR AREAS OF FOUNDATIONS MATERIALS FOR THE VALUE OF EACH IN ANSWERING THE COMMONPLACE QUESTIONS BY FREQUENCY IN RANK POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Foundations Materials</th>
<th>Frequency by Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History of Education (20 points)</td>
<td>1. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Education (22 points)</td>
<td>1. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. xxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of Education (26 points)</td>
<td>1. xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology of Education (22 points)</td>
<td>1. xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. xxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points explanation: an incidence in ranking position one is 4 points; an incidence in position two is 3 points; in position three, 2 points; and in position four, 1 point.
Reflections

A review of the responses in Table 7 and Appendix 2, Table 7 indicates that the preservice teachers are fairly evenly divided regarding which foundations materials would be most useful in answering the commonplace questions. The information in the table indicates that psychology stands on the highest ground. However, the other three occupy a nearly level plateau only slightly lower in elevation. If the preservice teachers were to teach one of the foundations, it would be psychology—four of nine—but that is certainly not a consensus, either. Philosophy and sociology each get two votes, while history claims just one.

Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of the interviewees' answers was that only five of the nine wanted to teach the course that they thought best provided answers to the commonplace questions. Perhaps finding the answers to commonplace questions is not an all-consuming passion for them. Apparently, while foundations scholars soar in the friendly skies and cherish the distant horizons, the preservice teachers find their fulfillment in waging war in the trenches and foxholes.

Bases of Future Decisions and Shifts of Perspective

Here is the final question I posed to the preservice teachers:

*On what basis would you make a decision about a trend or issue in education? Do you think your perspectives could change in the future? If so, what might shape a new perspective?*

Appendix 2, Table 8 presents the interviewees' responses to this question, while a summary discussion follows.
Reflections

I asked this last question because I wondered if the interviewees’ perceptions might change in the future as a result of some concept discovered in one of the foundations areas. All, naturally, agreed they could change their minds in the future. The most popular basis for decision-making appeared to be the possibility of future experiences which might present some type of challenge to the interviewees. The needs of individuals were also considered an important basis for decision-making. Not only is experience the basis for decision-making, it is also perceived by the interviewees as the most effective change agent in altering their present perspectives. Certainly a departure from this mode are the sentiments of Leah who believes that technological developments would be the most likely shaping force for new perspectives.

The case of Sam is interesting to note in this regard. He had demonstrated a philosophical sensitivity and appreciation somewhat beyond that found in his peers. As noted before, many of his responses differed from those of his peers, and he showed a greater interest in and a more positive attitude toward foundations materials. Yet, experience can teach lessons that he chooses not to ignore. The accounting of Sam’s perspectives in this report furnish an instructive source of comparison and contrast. They can be something more, however. His experience may be a sobering reminder that a speck of unpretentious information, deftly deposited in an unlikely spot, but at the golden moment, is capable of producing priceless pearls of powerful perception.
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This seventh and final chapter of my report has five sections. In the first and second sections, I summarize my findings and draw some conclusions from them. In the third, I present some recommendations for teacher education. In the fourth and fifth sections, I propose some contributions that my study may make to the field of teacher education, and suggest some possibilities for further studies.

Summary

In this first section, I use Table 8 to summarize the responses of the nine interviewees in nine topic areas which represent the major points of inquiry covered in my study. In this summary section I do not note individual differences among the interviewees, but rather paint a generalized word picture of the nine as a group. However, there is a tenth and final topic in the table which provides a glimpse of some ways in which some of the interviewees' experiences are unique when compared with their peers. A further discussion of my findings is continued in the conclusions of this chapter. Also, Appendix 2, Tables 9 through 17 are one-page tables which summarize in a succinct manner the perspectives of each interviewee.
### Table 8

**SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWEE RESPONSES AND PERCEPTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Generalizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biographical sketch</strong></td>
<td>Raised by two parents from whom they received their perceptions about life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of interest in teaching</strong></td>
<td>Had a teacher during the K-12 years which influenced the interviewees to be interested in teaching. They still recall this teacher with fondness. Took a traditional teacher education program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspectives regarding program</strong></td>
<td>Perceived typicality: different in some way from their peers. Program instructors: had one or two that they especially identified with. Definition of foundations: give a background by introducing principles &amp; issues. Foundations courses taken: the courses in their teacher education program. Grouping of courses: (1) practical/hands-on, &amp; (2) theoretical/ideas. Ranking for preparedness: (1) student teaching, (2) methods courses, (3) psychology. Technical or liberal: fairly evenly divided; but, both are considered important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shifts in perspectives</strong></td>
<td>Some shifting due to program &amp; especially the realities of field experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering the commonplace questions—ranking of total college program</strong></td>
<td>1. Student teaching. 2. Foundations materials. 3. Teaching methods courses. 4. Psychology-type courses. 5. General college courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis of Future decisions</strong></td>
<td>Their experience while working with students in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique traits; comparison to peers</strong></td>
<td>Unique factors included: transferring to another college, uncertainty of commitment to teaching, becoming Student Teacher of the Year, having a parent for a teacher, having a strong interest in children's fictional &amp; fantasy literature, making a perceived contribution to the program, coming back to college later in life, teaching someone to read while still a child, preparing for a pastoral ministry, having a parent with a Ph.D. in Philosophy of Education, not having a male mentor while young.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Conclusions

Since I want to relate the conclusions I draw to my original, guiding questions, I note them again here:

1. Who, or what, has shaped preservice teachers' ideas about education?
2. How have foundations studies influenced those ideas?

In the discussion which follows, I present some conclusions which I have drawn from the interviewees' answers to each of those questions.

Conclusions About Origins of Ideas

Origins of ideas about life

During my first interview with each of the preservice teachers, I asked,

What, or who, has shaped your thinking about life more than anything or anyone else?

I was not surprised when each answered the question by saying, "My family," meaning their parents. The one exception was Tony who qualified his response by stating that it was his grandmother more than anyone else who had molded his thinking about life. He also noted that his church had a strong influence, as did Amos, also. A sprinkling of additional factors emerged, also: "Learning from the experiences and mistakes of others" (Amos); "The two years I taught swimming lessons" (Dee); and, "My husband and my college experience" (Lena). Leah stated, "My perspective on life has changed probably four or five times." Nevertheless, the home environment, particularly the parents, has shaped the interviewees' perspectives about life.
Origins of pre-college ideas about education

About the same time, I had asked each of the interviewees this question:

What, or who, in your pre-college background has molded your ideas about education more than anything or anyone else?

Again, I was not surprised when seven of the nine replied that some aspect of their K-12 experience had been the strong influence over their perceptions of education. Usually these seven were referring to their former teachers, though Dee noted that it was the "hands-on" things she had done in school, and Rhea added that her Brownie leader had influenced her view of education. Two responses were in categories by themselves: Sam believed that his parents had shaped his ideas about education, and Tony felt that it was his church environment, with its "emphasis on total being and how they emphasized the importance of education."

Thus, for the interviewees, their ideas about life originated with their parents, and their pre-college views about education came from their schooling experiences. For these nine preservice teachers, the parent-teacher team dominated the formation of the interviewees' ideas during the first 18 or more years of their lives.

Origins of ideas about education learned while in college

However, a new dimension of the interviewees' ideas about education developed during their college years. After having asked the interviewees what or who had shaped their pre-college ideas about education, I wanted to know what or
who had shaped their current ideas about education. To do this, I used Schwab's (1978) concept of the four commonplaces of education as a framework to ask some specific questions about education. Though I was interested in the interviewees' answers about those questions, what I really wanted to know was the source of their answers to those commonplace questions.

Whereas the interviewees' pre-college perspectives regarding education had been shaped by their K-12 schooling experiences, particularly their teachers, I discovered that now the interviewees' perceptions about education, using the rubric of the commonplaces of education, had been strongly influenced by their teacher education program experiences: class sessions and activities, reading, and assignments, but especially by their field experiences and specifically student teaching. Of the possible 36 responses (four commonplaces times nine interviewees), just under half of the responses note field experiences as the source of their perceptions about the four commonplaces.

The extent to which cooperating teachers influence student teachers has been studied and debated. Boschee, Prescott, and Hein (1978) reviewed eight studies and found a diversity of opinion regarding the influence of cooperating teachers. After reviewing the other studies, Boschee et al. conducted a study on a related topic—the influence of cooperating teachers on the educational philosophy of student teachers. When Boschee and his associates compared the findings of their study to the other eight studies, they concluded that their findings largely contradicted the other studies: "No student teacher's educational philosophy was related to his/her
cooperating teacher's educational philosophy" (p. 60).

The influence that college has on the attitudes and beliefs of preservice teachers is uncertain. Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) reviewed a number of studies, including at least one study which had itself reviewed over 1,500 studies spanning a 40-year period. Zeichner and Tabachnick found two prevailing viewpoints: (1) higher education tends to liberalize the thinking of students, but they tend to regress to more traditional viewpoints during student teaching and the first year of teaching; and (2) though preservice teachers may exhibit a "veneer" of liberal thinking for their instructors, the preservice teachers actually "maintain" their "traditional teaching perspectives" during their programs (p. 8).

Consequently, when my interviewees demonstrated that both their family influences and their K-12 schooling experiences lingered in their memories and continued to influence their perceptions, I cannot be surprised. Of the 36 total responses, almost half reflect that the shaping of educational ideas is still attributed to the early schooling experiences.

*Origins of ideas about reality in education*

At this point, I pose this question: What is it that is *real* to the preservice teachers whom I interviewed? I suggest that this question could be answered with this statement: What is real to these nine preservice teachers are the ideas and perceptions they gained at home, during their K-12 schooling experiences, and during their program—*as* they are tested and proven in the fire of actual classroom experiences.
The interviewees must see how any theoretical ideas that they have function in a practical setting. For the most part, these preservice teachers do not believe what they cannot eventually see. Theories or concepts may sound good, but they will be passed over for the ideas that work, that is, the ideas that produce results such as student-learning of basic information and acceptable student behavior within the classroom social structure.

Writing about theoretical knowledge, Arnstine (1972) discusses "the general antipathy that nearly everyone has for theory" (p. 4), then adds that people tend to assume that "anything theoretical must also be impractical" (p. 5). The National Center for Research on Teacher Learning (1991) acknowledges this: "Teachers at all career stages value firsthand experience as the major source of knowledge and a means of learning to teach" (p. 69, emphasis mine).

Beyer and Zeichner (1982) cite evidence which they feel shows the vocational nature of teacher education programs. They relate B. Othanel Smith's view that "theory has value in the art of teaching only if 'theory' is used to mean empirical clinical knowledge" (p. 18). Beyer and Zeichner add, "The foundations are discredited . . . for their lack of direct utility for clinical experiences and corresponding teacher behaviors" (p. 18). They note that Katz terms this situation "excessive realism," meaning that "the school serves as a model for practice and is not itself an object for scrutiny and analysis" (p. 19).

*Origins of mental frameworks*

Lortie (1975) discusses at length the perspectives about education held by
preservice teachers. In a discussion of his "apprenticeship of observation" concept, Lortie reminds his readers that most students have spent about 13,000 hours during the K-12 years in continuous contact with classroom teachers. He observes that teaching is unusual in that those who decide to enter it have had exceptional opportunity to observe members of the occupation at work. . . . Teachers-to-be underestimate the difficulties involved, but this supports the contention that those planning to teach form definite ideas about the nature of the role. People entering other occupations are more likely to sense that their information is limited. . . .

Education students have spent years assessing teachers and many enter training with strong preconceptions based upon firm identifications. Students in education may simply classify education professors as new members of a category (teachers) with which they are already most familiar. The mind of the education student is not a blank awaiting inscription. (pp. 65, 66)

The National Center for Research on Teacher Learning (1991), after citing Lortie's work, claims that "the curriculum of teacher education pays little heed to what teachers-to-be know and believe" (p. 62). Later it asserts that "teachers often leave preservice preparation with their initial views intact. They tend to teach as they were taught rather than as they were enjoined to teach by teacher educators" (p. 67)

Graduate professors and graduate students who value foundations studies may, with good evidence, have well-defined beliefs about what ought to be the goals and methods in education. I am not devaluing or denigrating the world of the mind, but the truth seems to be: Preservice teachers are mostly concerned with what actually is. The accumulated ideas and perspective learned from their parents and their K-12 experiences are tested and proved by their field experiences, especially student teaching, and these become the basis of perspectives and decisions for the interviewees.
Conclusions About Influence of Foundations Studies

Using an open-ended question

It had been my assumption that interviewee perceptions about foundations studies would surface during my use of open-ended, essay-type questions. Although I did not follow a full ethnographic procedure, choosing rather to select and introduce domains and themes, I did avoid furnishing the interviewees with questions or scenarios where they were given multiple answers from which they could pick a response. This was the case (see Appendix 2, Questionnaire 2) when I asked:

For answers to the commonplace questions, where would you first consider looking?

I had consciously selected commonplace questions which had several answers, each one correct if you held a particular philosophical stance. As noted earlier, most of the interviewee responses indicated that the source for answers to the commonplace questions would be a person with the probable expertise or appropriate experience—a colleague, a department chairperson, a principal, a superintendent, or the community at large.

Lortie (1975) was cited earlier for his apprenticeship of observation concept. His presentation of that concept includes a discussion concerning the interaction between program instructors and preservice teachers:

One wonders how effectively such professors communicate with the many students who, it appears, see teaching as the "living out" of prior conceptions of good teaching. . . . The two groups—students and professors—may talk past one another. . . .

. . . Unless beginning teachers undergo training experiences which offset their individualistic and traditional experiences, the occupation will be staffed by
people who have little concern with building a shared technical culture. In the absence of such a culture, the diverse histories of teachers will play a cardinal role in their day-to-day activity. In that respect, the apprenticeship-of-observation is an ally of continuity rather than of change. (pp. 66, 67)

Certainly the observations of Lortie in his landmark study is reflected without major distortion in my own study—the "ally of continuity" theme appeared to be present. Foundations studies claimed for itself the role of antidote to unquestioned continuity. However, two-thirds of the way through my study, I had yet to find much interest in, or apparent awareness of, the foundations of education.

Using a multiple-choice question

I designed my final questions so that the term "foundations materials" was among the possible answers. Generally, the interviewees had stated that they would consult an individual in some position of authority or perceived expertise to answer the commonplace questions. However, when asked to pick from five possible answers, four of the nine selected foundations materials over other aspects of their total college program, including the highly valued student teaching experience. However, the student teaching experience was selected by three of the nine and overall was ranked higher than foundations material. Though five of the nine placed foundations at mid-point or below, the questions appeared to produce an increased awareness that philosophical questions need more than non-philosophical answers.

When pressed a little, I feel that the interviewees were aroused from what was otherwise a field experience-based perspective. Memory of the content of foundations materials they had studied was somewhat buried and dormant, but my
probing had stimulated a slight stirring of awareness. The foundations materials had not influenced the interviewees powerfully, but a faint awareness of them and their possible usefulness had lingered on the periphery of their consciousness.

Lortie (1975) cited an National Education Association study in which education students felt they had spent "about the right amount of time" (p. 68) studying foundations materials. However, these same students felt that the time they spent learning about "practical" aspects of teaching was not adequate. This contrast is intriguing, because typically far more actual time is spent studying practical courses than theoretical. For the interviewees, a little theory appeared to go a long way.

**Recommendations**

**Discover and Remember Preservice Teachers Preconceptions**

First, I recommend that teacher educators strive to discover their students’ presuppositions about the commonplaces of education. Butler, Bush, Wasicsko, Calaway, and Murrell (1981) wrote of "the recognized need to know more about attitudinal predispositions of students beginning their undergraduate studies in professional education courses" (p. 2). The National Center for Research on Teacher Learning (1991) had this to say: "While classroom teachers have been urged to take account of their pupils' conceptions in planning instruction, the curriculum of teacher education pays little heed to what teachers-to-be know and believe" (p. 62). It should go without saying, after learning about preservice teachers' preconceptions, instructors will design every facet of their courses with those perceptions in mind.
Make the Known Unknown to Preservice Teachers

I would agree with Leean (1979) that teacher educators should work at "making the known unknown." Preservice teachers should be introduced to and brought face-to-face with some of the many difficult, hard-to-answer educational dilemmas, issues, and debates. Leean proposes that

we should initiate undergraduates to the educational field by turning upside down the notion that experiential familiarity with schooling equates with knowledge about schooling. . . .

It is my contention that freshmen for the most part are fresh out of an educational system that they feel they know intimately, but that is an [sic] unknown to them as outer Mongolia. It is unknown in the sense that they have very little understanding of the complex pressures and issues underlying education today, nor an awareness of the dynamics of good teaching, nor a consciousness of what really happened to them over 12 years in a system which, if they played by the rules, rewarded them with an acceptable transcript for college entrance.

The construction of a course which moves from the known to the unknown is no easy task since it seems to violate most traditional learning modes. To begin with, what is familiar needs to be looked at in a new, fresh, naive way . . . as if one is looking at them for the first time. (p. 5, emphasis hers)

Thus, preservice teachers should skillfully, wisely, perhaps gently, have demonstrated to them that there is much they do not fully understand about education.

Challenge Preservice Teachers With Difficult Real-Life Scenarios

The interviewees were my teachers. I was their student. As I became an increasingly active student toward the conclusion of my interviews, I think that I may have begun to challenge my teachers with harder questions. I had started out wanting to understand their perspectives regarding foundations materials. Now I had became curious to explore whether those perspectives might change. With more interview
time, by using some carefully designed scenarios, and with insistent probing, I feel reasonably sure that I could have challenged the interviewees to search for answers that cannot be discovered empirically. However, time did not permit that experiment, and such an experiment was not central to my study. Moreover, our roles would have switched and I would have taken more of an instructional role. And, in that observation lies the heart of this recommendation.

Active, involved consideration of educational issues can be stimulated by introducing realistic, but hard-to-answer scenarios. Smith and Hickman (1978) studied 230 students in five sections of a particular introductory foundations course, taught by two different instructors. One group was taught in a fairly traditional manner, while an experimental group were given materials of a controversial, though persuasive character. Study results indicated that the experimental group experienced more attitudinal changes than did the traditional group of preservice teachers.

Reeves (1986) encourages instructors to introduce actual cases of schooling. Referring to particular schooling situations. Reeves suggests this: "What can be done in a course of study is to explore the possibilities which might exist in any situation so that students can utilize this knowledge later in coming to understand schooling in a particular situation" (p. 61).

Liston (1988) urges that "teacher education should encourage reflective analysis of and moral deliberation over the dilemmas of teaching and schooling" (p. 58). Doing this, he argues, can result in the ability for educational scholars to "bridge the gap between university ideals and classroom reality" (p. 58).
Writing on this theme, Ciriello (1989) states this about his article:

The purpose of this paper is to describe how students can be encouraged to reflect on their past schooling experiences in order to enrich their understanding and foster their appreciation of the foundations of education course as a valuable introduction to the world of the professional teacher. (p. 97)

Ciriello adds, "Unless education students are sensitized to their internalizations, biases, and preconceptions, exposure to different ideas will be wasted" (p. 97). Ciriello (1989) urges that effective instruction depends on the practical wisdom from experience being supported by the ability to utilize theoretical knowledge. Foundations courses, she points out, can build a mental framework whereby "disciplined, systematic, analytical" (p. 98) thinking can relate personal experiences to educational issues.

Encourage Preservice Teachers to Develop an Informed Perspective of Their Own

The philosophical-type questions I asked the interviewees may have appeared to be easy to answer. In a nutshell, the preservice teachers were saying, "When confronted with an issue, I'll just check with someone who knows the answers." The problem with the answer they gave is that those in positions of authority or influence probably do not know the answer themselves—they can only provide some answers—opinions which may be based neither on empirical findings nor on philosophical perspectives. In other words, their views may either only represent personal assumptions regarding truth, reality, goodness/beauty, or even a mindless acceptance of tired tradition.
However, answers from persons of authority do not, cannot, prove anything. The perspectives they have may indeed be based on what research shows works well in certain contexts, using particular learning materials, having certain goals, teaching particular students, employing certain teachers. But even research grows out of the soil of some particular set of philosophical assumptions.

I choose to stress this point because education has witnessed much debate. One major reason why we have so much debate is that the proponents of each side are arguing from completely different philosophical viewpoints and divergent presuppositions. One example (from the many that could be given) would be the question, How much should children be permitted to talk in the classroom? A strong case could be made for answering "a lot," but "very little" can be argued, also. Another example could be the quarrel over whether or not students should concentrate on studying the classical ideas found in the writing of the supposed great thinkers, as opposed to focusing on the latest technological knowledge and its application. Again, a persuasive argument can be made by the apologists of both positions.

Who is right? It all depends! It all depends on one's purposes and goals for education and his or her view of the real needs and nature of the human race. Everyone is right—from his or her philosophical point of view. No one is wrong—if you look at a matter through his or her eyes.

My study opened by noting the sorrow of foundations scholars who lament the hardiness of classroom technician thought and practice. If, for any reason, that perspective does not represent a prognosis of optimum health for education, then, at
the very minimum, hard-to-answer questions must be raised—questions for which
there are no answers, short of taking a set of broader historical, philosophical,
psychological, and sociological factors into account. Dippo (1991) asserts that
preservice teachers "need to know much more about how working teachers actually
'know what to do'" (p. 50).

Smith and Smith (1994) state that the concept of school-based management,
and thus more teacher involvement in decision-making, is widely accepted at present.
Lortie (1975) points out that teachers face genuine challenges when change and
innovation come to their school, and teachers, naturally, have mixed feelings about
being involved in the decision-making process. But, as Lortie points out, "the
decision to do the usual thing is clearly a decision" (p. 217). Therefore, whether
teachers want to be involved in decision-making or not, they probably will be.
Consequently, I would ask, Are teachers ready to be a part of the decision-making
process if their search for answers to commonplace questions can only culminate in a
conversation with those who are already making the decisions—principals and
superintendents? Further, I would inquire, How do we know if those in positions of
responsibility have an informed perspective—unless we are somewhat informed
ourselves?

Contributions of the Study

This study, on a limited basis, confirms the findings of many of the studies
discussed in the preceding pages and chapters. However, it has made a modest
contribution of its own and fills a modest void in the field of education. There have
been both quantitative and qualitative studies done on preservice teacher attitudes
towards foundations studies. However, I have not discovered a study in the literature
which attempts to explore the relationship between the origins of preservice teachers’
perspectives on education and the impact of foundations studies on those perspectives.

A second unique contribution of my study is the organization of educational
issues or dilemmas using the framework of Schwab’s (1978) commonplaces of
education. The resulting categorization of issues I have named the "commonplace
questions." This framework can help to organize the complex educational questions
into a simple, manageable, convenient, and easy-to-remember organization, one that
is directly related to the common elements of formal schooling—the commonplaces of
education.

A third contribution that this study can make is found in a terse summary of
how it developed. The study commenced by inquiring about the perspectives of
preservice teachers regarding education in general. The study concluded by inquiring
into interviewees' awareness of and appreciation for the contributions which
foundations studies could make in dealing with issues. The result was an examination
of relevant studies which resulted in the major points in the recommendations section
of this chapter. These major points can serve as a guide to program instructors: (1)
discover and remember preservice teachers preconceptions, (2) make the known
unknown to preservice teachers, (3) challenge preservice teachers with difficult real-
life scenarios, and (4) encourage preservice teachers to develop an informed
perspective of their own. In the process of following this sequence, preservice
teachers will learn how it is possible to achieve an informed perspective.

In the following and final section of my report, I make a number of suggestions for further research based on the literature I have reviewed and the findings of my own study.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

There are at least three studies which, if undertaken, would extend the understanding of the field of education and especially benefit the area of concern formed by the intersection of foundations studies and teacher education programs.

First, I would like to see a study done that would expand my small beginnings of asking commonplace questions. However, instead of introducing short questions and soliciting the interviewees' opinion of the best source for information for gaining an informed perspective, I suggest the use of a set of short scenarios for each commonplace, which could be organized and known as the commonplace scenarios. These scenarios would give an educational dilemma in a story form. Then the interviewee would be asked to suggest a source for gaining an informed perspective, and how the dilemmas could be resolved. This procedure would result in making an issue come alive and would add interest to the interview. The interviewer might want to be prepared to gently, but insistently, probe for answers and to challenge the interviewees' responses with counter proposals.

Naturally, it would be vital for a strong rapport to exist between the interviewer and his interviewees. This would permit and encourage an friendly, unafraid, animated dialogue wherein the interviewer would feel free to probe and
challenge the interviewee’s responses. It would allow the interviewee to reflect on his or her perspectives and to venture them without fear of embarrassment or reproach.

A second suggested study would involve a longitudinal ethnographic study, one which follows a group of preservice teachers throughout their program. One of the benefits from this study would be to follow the development of the thinking of the group over the period of time covered by their program. Information would be gained about which kinds of circumstances and situations were conducive to various kinds of thinking and learning and confirmation or change in preservice teachers’ perspectives.

A third study would focus on discovering the interaction between field experiences and foundations materials. During a weekly, field-experience discussion seminar, individual interviews and participant observation could be carried on. This would provide insights both into individual thinking and into group interaction as the members of the group introduce foundational considerations and relate them to their field experiences. Much of the ambiguity about the importance of foundations materials and the challenges of field experiences would be clarified.

In a study of this type, the complementary relationship between the theoretical and the practical would be discovered and the researcher would be a witness to the developments. I believe that an ideal researcher for this type of study would be someone who could function in a dual instructor-researcher role. Finally, I believe that the four main points in the recommendations section of this chapter would be ideal as a set of guidelines for the seminar’s discussions.
APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRES
QUESTIONNAIRE 1

THE STUDY IN A NUTSHELL

Before you took your foundations courses (before you studied the ideas and arguments of the "authorities" about education), you (a preservice teacher) may have discovered and developed your own ideas about teachers, students, curriculum, and school environment.

1. What, or who, has shaped your ideas about education?

2. How have the ideas you might have had about education before you started your teacher education program affected your study of education foundations courses?

Study Inquiries

First Interview

1. Your background is important because it probably has influenced your ideas about teaching. Please tell about
a. family (parents, siblings, social, economic, education, occupation),
b. education (K-12),
c. religious/moral training,
d. youth organizations in which you participated

2. What, or who, has shaped your thinking about life (home, marriage, money, occupation) more than anything/anyone else?

3. What opinions about life have you developed on your own? Were others (or even you) uncomfortable at first when you started thinking for yourself?

4. What, or who, in your pre-college background has molded your ideas about education more than anything/anyone else?

Second Interview

5. Which foundations courses have you taken? In your opinion, what is the purpose of foundations courses?

6. What are your ideas about each of the following? Where did you get those ideas?
   a. What should teachers be like? What should they do?
   b. What should happen to students in their education?
   c. What is a good curriculum?
   d. What is a good school environment like?

7. Are those ideas a shift in your thinking from your pre-college ideas? Has college confirmed any of your previous ideas?

8. How have your pre-college ideas about life in general affected your ideas about education and your teacher education program?

9. What, or who, in your teacher education program has shaped your thinking about education more than anything/anyone else?

10. What might keep foundations classes from helping teacher education students understand educational issues better? How would you teach a foundations class? Which one would it be?
QUESTIONNAIRE 2
WHERE I WOULD FIRST LOOK FOR INFORMATION
(To Form an Informed Perspective on the Commonplaces of Education)

Directions: The commonplaces of education (according to Schwab) are: teacher, student, curriculum, and context. Listed below are a number of questions about the four commonplaces of education. After reading each of the four sections, please state briefly the major source where you would look to find the answers to the questions about that commonplace. Possible answers may include: family influences, religious/moral training, youth organizations, personal K-12 classroom experiences, handouts and/or notes from a particular class, the influence of a particular professor, textbooks, other books (such as biographies), professional colleagues, the classroom experiences related to your teacher education program, etc., etc. Also, please feel free to qualify your answers or explain your rationale in any way you may choose.

(1) The Teacher: what should be his or her role in the classroom? to what extent should he or she control the scheduling, the activities, the rules, the academic standards? should he or she administer the resources of time, money, and materials equally to every student? should he or she administer rules and justice identically to every student? to what extent should teachers use extrinsic/external motivation? how should a teacher be educated? should only state certified teachers be hired? which educational decisions should teachers make? should a teacher be an informed person who influences decisions or should he or she concentrate on effective classroom management and instruction? is it better for a teacher to work alone or as a member of a team?

My general ideas about the teacher have been shaped by ________________________________________________________________________
For answers to these questions I would first consider ____________________________________________

(2) The Student: what should be his or her role in the classroom? to what extent should he or she help determine the scheduling, the activities, the rules, the academic standards? what is his or her nature morally and ethically? should he or she learn individually or cooperatively? should he or she be dealt with as distinctly unique or as basically possessing many characteristics of his or her peers? should cognitive development be emphasized over affective and psychomotor development? how educable are students? how important is education to him or her? how is the best way to learn? what are the characteristics of a truly educated person? should all children go to school? how long should children attend school? is there any limit for growth and progress? do students do best when learning with peers from similar backgrounds and also with similar potential?

My general ideas about the student have been shaped by ________________________________________________________________________
For answers to these questions I would first consider ____________________________________________

(3) The Curriculum: what should be the role of the curriculum in the classroom? who and/or what should determine its content? what should be its purpose? who should design it? how should it be presented? which should be emphasized: knowledge that has personal importance to a student, or knowledge that is traditionally considered to be important for all citizens? which should be emphasized: learning information that is important and useful in itself, or "learning to learn" (acquiring skills of reasoning, analyzing, organizing)? should the emphasis be on building awareness and appreciation of the common culture or on celebrating cultural diversity? is there a particular need that should dictate what is studied: legal, economic, social, academic, religious/spiritual, etc.? should spiritual values be taught?

My general ideas about the curriculum have been shaped by ________________________________________________________________________
For answers to these questions I would first consider ____________________________________________

(4) The Context: what should be the environment within the classroom? should the mood be businesslike or casual? should there even be a classroom? how should the individual classroom relate to the rest of the school and to the community? is the best classroom highly-structured or one that allows for great individuality and choice?

My general ideas about the context have been shaped by ________________________________________________________________________
For answers to these questions I would first consider ____________________________________________
QUESTIONNAIRE 3
PHYNUL KWESTYONS

Directions: Please respond to the following with the fewest possible words. Please make your responses terse, succinct, to-the-point, pithy, and concise. Please plan on giving your response in the space provided below each question. Thanks!

1. You have taken classes in the following five areas: (a) general college courses such as English, science, art, etc., (b) foundations materials such as philosophy of education, history of education, and sociology of education, (c) psychology/development type courses, (d) teaching methods courses, and (e) student teaching. Though all areas are important, which area will have helped you the most in becoming a good teacher? Please rank the areas in order of importance: most important, second most important, etc.

2. Do you think that your experience in your teacher education program is typical of or different than your peers? In what ways?

3. Which of your teacher education program course instructors do you identify with the most? Why?

4. There has been a longstanding debate in teacher education: (a) should it emphasize technical expertise in managing a classroom and providing instruction? or, (b) should it focus on helping preservice teachers to understand educational issues by providing broad insights and informed perspectives about those issues? Which side of this debate have you leaned toward or taken? Why do you think that is the case?

5. On another sheet the four commonplaces of education were noted. After each of these commonplaces, there were a number of questions listed. Overall, which of the following five areas of study would help you the most in answering those questions?: (a) general college courses such as English, science, art, etc., (b) foundations materials such as philosophy of education, history of education, and sociology of education, (c) psychology/development type courses, (d) teaching methods courses, and (e) student teaching. Please rank the five areas as most important, second most important, etc., in dealing with those "commonplace questions."

6. In your teacher education program you have studied material from the following four areas: (a) history of education, (b) philosophy of education, (c) psychology of education, and (d) sociology of education. Which area would help you the most in understanding educational debates, issues, or dilemmas? Please rank them in order of importance: most important, second most important, etc. If you could teach any of this foundational material, which area would it be? How would you teach it?

7. On what basis would you make a decision about a trend or issue in education? Do you think your perspectives could change in the future? If so, what might shape a new perspective?
**QUESTIONNAIRE 4**

**SHAPERS OF EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT AND PRACTICE**

Directions: Some educators consider the individuals below as influential educational thought leaders. Please circle the names you have heard of. In addition, when you know something about an individual, place the letter beside that person's name in the parentheses by the most accurate description of them on the right. Put a check mark by ones with whom you identify in a special way because their ideas or goals have influenced your thinking or practice. If you could meet that person, what would you want to talk about or ask him or her?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong></td>
<td>Mortimer J. Adler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong></td>
<td>Aristotle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong></td>
<td>Arthur Bestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.</strong></td>
<td>Alfred Binet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.</strong></td>
<td>Benjamin S. Bloom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F.</strong></td>
<td>J. Franklin Bobbitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G.</strong></td>
<td>Jerome Bruner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.</strong></td>
<td>John Amos Comenius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.</strong></td>
<td>James Bryant Conant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J.</strong></td>
<td>George S. Counts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K.</strong></td>
<td>John Dewey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L.</strong></td>
<td>Paulo Freire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.</strong></td>
<td>Friedrich Froebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N.</strong></td>
<td>John I. Goodlad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O.</strong></td>
<td>Johann Friedrich Herbart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.</strong></td>
<td>Robert Maynard Hutchins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q.</strong></td>
<td>John Locke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R.</strong></td>
<td>Horace Mann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.</strong></td>
<td>Maria Montessori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T.</strong></td>
<td>Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.</strong></td>
<td>Plato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V.</strong></td>
<td>Protagoras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W.</strong></td>
<td>Hyman G. Rickover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X.</strong></td>
<td>Jean Jacques Rousseau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y.</strong></td>
<td>Herbert Spenser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z.</strong></td>
<td>Edward Lee Thorndike</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 2
TABLES
TABLE 1
SOURCE OF CURRENT PERSPECTIVES REGARDING THE COMMONPLACES OF EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interviewee Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amos   | Teacher: Classroom observation & my previous work experiences  
         Student: Working with & observing the kids I've worked with in the classroom  
         Curriculum: I haven't the slightest idea; everything's changing; we don't know the future  
         Context: Dealing with problem children & seeing their reactions to certain situations |
| Dee    | Teacher: My K-12 teachers  
         Student: My program field experiences  
         Curriculum: My college classes  
         Context: My last two years of college; in my field experiences I've seen what I like |
| Gorry  | Teacher: Teachers I had when I was in school; from program classes & field experiences  
         Student: Mostly college & program field experiences, especially student teaching  
         Curriculum: A class in college; but, everybody pretty much agrees what the basics should be  
         Context: Childhood experiences, plus field experiences |
| John   | Teacher: My high school teacher at Penn High  
         Student: My student teaching experience  
         Curriculum: My methods classes  
         Context: My student teaching experience |
| Leah   | Teacher: My supervising teacher in student teaching  
         Student: My own personal experiences in school  
         Curriculum: My own early education  
         Context: The opposite of what I had—I discovered this more fully in student teaching |
| Lena   | Teacher: Being taught by teachers who modeled good teaching  
         Student: Being in school myself, including college; my recent interest in lifelong learning  
         Curriculum: Especially grades 1-4: also, learning about whole language & discovery learning  
         Context: My prior experience |
| Rhea   | Teacher: Some of the teachers that I've had previously  
         Student: Probably different teachers and parents shaped how to behave; also, home training  
         Curriculum: Educators, parents, people in authority, ministers  
         Context: My subbing experiences; basically, the materials that the teachers uses & presents |
| Sam    | Teacher: My father and mother  
         Student: My experience as a teacher  
         Curriculum: M. J. Adler  
         Context: My K-12 classroom experience |
| Tony   | Teacher: Many things—working with children & students; my student teaching seminar  
         Student: It's hard to say; my church has had a lot of influence  
         Curriculum: The interests and needs of a given community  
         Context: Observing in different classrooms |
TABLE 2

SOURCE FOR ANSWERS REGARDING TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interviewee Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>I would go to the administration of a given school. I would go upward through the chain of command, starting with the department chair person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>I would look at the students and see what their needs are. Also, I would talk to colleagues. I wouldn’t go to books—that’s not me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>I would talk to the rest of my teaching team—my colleagues at that school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>I would check my methods books, or something like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>I would go to an “excellent” school and visit their teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>I’m human, so first I would ask God for guidance and help. Second, I would consider my experience and personality. Third, perhaps I’d check a book I’ve read. Fourth, I might go to a library to check recent research and try to keep current in my field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea</td>
<td>I’d go to God first. Also, I’d talk to colleagues, then experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>I would first talk to my father and mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>I’d talk to several experienced teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 3**  

**SOURCE FOR ANSWERS REGARDING STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interviewee Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>First, there are two types of questions here. Consult the school psychologist if it deals with questions about an individual. Second, consult the administration if the question is about the format the school wishes to establish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>I'd check research on students and their needs. Also, talk to colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>I’d look at my textbooks and notes in general methods and in educational psychology. Also, I'd talk to certain teachers at my university, especially special education teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>I’d ask students what they thought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>I’d run a controlled experiment and interview parents of students and determine how their attitudes affect their children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>The same as for teacher. [I'm human, so first I would ask God for guidance and help. Second, I would consider my experience and personality. Third, perhaps I'd check a book I've read. Fourth, I might go to a library to check recent research and try to keep current in my field.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea</td>
<td>I’d go to God first. Also, I’d check with experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>I’d consider talking with other teachers in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>College Students!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions about the Curriculum: What should be the role of the curriculum in the classroom? Who and/or what should determine its content? What should be its purpose? Who should design it? How should it be presented? Which should be emphasized: knowledge that has personal importance to a student, or knowledge that is traditionally considered to be important for all citizens? Which should be emphasized: learning information that is important and useful in itself, or "learning to learn" (acquiring skills of reasoning, analyzing, organizing)? Should the emphasis be on building awareness and appreciation of the common culture or on celebrating cultural diversity? Is there a particular need that should dictate what is studied: legal, economic, social, academic, religious/spiritual, etc.? Should spiritual values be taught?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interviewee Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>You need to follow the chain of command here, but also consult the community to see what they need for their students. Consider the job market. Plan toward society’s goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>The superintendent. Maybe the school principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>The community along with the school’s desires and needs. Also, I’d check with the superintendent and principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>The school teachers of that particular school—my colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Check with local businesses—students need to be prepared for their lifework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>The same as for teacher. [I’m human, so first I would ask God for guidance and help. Second, I would consider my experience and personality. Third, perhaps I’d check a book I’ve read. Fourth, I might go to a library to check recent research and try to keep current in my field.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea</td>
<td>God first. Also, colleagues. Also, ministers and pastors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Consult the Paideia Proposal and textbooks on the subject being taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>See what a community’s interests and needs are. Also, talk to professionals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 5

**SOURCE FOR ANSWERS REGARDING CONTEXT**

*Questions about the Context: What should be the environment within the classroom? Should the mood be businesslike or casual? Should there even be a classroom? How should the individual classroom relate to the rest of the school and to the community? Is the best classroom highly structured or one that allows for great individuality and choice?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interviewee Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>I would consult with the department chair to find out what we're trying to set for goals for the class. The classroom should consider that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>My colleagues—what has worked for them. A teacher's personality determines a lot. I'd also want to talk to parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>I'd check notes taken during field experiences. Also, the notes from the classes when field experiences were discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>I'd get information within the school—the principal and teachers of that particular school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Schools of Excellence!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>The same as for teacher. [I'm human, so first I would ask God for guidance and help. Second, I would consider my experience and personality. Third, perhaps I'd check a book I've read. Fourth, I might go to a library to check recent research and try to keep current in my field.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea</td>
<td>God first; also colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>My Father!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>I would go to a school's counselor and also research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6
RANKING OF FIVE ASPECTS OF THE TOTAL COLLEGE PROGRAM FOR THE IMPORTANCE OF EACH IN ANSWERING THE COMMONPLACE QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interviewee Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amos | 1. Teaching methods courses  
2. Psychology/development-type courses  
3. Student teaching  
4. General college courses  
5. Foundations materials (I would first want to know what kind of school it was.) |
| Dee  | 1. Foundations materials  
2. Student teaching  
3. Teaching methods courses  
4. Psychology/development-type courses  
5. General college courses |
| Gerry | 1. Student teaching  
2. Teaching methods courses  
3. Psychology/development-type courses  
4. Foundations materials  
5. General college courses |
| John | 1. Teaching methods courses  
2. Student teaching  
3. Psychology/development-type courses  
4. Foundations materials  
5. General college courses |
| Leah | 1. Student teaching  
2. Psychology/development-type courses  
3. Foundations materials  
4. Teaching methods courses  
5. General college courses |
| Lena | 1. Foundations materials  
2. Teaching methods courses  
3. Psychology/development-type courses  
4. Student teaching  
5. General college courses |
| Rhea | 1. Foundations materials  
2. Psychology/development-type courses  
3. Teaching methods courses  
4. Student teaching  
5. General college courses |
| Sam  | 1. Foundations materials  
2. Student teaching  
3. Teaching methods courses  
4. Psychology/development-type courses ("real close behind teaching methods")  
5. General college courses |
| Tony | 1. Student teaching  
2. Foundations materials  
3. Psychology/development-type courses  
4. Teaching methods courses  
5. General college courses |
TABLE 7

INTERVIEWEE RANKING OF FOUR AREAS OF FOUNDATIONS MATERIALS FOR THE VALUE OF EACH IN ANSWERING THE COMMONPLACE QUESTIONS AND INTERVIEWEE TEACHING PREFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interviewee Ranking</th>
<th>Interviewee Teaching Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amos  | 1. Psychology of education  
2. Sociology of education  
3. Philosophy of education  
4. History of education   | Sociology—even though I feel psychology of education would help the most in understanding issues. I would take my students to different kinds of schools and in different areas, such as the inner-city. |
| Dee   | 1. Philosophy of education  
2. Psychology of education  
3. History of education  
4. Sociology of education | Psychology. I could do a lot of things with labs, hands-on experiences, and observation.        |
| Gerry | 1. History of education  
2. Philosophy of education  
3. Sociology of education  
4. Psychology of education | History (maybe psychology). I would teach it cooperatively. I'd also use lectures.              |
| John  | 1. Psychology of education  
2. Sociology of education  
3. Philosophy of education  
4. History of education | Psychology. It is the most interesting—I enjoy it—and it would be good to teach one you like. I'd relate it to everyday life. |
| Leah  | 1. Sociology of education  
2. Psychology of education  
3. Philosophy of education  
4. History of education | Sociology. I'd want to give a global perspective; I'd try to show where the U.S. might be in 10 years if it doesn't pull up its socks! |
| Lena  | 1. Sociology of education  
2. Psychology of education  
3. History of education  
4. Philosophy of education | Philosophy (partly because I had trouble with it, especially terms like epistemology). I'd base it around ideas of [the book] Education and show how it touches other philosophies. |
| Rhea  | 1. Psychology of education  
2. History of education  
3. Philosophy of education  
4. Sociology of education | Psychology. Introduction to the Teaching Profession helped me understand issues, but the sociology part "got lost" because there was too much material. |
| Sam   | 1. Philosophy of education  
2. Psychology of education  
3. History of education  
4. Sociology of education | Philosophy. I'd teach it by asking questions.                                                   |
| Tony  | 1. History of education  
2. Sociology of education  
3. Philosophy of education  
4. Psychology of education | Psychology. I'd present scenarios and talk about how to handle each situation. [A previous "ranking" appeared to be a, b, c, d.] |
TABLE 8
BASES OF FUTURE DECISIONS AND SHIFTS OF PERSPECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interviewee Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>Decision would be based on the needs of the students and how it would affect them. My perspectives would have to change sometimes. New circumstances or a new need could shape a new perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>Decisions for me would be based on my own experiences, as well as my colleagues’ experiences. Definitely, they could change. Experience and the reality of what happens would shape a change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>The basis for my decisions would be my own teaching experience, if I had some, along with other (experienced) teachers. Yes, I could change. Probably experience would shape a new perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>The basis would be research and talking to peers. Yes, my perspectives could change. Testing or trying out an idea in the classroom might change my thinking to a new idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Decisions would be based on what’s happening in the business world and in world conditions. Yes, definitely, I could change. I think new technological developments would shape a new perspective as much as anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>The basis of future decisions would be my Christian experience, Christ, the Bible, and current research. Yes, I could change my perspectives. The things that might shape a new perspective might be new evidence, thinking about it, reviewing what had worked, and knowing what didn’t work anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea</td>
<td>I’d base decisions on my experiences. Sure, I could change a perspective. A new perspective might be shaped by new experiences, new challenges, and new students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>I would make a decision based on my experience. My perspective might change, depending on my experience in education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Decisions would be based on meetings people’s needs (&quot;where they are&quot;) and adapting to students’ needs. Yes, I could change a perspective. Being exposed to other ideas, along with examining the &quot;sides&quot; of issues—these would shape a new perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9

#### SUMMARY: AMOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biographical Sketch</strong></td>
<td>Father is retired factory worker; mother was homemaker; youngest of six children; parents didn't finish high school; parents-in-law well-educated; raised in a large Eastern city until age 12; moved to country to prevent busing; involved in sports K-16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Interest in Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Interest did not apparently originate in family; had high school science teacher &amp; high school coach who got him interested in teaching, though Amos prefers teaching the intermediate grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspectives Regarding Program</strong></td>
<td>Perceived typicality: different than peers because of work experiences; also, transferred. Program instructors: identified with an instructor who taught him to observe children. Definition of foundations: abstract knowledge; shows the reasoning behind an idea. Foundations courses taken: intro., c &amp; i, devel. psych., sch. &amp; soc., methods, soc. ed. Grouping of courses: (1) book education, &amp; (2) hands-on. Ranking for preparedness: (1) student teaching, (2) psychology, (3) methods courses. Technical or liberal: liberal since student teaching—has seen need of broader view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shifts in Perspectives</strong></td>
<td>Not really a shift; more of an expansion or refinement of the ideas which were already there in his mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Perspectives Regarding Commonplaces</strong></td>
<td>Teachers: observation &amp; previous work experience. Students: working with, observing, &amp; talking to the kids he's worked with. Curriculum: doesn't know because everything is changing &amp; we don't know the future. Context: dealing with problem children &amp; seeing their reaction to certain situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis of Future Decisions</strong></td>
<td>Based on the needs of the student &amp; how something would affect students; new circumstances or needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique Traits; Comparison to Peers</strong></td>
<td>Even though Amos has completed his teacher education program, he is not at all sure he wants to teach—at least to have 30 students for 180 days—though he indicates he is seeking a teaching position. Of the nine preservice teachers I interviewed, Amos was the only one who appeared to be somewhat disenchanted with teaching. Amos asserts that he never had a really good teacher in his program. He was the only one to rate foundations materials last for their value in answering the commonplace questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 10**

**SUMMARY: DEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biographical Sketch</strong></td>
<td>Father is lower grades teacher; mother is R.N.; oldest of three children; parents adopted two Cree children; lived in Saskatchewan community with teacher-farmer uncles; parents encouraged reading; had to submit weekly TV viewing plan; taught swimming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Interest in Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Wasn't sure of major when beginning college; had many uncles &amp; aunts who were teachers; intermediate teacher still remembered as model; taught swimming lessons at local pool &amp; also summer camps; prefers teaching elementary grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspectives Regarding Program</strong></td>
<td>Perceived typicality: typical, but she looks for concepts more than facts—unlike peers. Program instructors: two—one for beliefs, other because is likeable &amp; flexible. Definition of foundations: the first classes in program, like psychology; methods classes. Foundations courses taken: all of her methods classes. Grouping of courses: (1) theory, &amp; (2) practical. Ranking for preparedness: (3) student teaching, (2) methods courses, (3) psychology. Technical or liberal: technical, because it helps one know how to manage a classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shifts in Perspectives</strong></td>
<td>She probably gives more attention to the curriculum; also, more aware of the teacher's role; in high school she just wanted to do her work on her own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Perspectives Regarding Commonplaces</strong></td>
<td>Teachers: K-12 teachers. Students: program field experiences. Curriculum: college classes. Context: last two years of college &amp; what she has seen in her field experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering the Commonplace Questions—General Source</strong></td>
<td>Teachers: student need; also, colleagues; she wouldn't consult books. Students: research on students &amp; their needs; also, colleagues. Curriculum: superintendent; perhaps the principal. Context: her colleagues—what has worked for them; a teacher's personality; her parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering the Commonplace Questions—Ranking Total College Program</strong></td>
<td>1. Foundations materials. 2. Student teaching. 3. Teaching methods courses. 4. Psychology type courses. 5. General college courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis of Future Decisions</strong></td>
<td>Her experiences &amp; those of her colleagues; the reality of what happens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique Traits; Comparison to Peers</strong></td>
<td>Dee is the only interviewee who was taught by one of her parents. She was selected for the &quot;Student Teacher of the Year&quot; award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Highlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biographical Sketch</strong></td>
<td>Father in trucking; mother in real estate office work; one younger brother; Disney &amp; Mickey Mouse fan; collects model horses; loves fiction books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Interest in Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Interest apparently not from family; always wanted to be a teacher; had both very good &amp; very bad teachers in elementary years; first of ninth grade, test showed aptitude for teaching; remembers high school history teacher as model; taught youth Bible class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspectives Regarding Program</strong></td>
<td>Perceived typicality: fairly typical. Program instructors: two—one for getting out into schools, other for similar thinking. Definition of foundations: teach what you need to know to be able to teach. Foundations courses taken: all of her teacher education courses, except the first—intro. Grouping of courses: (1) knowledge/background/definitions/ideas, &amp; (2) methods. Ranking for preparedness: (1) student teaching, (2) methods courses, (3) psychology. Technical or liberal: technical, because those are the things you do in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shifts in Perspectives</strong></td>
<td>Some has remained the same, but a lot has changed because of what she learned in college, including her field experiences. What works has a lot of influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Perspectives Regarding Commonplaces</strong></td>
<td>Teachers: the teachers she had in school, her college classes, &amp; field experiences. Students: college &amp; program field experiences, especially student teaching. Curriculum: a college class, but everybody pretty much agrees on what the basics are. Context: childhood experiences, plus field experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering the Commonplace Questions—General Source</strong></td>
<td>Teachers: the rest of her teaching team—her colleagues at school. Students: texts &amp; notes; certain program instructors, especially special ed teachers. Curriculum: the community; desires &amp; needs of school; superintendent &amp; principal. Context: notes of field experiences; also notes from discussions about field experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering the Commonplace Questions—Ranking Total College Program</strong></td>
<td>1. Student teaching. 2. Teaching methods courses. 3. Psychology type courses. 4. Foundations materials. 5. General college courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis of Future Decisions</strong></td>
<td>Her own teaching experience, if/when she had some, &amp; other (experienced) teachers; future experiences would be important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique Traits; Comparison to Peers</strong></td>
<td>Gerry expressed a far greater identity with fictional &amp; fantasy children’s literature than any of the other interviewees. She was the only interviewee whose first choice of a foundations area to teach was history, though psychology was a possibility, also.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12

SUMMARY: JOHN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biographical Sketch</strong></td>
<td>Father is retired police officer; mother is pharmacist; lived in same house on farm all of life; has older sister; active in high school sports; couldn’t watch TV during week; learned to enjoy reading; liked to sit &amp; think as a youngster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Interest in Teaching</strong></td>
<td>John’s grandmother thought he would be a minister or a teacher; became interested in teaching through fourth grade teacher who pushed him to do well; some male teachers later influenced his decision; prefers intermediate grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspectives Regarding Program</strong></td>
<td>Perceived typicality: different; participated more; felt he brought up important questions. Program instructors: one who understands teaching is a gift; can’t be learned from book. Definition of foundations: methods—where you learn how to teach a specific subject. Foundations courses taken: all of the courses in the teacher education program. Grouping of courses: (1) those with field/hands-on experiences, &amp; (2) those without. Ranking for preparedness: (1) student teaching, (2) methods courses, (3) psychology. Technical or liberal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shifts in Perspectives</strong></td>
<td>His ideas were more textbook-oriented. Now it’s hands-on, cooperative learning &amp; more use of technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering the Commonplace Questions—Ranking Total College Program</strong></td>
<td>1. Teaching methods courses. 2. Student teaching. 3. Psychology type courses. 4. Foundations materials. 5. General college courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis of Future Decisions</strong></td>
<td>Research &amp; talking with his peers. He would want to test a new perspective by trying it out in his classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique Traits; Comparison to Peers</strong></td>
<td>He is the only interviewee who felt that he had made an important contribution to his program by bringing up important questions. He is also the only one who identified with the concept that teaching is a gift &amp; which cannot be learned from a book.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 13

#### SUMMARY: LEAH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biographical Sketch</strong></td>
<td>Father was railroad man; mother is homemaker; would not ever disappoint her aunt; father was good at math &amp; a perfectionist; taught for three years after one year college; married &amp; became full time homemaker; had home-based business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Interest in Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Interest apparently not from family; after Canadian K-13 graduation, took one year teachers training course; taught for three years; after becoming single, work as accountant; came back to college when about 50; prefers teaching elementary grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspectives Regarding Program</strong></td>
<td>Perceived typicality: different; her students' parents were good parents, though poor. Program instructors: one who made class time count &amp; who taught practical things. Definition of foundations: they provide teachers with a look at what they're getting into. Foundations courses taken: intro. class, reading classes, methods, art &amp; music apprec'n. Grouping of courses: (1) theoretical, &amp; (2) practical. Ranking for preparedness: (1) student teaching, (2) methods courses, (3) psychology. Technical or liberal: technical, but teachers still need to know what the issues are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shifts in Perspectives</strong></td>
<td>Her student teaching has shown her the benefits of positive reinforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering the Commonplace Questions—General Source</strong></td>
<td>Teachers: go to an excellent school &amp; talk to the teachers there. Students: run control experiment; interview parents—how their attitudes affect children. Curriculum: businesses because students need to be prepared for their lifeworks. Context: schools of excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering the Commonplace Questions—Ranking Total College Program</strong></td>
<td>1. Student teaching. 2. Psychology type courses. 3. Foundations materials. 4. Teaching methods courses. 5. General college classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis of Future Decisions</strong></td>
<td>What's happening in the business world &amp; in world conditions. New technological developments might also bring about new perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique Traits; Comparison to Peers</strong></td>
<td>She was almost 30 years older than any of the other interviewees, except one, having come back to college in her late 40s. Back in the early 1960s she had taught for three years after taking a one-year Canadian training program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 14
**SUMMARY: LENA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biographical Sketch</strong></td>
<td>Father is retired upper elementary teacher; mother is homemaker &amp; was teacher's aide/bus driver; youngest of five children; lived in same house since she was about six; was tomboy in all-boy neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Interest in Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Wanted to be teacher since she can remember; loved to play school when young; at about 11 or 12 taught niece to read; enjoyed helping her primary grades teacher (still Lena's favorite) after school while waiting for father; prefers teaching elementary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspectives Regarding Program</strong></td>
<td>Perceived typicality: typical; she felt she had similar expectations &amp; requirements. Program instructors: three—(1) loves what she does; (2) tries new things; (3) caring. Definition of foundations: a framework that gives ideas; what the latest trends are. Foundations courses taken: methods, intro., class., mgmt., first days of school. Grouping of courses: (1) methods/how-to classes, &amp; (2) misc./basics/foundations. Ranking for preparedness: (1) general college courses, (2) psychology, (3) student teaching. Technical or liberal: liberal, if she had to choose; she sees importance of both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shifts in Perspectives</strong></td>
<td>Learning about the whole language approach caused a big shift. She now sees the importance of education continuing after finishing school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering the Commonplace Questions—General Source</strong></td>
<td>Teachers: (1) ask God, (2) her experience &amp; personality, (3) books &amp; research. Students: same as for teachers. Curriculum: same as for teachers. Context: same as for teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering the Commonplace Questions—Ranking Total College Program</strong></td>
<td>1. Foundations materials. 2. Teaching methods courses. 3. Psychology type courses. 4. Student teaching. 5. General college courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis of Future Decisions</strong></td>
<td>Her Christian experience, the Bible, &amp; current research. She would want to weigh evidence, think about it, &amp; review what had worked &amp; didn't work anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique Traits; Comparison to Peers</strong></td>
<td>She is the only interviewee to rank her general college courses first for their value in helping her to become a good teacher; she also ranked teaching methods last. She was also the only one to cite an 1800s book, <em>Education</em>, as one she would love to use if she ever taught a philosophy of education class (and she had trouble with its terms when she took it). She was the only one who stated she had loved to play school at an early age.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 15
SUMMARY: RHEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biographical Sketch</td>
<td>Father was factory worker; mother did domestic work; second oldest of five children; close-knit family &amp; active in church; is being prepared for pastoral ministry &amp; will soon receive ordination; reading was important when small—had trips to library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Interest in Teaching</td>
<td>Interest apparently not from home; strongly influenced by fourth grade teacher (whom she still sees occasionally); may combine elementary teaching with ministry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives Regarding Program</td>
<td>Perceived typicality: different, because of background—hadn’t been to Christian schools. Program instructors: three—noted sincerity, dedication, inspiration, going the extra mile. Definition of foundations: basically what education is about; shows anatomy of teaching. Foundations courses taken: all methods, intro. to tchg., princ. of tchg., except. child. Grouping of courses: (1) understand the concept of teaching, &amp; (2) the methods. Ranking for preparedness: (1) methods courses, (2) student tchg., (3) found. materials. Technical or liberal: technical; but would prefer to have a mixture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifts in Perspectives</td>
<td>She is now seeing that some parents are neglecting their responsibilities &amp; as a result teachers are having to substitute for the parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Perspectives Regarding Commonplaces</td>
<td>Teachers: teachers she had previously. Students: various teachers; her parents &amp; home training. Curriculum: educators, parents, people in authority, &amp; ministers. Context: subbing experiences; also, the materials a teacher uses or presents to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering the Commonplace Questions—General Source</td>
<td>Teachers: God first; also, colleagues; then experts. Students: God first; also, experts. Curriculum: God first; also, colleagues; also, ministers &amp; pastors. Context: God first; also, colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering the Commonplace Questions—Ranking Total College Program</td>
<td>1. Foundations materials. 2. Psychology type courses. 3. Teaching methods courses. 4. Student teaching. 5. General college courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of Future Decisions</td>
<td>Her experiences—new experiences, new challenges, &amp; new students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Traits; Comparison to Peers</td>
<td>Rhea is the only interviewee who, besides classroom teaching, is planning for a spiritual pastoral ministry. She is also the only one who ranked teaching methods courses as her most valuable preparation for teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 16

**SUMMARY: SAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biographical Sketch</strong></td>
<td>Father is college teacher; mother is primary grades teacher; oldest of four children; took family camping trips; had lots of club activities; plays saxophone; parents had allowance policy; had trips to library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Interest in Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Had graduated with major in telecommunications; saw ad about teaching while working at TV station; started subbing; started master's program to work toward certification; greatly admires &amp; accepts parent's advice; prefers teaching secondary science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspectives Regarding Program</strong></td>
<td>Perceived typicality: different; no one else in program seems interested in phil. of ed. Program instructors: one instructor was an actual high school teacher &amp; very practical. Definition of foundations: survey—gives history, sociology, &amp; philosophy of the field. Foundations courses taken: foundations in education (covered hist., phil., &amp; sociol.). Grouping of courses: (1) foundations, (2) practical, methods courses. Ranking for preparedness: (1) student teaching, (2) general college courses, (3) methods. Technical or liberal: he does not lean either way; but, teachers must understand issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shifts in Perspectives</strong></td>
<td>The Paidia Proposal concepts were a big turning point for him in his understanding of education &amp; its goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answering the Commonplace Questions—Ranking Total College Program</strong></td>
<td>1. Foundations materials. 2. Student teaching. 3. Teaching methods courses. 4. Psychology type courses. 5. General college courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis of Future Decisions</strong></td>
<td>Based on his experience in education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique Traits; Comparison to Peers</strong></td>
<td>Sam is the only interviewee who has two parents who are teachers; he is the only one whose father has a Ph.D. in philosophy of education. Sam is the only interviewee who identified with Mortimer J. Adler &amp; his Paidia Proposal. He is the only one who already had a four-year college degree in another field but decided to work on teaching certification. (He feels that his previous degree in telecommunications was not an education, in its fullest sense.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 17
SUMMARY: TONY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biographical Sketch</td>
<td>Father not part of Tony's life; mother is housekeeper &amp; seamstress; raised by grandmother; has two half sisters; worked at large tourist hotel in native Bermuda as pool attendant &amp; child counselor; sponsored in program by Bermuda government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Interest in Teaching</td>
<td>Interest not apparently from home; no male role model in early life; wanted to help others like that; first planned to take psychology; switched to education; fondly recalls high school math teacher; prefers teaching elementary grades; active in Big Brothers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives Regarding Program</td>
<td>Perceived typicality: different; his student teaching was done with another student. Program instructors: two—one, very professional; the other, personal &amp; interested. Definition of foundations: classes that give general ideas/principles/building blocks. Foundations courses taken: he mentions five, plus all the methods courses. Grouping of courses: (1) how to transfer knowledge, &amp; (2) how to relate to students. Ranking for preparedness: (1) student teaching, (2) psychology, (3) foundtn. materials. Technical or liberal: liberal; more open idea; students can learn to think for themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifts in Perspectives</td>
<td>He doesn’t think there’s been much of a shift in his attitudes about students &amp; teachers. His program has possibly reaffirmed what he already believed about those things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Perspectives Regarding Commonplaces</td>
<td>Teachers: working with children &amp; students; student teaching seminar. Students: it’s hard for him to say; his church has had a lot of influence. Curriculum: the interests &amp; needs of a given community. Context: observing in different classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering the Commonplace Questions—General Source</td>
<td>Teachers: several experienced teachers. Students: college students. Curriculum: a community’s interests &amp; needs; also, professionals. Context: a school’s counselor; also, research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering the Commonplace Questions—Ranking Total College Program</td>
<td>1. Student teaching. 2. Psychology type courses. 3. Foundations materials. 4. Teaching methods courses. 5. General college courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of Future Decisions</td>
<td>Being able to meet people’s needs where they are &amp; adapting to students’ needs. Being exposed to other ideas &amp; examining the different sides of an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Traits; Comparison to Peers</td>
<td>Tony is the only interviewee who had no significant male in his early life. He is the only one for whom the major responsibility for his rearing was with his grandmother. He is the only one financially sponsored by his government. He is the only interviewee who had the responsibility to take care of &amp; entertain the children of tourist guests. Tony is the only one who is active with Big Brothers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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