NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

The Moral Atmosphere of the Classroom: A Critique of Teaching in the American Public Schools according to the Moral Theories of Noddings and Kohlberg

Warren Duff

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Educational Studies

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Arts at

Concordia University

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

June 1992

ISBN 0-315-87259-4

Canada

ABSTRACT

The Moral Atmosphere of the Classroom: A Critique of Teaching in the American Public Schools according to the Moral Theories of Noddings and Kohlberg

Warren Duff

This study presents a composite picture of teaching in the Public Schooling System in the United states. It does this, through an examination of relevant literature, with respect to the structure and practice of teaching, and the preparation of teachers in teacher-training institutions.

The findings are then critiqued, according to the moral theories of Nel Noddings and Lawrence Kohlberg, in order to ascertain the possibilities for moral education within the schools.

The study also includes a separate discussion (and critique according to the same moral theories) of several schools, also within the public schooling system, considered to be unusually successful.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. William Knitter, for his critical reading of this paper, as well as for his guidance and kind suggestions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	MORAL THEORIES OF NODDINGS AND KOHLBERG	9
	Noddings' Theory of Moral Development	9
	The One-Caring	10
	The Ethical Ideal	11
	The One Cared-For	12
	Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development	15
	The Foundations of the Theory	15
	The Stages	16
	Form, Content, and the Principle of Justice	20
	Role-Taking and Cognitive-Moral Conflict	22
	The Significance of the Stages	25
3.	THE STRUCTURE OF TEACHING	29
	School Reform and the Structure of Teaching	29
	The Structure of Teaching and the Classroom	35
	The Emphasis of Teaching	37
	The Cellular Arrangement of Teaching	39
	Teachers' Relations with Significant Others	44
4.	THE PRACTICE OF TEACHING	50
	Group Control	50
	The 'Lecture and Recitation' Approach	53
	Tracking	63

Page

5. THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS 73

The Historical Context 73

The Present Status of Teacher Education 77

The Content of Teacher Education 80

Teacher Education and the Reality of the Classroom 87

6. CRITIQUE OF TEACHING ACCORDING TO THE THEORIES OF NODDINGS AND KOHLBERG 96

Implications for Moral Education According to Noddings 96

The School's Primary Responsibility 96

School Organization and the Caring Ethic 101

Implications for Moral Education According to Kohlberg 109

Kohlberg's Position 109

'The Crowds, the Praise, and the Power' and Conventional Morality 110

School Democracy and Moral Education . . . 113

The 'Hidden Curriculum' and Moral Education 115

Kohlberg's Aims for Moral Education Restated 119

Studies Using Kohlberg's Methods 123

Critique of Teaching According to Noddings . . . 128

The Structure of Teaching: The Hierarchical Arrangement of Teaching and the Caring Ethic 128

The Practice of Teaching: 'Lecture and Recitation' and the Caring Ethic 131

Tracking and the Caring Ethic 134

Page

Teacher Preparation and the Caring Ethic 136

Critique of Teaching According to Kohlberg . . . 142

Introductory Remarks 142

The Structure of Teaching: The Schools and Conventional Morality 143

The Practice of Teaching: 'Lecture and Recitation' and Tracking 148

Kohlberg and Teacher Training 150

The 'Hidden Curriculum 152

7. SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS 160

Introductory Remarks 160

Overview of the Schools 162

Teaching Practices 164

Leadership 168

Critique according to Noddings 170

Critique according to Kohlberg 172

8. CONCLUDING REMARKS 177

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 183

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A general criticism of American education in the press and educational literature is that the public schooling system is in a state of crisis; one which Goodlad (1984) says may be threatening its very survival. It is a crisis which, in the United States, is reflected in a widespread disaffection with schooling, based on the contention, among most parents teachers, and administrators, as well as both conservative and radical critics, that the schools have failed to educate (Aronowitz and Giroux, 1985). Issues in the crisis have to do, for example, with charges related to educational goals and expectations - that they are excessively focused on cognitive development rather than on the development of the whole person as they purport to be. Other issues have to do with a loss of credibility in the system of meritocracy, which continues to discriminate against minority students and those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds.

The criticisms underlying and informing this charge of crisis involve many dimensions of schooling. The general question of this thesis is whether this sense of crisis is fair or misplaced. Since a full treatment of all dimensions

of schooling is beyond the scope of this thesis, the discussion limits itself to one central dimension, namely teaching. It does this by examining the state of schooling with respect to three aspects of teaching; the structure of teaching, the practice of teaching, and the preparation of teachers. Accordingly, a composite picture of teaching is drawn along the lines of these three aspects. The general question is then focused on a critique of the composite picture. Since, however, an all-inclusive critique of even those aspects of teaching comprising the composite picture is well beyond the scope of this thesis, it confines itself to one dimension of critique, namely, the moral dimension. Specifically, the critique seeks to examine the moral atmosphere of the school and classroom.

Teaching has been made the focus of the discussion because, in the final analysis, it is the teacher who is the key figure in the educational enterprise. It is the teacher with whom the school child spends the vast majority of time throughout the schooling years. It is also the teacher through whom is transmitted most of what the school system has to offer educationally to the child. Each of the areas discussed - the structure of teaching, the practice of teaching, and the preparation of teachers - is shown to play a crucial role in determining the kind and quality of teaching relations in the school, relations not only between teachers and students, but between teachers and all significant others:

school administrators, other teachers, parents, and any other adults with an interest in the educational process.

The critique following the composite picture forms the central purpose of the paper. It focuses, as mentioned above, on one dimension of critique, namely, the moral atmosphere of the school and classroom. This is done with a view to determining the possibilities for moral education within the public schooling system. The writer considers the approach both legitimate and fair. This contention is based on the understanding that the views which comprise the central discussion of the critique - those of the moral theorists Nel Noddings and Lawrence Kohlberg - raise strong arguments to the effect that all education, in so far as it is concerned with human growth and development, has immediate, direct, and far-reaching implications for the moral development of children.

Kohlberg has been chosen because, according to R.S. Peters (1981), his is the most important theory of moral development to date. It is a theory which, according to its author, has been proven through extensive and wide empirical research in a diversity of cultural settings throughout the world.

Noddings' theory has been chosen because it represents, by her own admission, a specifically 'feminine' alternative to Kohlberg's 'male' approach to morality, and, in fact, purports to make up for a serious lack in Kohlberg's theory, namely, its failure to provide for an adequate treatment of the

affective side of moral development.

Kohlberg's theory is based upon psychological developmental 'stages', through which all children pass, and do so in the same order of progression, regardless of race or cultural background. It is a view of moral development founded upon moral reasoning from lower, more elementary concepts, to higher, more sophisticated ones, toward the refinement of an understanding and practice of moral principles, culminating in a fully autonomous morality based on justice. Kohlberg's approach, though it does not exclude the affective side of moral development, does not adequately provide for it.

Noddings' approach does provide for the affective dimension, through an approach which she calls 'caring'. It is an approach which not only does not dwell upon moral principles, but which, contrary to Kohlberg's, takes a clear position opposed to principles altogether. The caring ethic is one which resides entirely at the heart of a one-to-one relationship between the one-caring and the one cared-for. In the context of this paper, the caring relationship is that between the teacher and the child.

Thus, the two theories between them provide for both the male and female, the rational and affective, approaches to moral issues and development. Equally important, however, both theories were formulated with a direct and explicit focus on the educational process, and especially on relations

between the teacher and the child. In addition, both theories either deal directly with, or have important implications for, not only teaching practices and teacher-student relations, but also for the structure of teaching, and the preparation of teachers. Finally, though the approaches and emphases of the two theories diverge greatly, they nevertheless share crucial common grounds in areas of teaching practice, which have a direct and vital bearing on teaching relations generally, and particularly those between the teacher and the child.

With regard to the composite picture of teaching, sources which are descriptive, and which are themselves founded on empirical research, have been made central to the discussion. Lortie's (1975) study, for example, the findings of which are reflected in a number of more recent studies cited in the discussion, elucidates, among other things, the structure of teaching relations, especially with reference to the important 'cellular' arrangement of teaching. This arrangement is seen as one which has fundamental and far-reaching implications for teaching practice within the classroom, as well as for teaching relations generally. Goodlad's (1984) broad and extensive analysis of teaching practices in over 1000 classrooms in all major school settings across the United States both speaks to, and extends upon, Lortie's and others' findings with respect to teaching structure and practice in the public schools. Persell (1977), whose study analyzes the underlying structures, both within and outside the school,

which create inequality in the educational process, has been chosen for this discussion because she deals at length and in depth with the nature, extent, and consequences of discrimination against minority students and those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. She does this specifically in terms of teaching practices, as well as with respect to relations between teachers and students in the classroom. On the issue of teacher preparation, authors such as Giroux (in Popkewitz, 1987), Parker (1989), Goodlad et al. (1990), and Sarason (1986) discuss such topics as: the origin and status of teacher-education departments in universities, especially in research universities; the quality of teacher education; and the impact of teacher training on the ideological orientation of prospective teachers - all with a view to how these factors come ultimately to bear on the school and classroom.

Chapter 2 establishes the perspective of the paper with an explication of the moral theories of Noddings and Kohlberg. This explication is given by way of introducing the fundamental elements of both theories, but without going into their implications for moral education itself. These will be taken up later in the chapter on critique.

Chapter 3 initiates the discussion of the first part of the composite picture of teaching, that is, the structure of teaching. It deals with the kind of authority arrangement which has traditionally characterized teaching relations in

the public schooling system of the United States, and which, it is argued, continues to characterize them today. That structure is described as one which is essentially hierarchical, that is, in which the higher legislates to the lower. It is seen as an arrangement of authority in which teachers typically continue to be regarded as subordinate employees of school boards, whose job is to carry out the directives of their employer.

Chapter 4 takes up the second part of the discussion of the composite picture. It deals with the issues of teaching practices and teacher attitudes. These are factors seen to have a direct and crucial bearing upon relations generally between teachers and students in the classroom, upon classroom behavior, and hence upon students' images of themselves.

Chapter 5 completes the composite picture with a discussion of teacher-training institutions. This involves such things as an examination of the development of these institutions, their status on university campuses, and their orientation to teacher training. Also discussed is how they prepare prospective teachers to meet and deal with the realities they will later encounter in the school classroom.

Chapter 6 begins with a discussion of the implications of the theories of Noddings and Kohlberg for moral education. The discussion then moves into the critique of teaching in the three areas making up the composite picture: the structure of teaching, teaching practice, and the preparation of teachers.

Each of these elements is given a separate critique.

Chapter 7 presents a discussion of several schools in the public schooling system considered to be unusually successful. This discussion has been included, not so much in an attempt to redress or refute the picture drawn and the conclusions arrived at in the preceding critique, as to provide for a brief look at several schools which, in the writer's opinion, do indeed appear to move considerably beyond expectations for moral education in the public schooling system generally. This discussion also contains its own critique according to Noddings and Kohlberg.

To recapitulate, the paper proposes, a) through a study of relevant literature, to draw a composite picture of teaching in the American public schooling system, with respect to the structure and practice of teaching, and the preparation of teachers and, b) to critique those findings relative to the schools' possibilities for moral education, according to the moral theories of Noddings and Kohlberg. Secondly, the paper discusses and critiques several schools within the public schooling system considered to be unusually successful.

CHAPTER 2

THE MORAL THEORIES OF NODDINGS AND KOHLBERG

This chapter discusses the main elements of the Caring Ethic of Noddings and the Stage theory of Kohlberg. It does this by way of establishing the perspective of the paper with respect to the three subsequent chapters devoted to the drawing of the composite picture of public schooling in the United States. The discussion of the educational implications of both theories is not, however, taken up in this chapter, but is left, for the sake of greater coherence, to the chapter (Chapter 6) critiquing the composite picture.

Noddings' Theory of Moral Development

Noddings (1984) proposes her theory of moral development as an alternative, and more specifically feminine, view to that of Kohlberg's, which she sees as lacking a necessary affective component. Her ethic of caring is based in a one-to-one relationship, which is described as the one-caring and the one cared-for (As a matter of convenience the discussion of Noddings' theory will adhere to that author's use of the feminine when speaking of the one-caring and the masculine

when referring to the one cared-for). Without this relationship, which is always one-to-one, caring does not exist. The two parties in this relationship have characteristics peculiar to each. It is essentially these characteristics of the one-caring and the one cared-for which define the ethic of caring.

The One-Caring

Caring can, of course, be directed toward non-living things, but it is primarily with caring in relation to living things - and specifically people - that this discussion is concerned. The key element in caring, from the perspective of the one-caring is what Noddings (1984) calls 'engrossment'.

Engrossment is the ability in the one-caring to 'feel with' the other. This 'feeling with' the other has nothing to do with putting oneself in the shoes of the other in terms of analysis or projection. Rather, as Noddings says,

> I set aside my temptation to analyze and to plan. . . . I receive the other into myself, and I see and feel with the other (Noddings; 1984: 30).

Engrossment involves entering into a feeling mode. Noddings (1984) explains that 'feeling with' (being engrossed in) the other involves a shift of motivation in the one-caring, away from an attempt to transform the world, to allowing oneself to be transformed. Noddings (1984) compares engrossment with the state of being 'seized' such as precedes

the act of creation in the artist. She says,

> It is a lateral move of some sort . . . qualitatively different from the analytic-objective mode in which we impose structure on the world. It is a precreative mode characterized by outer quietude and inner voices and images, by absorption and sensory concentration. The one so engrossed is listening, looking, feeling (Noddings; 1984: 34).

Noddings (1984) does not exclude analysis from the caring relationship, but she takes pains to show its place in caring. One cannot remain indefinitely in the feeling mode. Analysis must indeed enter as the one-caring responds to the one cared-for, as when there is a problem to be solved. The important thing, however, is that such analysis never lose sight of the person of the cared-for, lest, in attempting to help the one cared-for, one's objective thinking should become lost in abstraction and the one-caring end up caring for the problem rather than the person.

The Ethical Ideal

The core of the caring ethic - Noddings (1984) prefers this word to morality - is the ethical ideal. It springs from a natural capacity to care founded and developed in one's best memories of caring and being cared for, and out of which one forms a picture of oneself. Noddings defines the ethical ideal as follows:

> The ethical ideal is an active relation between one's actual self and ideal self as

> one-caring and one cared-for. It is this ideal which enables one both to utilize one's natural capacity to care, and, when necessary, to extend it in order to move toward the stranger and to treat that stranger as oneself. It is an ideal founded and nurtured in the idea of relatedness . . . that which connects me naturally to the other, reconnects me through the other to myself. . . . It is this caring that sustains me when caring for the other fails, and it is this caring that enables me to surpass my actual uncaring self in the direction of caring (Noddings; 1984: 49-50).

The ethical ideal produces and sustains what Noddings (1984) calls the 'I must' of caring; that quality which compels one to move toward the other in spite of doubts, aversion, or apathy. The ethic of caring is not founded on any ultimate concept of right or wrong. In the end the one-caring may never know whether what she did was right. But she is willing to humble herself in the face of uncertainty, refusing to take refuge in an abstraction - in the form of principles - in order to justify whatever action she may undertake in respect of the one cared-for.

The One Cared-For

The caring relationship is by definition one of inequality; the one cared-for needs something from the one-caring, but not vice versa. However, for the caring relationship to be complete the one-caring must be received by the one cared-for. In other words, the one cared-for must reciprocate. Noddings (1984) speaks of the one cared-for

mainly in terms of the mother-child and teacher-student relationships. Thus, the teacher, for example, receives the child in such a way that she ". . . assumes a dual perspective and can see things from both her own pole and that of the cared-for (Noddings; 1984: 63)." Noddings, drawing on the thinking of Martin Buber, calls this perspective 'inclusion'. It is through inclusion that the caring goes beyond mere acceptance of the cared-for to the crucial fostering of what Martin Buber calls 'confirmation'. Noddings says,

> It is only through inclusion that the parent or teacher can practice confirmation. I must see the cared-for as he is and as he might be - as he envisions his best self - in order to confirm him. . . . Confirmation does not 'accept' and shrug off. It accepts, embraces, and leads upward. It questions, it responds, it sympathizes, it challenges, it delights (Noddings; 1984: 67).

If the one cared-for does not apprehend the caring, does not recognize it, or rejects it, then there is no caring relationship no matter what transpires on the side of the one-caring. Thus, there is an intimate and all-important interdependence between the one-caring and the one cared-for, based on the recognition and acceptance of the caring. This necessary reciprocation on the part of the one cared-for maintains the caring relationship, preventing the caring from turning back on itself in self-preoccupation, and becoming counterproductive.

The inherent dependency of the caring relationship on the reciprocity of the one cared-for creates a dilemma for the

one-caring. On the one hand a weak commitment to the ethical ideal can cause the one-caring (particularly with respect to those remote from her natural caring) to forsake her ethical ideal and turn away from the other, and perhaps take refuge in rules and rationalizations. On the other hand, it creates an unavoidable vulnerability in her. An unscrupulous other can use the caring against the one-caring for harm; that other may even destroy a weak ethical ideal in the one-caring.

In maintaining that the caring ethic is a specifically feminine approach to morality Noddings does not mean to imply that caring cannot be practiced by men, but simply that women are by nature (being biologically oriented toward nurturing and caring) better equipped to approach morality in this fashion.

Since caring does not proceed from principles imposed upon a situation, it seeks to fully understand the situation by moving toward the concrete. Noddings (1984) contrasts the approach of the caring ethic from a principled ethic very clearly in her description of Abraham's dilemma in the face of being directed by God to kill his own son in order to prove his devotion. For Noddings such a situation would be an absolute impossibility from the perspective of a caring ethic. She maintains that only a God projected out of a male ego could demand such a sacrifice from a person. Noddings does not see Abraham's decision to kill his son as an enlightened one, and any God who would demand such a sacrifice would not

be God, but a violent egoist. Such, for Nodding, is the ultimate blindness of an ethic based on judgement.

Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development

The Foundations of the Theory

Kohlberg (1975) explains that his Stage theory of moral development is based on the developmental ideas of John Dewey and the stages of logical reasoning of Piaget. Specifically, he took the three levels of psychological development posited by Dewey, namely what Dewey called the premoral or preconventional level, the conventional level, and the autonomous level, and divided each into two stages, to be described presently. From Piaget he took the three stages of logical reasoning: the intuitive stage, the concrete operational stage, and the formal operational stage, and incorporated them with his treatment of Dewey's developmental levels. Kohlberg says,

> The approach is called cognitive because it recognizes that moral education, like intellectual education, has its basis in stimulating the active thinking of the child about moral issues and decisions. It is called developmental because it sees the aims of moral education as a movement through moral stages (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 176).

Kohlberg defines the moral stages as "structures of moral

judgement or moral reasoning (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 179)." Though he does not see judgement as the only component of moral behavior he maintains that it is the single most important factor yet discovered in moral behavior (Purpel and Ryan 1976).

The theory's claim to legitimacy is based on a fifteen year study of seventy-five boys in Chicago, (and validated by further empirical studies in several Asian cultural settings), whose ages, at the beginning of the study ranged from ten to sixteen years. Kohlberg (1981) claims, also based on empirical evidence, that the Stages of moral development are culturally invariant, and that the order in which they occur is the only logical one, because of the order of the concepts underlying them. In other words, the order of these concepts proceeds from one of lesser to greater maturity, and, according to Kohlberg (1981), could not be otherwise.

The Stages

Kohlberg elucidates the six stages of moral development as follows (Mischel; 1971: 164-65):

1. Preconventional level

> At this level the child is responsive to cultural rules and labels of good and bad, right or wrong, but interprets these labels in terms of either the physical or the hedonistic consequences of action (punishment, reward, exchange of favors), or in terms of the physical power of those who enunciate the rules and labels. The level is divided into

the following two stages:

Stage 1: The punishment and obedience orientation. The physical consequences of action determine its goodness or badness regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences. Avoidance of punishment and unquestioning deference to power are valued in their own right, not in terms of respect for an underlying moral order supported by punishment and authority (the latter being stage 4).

Stage 2: The instrumental relativist orientation. Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfies one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others. Human relations are viewed in terms like those of the market place. Elements of fairness, or reciprocity, and of equal sharing are present, but they are always interpreted in a physical pragmatic way. Reciprocity is a matter of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours," not of loyalty, gratitude, or justice.

II. Conventional level

At this level, maintaining the expectations of the individual's family, group, or nation is perceived as valuable in its own right, regardless of immediate and obvious consequences. The attitude is not only one of conformity to personal expectations and social order, but of loyalty to it, of actively maintaining, supporting, and justifying the order, and of identifying with the persons or group involved in it. At this level, there are the following two stages:

Stage 3: The interpersonal concordance of "good boy - nice girl" orientation. Good behavior is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them. There is much conformity to stereotypical images of what is majority or "natural" behavior. Behavior is frequently judged by intention - "he means well" becomes important for the first time. One earns approval by being "nice."

Stage 4: The "law and order" orientation. There is orientation toward

authority, fixed rules, and the maintenance of the social order. Right behavior consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social order for it's own sake.

III. Postconventional, autonomous, or principled level

At this level, there is a clear effort to define moral values and principles which have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles, and apart from the individual's own identification with these groups. This level again has two stages:

Stage 5: The social-contract legalistic orientation, generally with utilitarian overtones. Right action tends to be defined in terms of general individual rights, and standards which have been critically examined and agreed upon by the whole society. There is a clear awareness of the relativism of personal values and opinions and a corresponding emphasis upon procedural rules for reaching consensus. Aside from what is constitutionally and democratically agreed upon, the right is a matter of personal "values" and "opinion." The result is an emphasis upon the "legal point of view," but with an emphasis upon the possibility of changing law in terms of rational considerations of social utility (rather than freezing it in terms of stage 4 "law and order"). Outside the legal realm, free agreement and contract is the binding element of obligation. This is the "official" morality of the American government and constitution.

Stage 6: The universal ethical principle orientation. Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen ethical principles appealing to logical comprehensiveness, universality, and consistency. These principles are abstract and ethical (the golden Rule, the categorical imperative); they are not concrete moral rules like the Ten commandments. At heart, these are universal principles of justice, of the reciprocity and equality of human rights, and of respect for the dignity of human beings as

individual persons.

The relation of the moral Stages to cognitive development has to do with the fact, according to Kohlberg (Mosher 1980), that cognitive development puts a ceiling on moral reasoning, and hence on moral behavior. Speaking of Piaget's three stages of logical reasoning (mentioned above) Kohlberg says,

> A person whose logical stage is only concrete operational is limited to the preconventional moral stages (Stages 1 and 2). A person whose logical stage is only partially formal operational is limited to the conventional moral stages (Stages 3 and 4). While logical development is necessary for moral development and sets limits to it, most individuals are higher in logical stage than they are in moral stage (Mosher; 1980: 25).

Around the age of seven children enter the stage of concrete thought, and so, from age seven until adolescence their moral reasoning is limited to the Preconventional Stages. During early adolescence the individual's thinking is only partially formal operational, and thus, moral reasoning is limited to the Conventional Stages. After that, in late adolescence, moral reasoning may advance to the Postconventional Level (Stages 5 and 6). However, as was pointed out above, moral Stage is not defined by the level of logical thought. For example, Kohlberg maintains that, while his longitudinal studies in Israel, Turkey and the United States confirmed that Stage 5 was a natural stage of development, ". . . only a small minority of adults, even of college graduates, reached the fifth stage (Mosher; 1980: 27)."

Form, Content, and the Principle of Justice

Moral development through the Stages involves both a moral form and a moral content: that is, form and content in moral reasoning. To demonstrate the difference between form and content, Kohlberg (1987) cites the responses of children from different cultures (Taiwanese and American) at the same level of moral reasoning (Stage 2), to a moral dilemma about whether a husband should steal a drug to save his wife's life. Whereas Taiwanese children typically will reason that the husband should steal the drug because if his wife dies there will be an expensive funeral, American children at the same level will agree with stealing the drug because, for example, the man needs his wife to cook and look after the children. It can be seen here that, though the content of the reasoning in the two cases is different, the same pragmatic reasoning characterizes each; that is, the form of the reasoning in the two cases is identical.

However, for Kohlberg (1981) it is the form of moral reasoning which is of paramount importance, since it involves the orientation to morality, that is, the individual's attitudes towards moral behavior. Furthermore, the form of moral reasoning is universal, whereas the content of morality isn't. It is an orientation which reaches its culmination in a principled morality (Stage 6), rather than in a set of fixed and rigid rules. The content of morality, the actual

following of rules, issues naturally from the form of morality. Kohlberg (1981) maintains that the form of morality cannot be taught didactically, since it involves the gaining of personal insights into one's own behavior, and not the mere learning of a set of behavioral rules. It (the form of morality) can only occur through the individual's contact with and involvement in the social environment. At best the form of morality can be stimulated through an environment - with morally integrated adults - conducive to moral development. Though Kohlberg concedes that the content of morality can be taught, such teaching is useless, because all one ends up with is a 'bag of virtues' (Kohlberg 1981); that is, with a lot of habits that don't form a general guide to behavior, because habits are situation specific. Such habits preclude the operation of intelligence, and thus are useless as a guide to moral behavior. The essence and goal of moral development is the grasping and applying of the higher order principles (e.g., the Golden Rule, the categorical imperative), which Kohlberg (Mischel 1971) points out are really universal principles of justice; justice being the foundation of Kohlbergian morality. Speaking of the principle of justice, Joy (1983) quotes Kohlberg as follows:

> We shall claim that human welfare is always the core of morality but that . . . welfare considerations subsumed under the heading "justice" take priority over other "principles" for considering welfare whenever there is conflict between the two, and that there is no strong "principle" for deciding between the various welfare alternatives other

> than justice. We . . . take the word "justice" to mean a moral resolution of competing claims, that is, a reference to a method of distributing or defining claims. . . (Joy; 1983: 50).

In other words, when the issue comes down to one human life or issue against another, it is the principle of justice which decides which it shall be.

The cognitive-developmental approach to morality maintains that moral reasoning is basic to, and underscores, the development of moral action. The child's development through the moral Stages is a development toward an ever more refined and sophisticated concept of the principle of justice. Thus, Joy explains,

> the young child leaves first impressions of justice as "getting caught" and being hurt "so I will never, never do it again" (Preconventional level). That model is transformed into needing to make everybody happy, and seeing penalties as necessary to "make things come out even" or doing "what is best for everybody - for society" (Conventional level). Eventually, even this view may be transformed into an empathetic identification with the offender and the social order. The decision may even rise from taking the unmarked chair and being willing personally to accept the consequences appropriate to any member present - role-taking that might cost one everything (Postconventional level) (Joy; 1983: 50-51).

Role-Taking and Cognitive-Moral Conflict

Moral development, through the Stages, is the product essentially of the child's interaction with others. Kohlberg

(1987) proposes two primary vehicles - through interaction with others - as being responsible for the fostering of the development of moral reasoning, and hence moral action: role-taking, and cognitive-moral conflict.

Role-taking is quite simply the capacity to take on the views of others. With respect to moral development Kohlberg says,

> Moral role-taking involves an emotional and emphatic or sympathetic component, but it also involves a cognitive capacity to define situations in terms of rights and duties, in terms of reciprocity and the perspectives of other selves (Kohlberg; 1987: 273).

The value of a social environment for moral development is intimately bound up with the opportunities it provides for role-taking. Speaking specifically of the family group, Kohlberg (1987) points out that parents' encouragement of dialogue with the child on value issues (dialogue being a role-taking opportunity) is one of the clearest determinants of moral Stage advance. And, speaking more generally about role-taking opportunities, Kohlberg says,

> the higher an individual child's participation in a social group or institution, the more opportunities the child has to take the social perspectives of others. . . . Not only is participation necessary, but mutuality of role-taking is also necessary. If, for instance, adults do not consider the child's point of view, the child may not communicate or take the adult's point of view (Kohlberg; 1987: 313).

Essential to role-taking, then, is authentic dialogue between the adult and the child. Kohlberg (1987) sums up

social conditions necessary for moral growth in terms of role-taking opportunities as follows: they are perceived as being fair in terms of their governing rules, they are seen as offering opportunity for discussion and exchange about rules and fairness, and there is a sense of involvement, of participant responsibility for the group's goals and rules, as well as the welfare of its members.

Cognitive-moral conflict, like role-taking, is also the outcome of interaction between the individual and the group. It occurs when an individual, faced with a moral dilemma, is confronted with arguments which conflict with his or her own. Kohlberg (e.g., see Oliver 1972) has produced a number of 'moral dilemmas', which are used to test the level of moral reasoning of children at different stages of development. The best known of these is the Heinz dilemma (alluded to above), in which a husband is faced with the problem of whether or not to steal a drug in order to save his wife. The problem is occasioned by the fact that the druggist has refused to lower his price for the drug (which he himself invented), with the result that the man in question isn't able to afford it. Kohlberg (1987) has found, through a number of studies carried out by associates, that presenting such dilemmas for discussion in groups made up of children at different Stages of moral development helps facilitate moral growth. Specifically, presenting children with models of conflicting reasoning at levels one or two Stages higher than their own

facilitates growth up to the next higher Stage. In short, growth is always upward, and always to the next higher Stage. There is no Stage-skipping. Kohlberg concludes,

> It should be noted that cognitive-moral conflict is a mechanism not only for change in moral judgement but in moral action. In "just community" schools (involving programs designed by Kohlberg and associates), students who violate rules that they have democratically endorsed are publicly confronted with discrepancies between their public judgments and their actual actions. This appears to be a mechanism not only promoting greater judgement action consistency but upward moral change (Kohlberg; 1987: 317).

The Significance of the Stages

Kohlberg's (Purpel and Ryan 1976) view of moral development runs directly counter to the relativity view. For him ethical values are universal, not relative. Furthermore, children have their own universal values particular to the different Stages of moral development. Thus the cognitive-developmental approach to moral development has as its aim the stimulation of moral development in the child through the Stages, to that of a principled morality, represented by Stage 6, the only fully moral Stage.

Kohlberg states the cognitive-developmental significance of the moral Stages as follows:

> we claim that the formal definition of morality works only when we recognize that there are developmental levels of moral discourse or judgement which increasingly approximate to the philosopher's forms. A

> developmental strategy or definition is one which isolates a function, such as intelligence, but defines this function by a progressive developmental clarification of the function . . . similarly, in our view there is a moral judgmental function present from the age of four or five onwards in judgements of "good" and "bad" and "has to" (our stage 1), but this function is only fully defined by its final stages (principled morality) (Beck; 1971: 55-56).

Morality, then, is defined in terms of judgement rather than in terms of affect or behavior. Morality (as stated above) is the individual's attitude toward behavior, affect, or rules. Kohlberg says,

> we define morality in terms of the formal character of a moral judgement or a moral point of view, rather than in terms of its content. Impersonality, ideality, universalizability, and pre-emptiveness are among the formal characteristics of a moral judgement (Beck; 1971: 55).

Applying these characteristics to the hierarchy of moral Stages, Kohlberg (Beck 1971) explains why a higher Stage is more moral than a lower one (using here the example of Stage 6). He says,

> when a ten-year-old at stage 1 answers a "moral should" question - "Should Joe tell on his younger brother?" - in terms of the probabilities of getting beaten up by his father and by his brother, he does not answer with a moral judgement that is universal (applies to all situations of this kind) or that has any impersonal or ideal grounds. In contrast, stage-6 statements not only specifically use moral words like "morally right" and "duty" but also use them in a moral way: "regardless of who it was," implies universality; "morally I would do it in spite of fear of punishment" implies impersonality and ideality of obligation, etc.(Beck; 1971: 56-57).

In summary, thus far the paper has discussed the main elements of the theories of Noddings and Kohlberg. With respect to Noddings, the caring ethic is seen as based in the relationship between the one-caring and the one cared-for. It is founded on reciprocity between the one-caring and the one cared-for, and cannot function apart from that reciprocity. Caring involves a shift in perspective, called 'engrossment', in the one-caring, enabling her to see the one cared-for through the other's, as well as her own eyes. Engrossment manifests in 'inclusion', through which the one-caring receives the one cared-for as one's own best self, thus enabling the one-caring to 'confirm' the one cared-for; that is, to enable the one cared-for to relate to himself in terms of his own best self, his ethical ideal.

Kohlberg's (1975) theory, in contrast to Noddings', involves a concept of principled morality based on judgement, rather than one based on specific rules of behavior. Being founded in principles means that it transcends specific rules of behavior, centering rather on larger, more inclusive and far-seeing criteria, such as the Golden Rule, as mentioned above, where it can be seen that the application of which might very well involve different rules in different circumstances. The primary and overarching principle is that of justice: liberty, equality, and reciprocity. Each Stage of moral development deals with this principle in its own way, meaning that justice at a lower Stage is dealt with less

adequately than at higher Stages. In short, the entire theory is about the application of the principle of justice, and the means (role-taking and cognitive-moral conflict) by which that principle is brought to its highest and most universal meaning and expression in human social relations.

Before taking up the educational implications of the two theories, leading to the critique of teaching, the paper will present, in the next three chapters, a composite picture of teaching in the public schools of the United States, starting first with a discussion of the structure of teaching.

CHAPTER 3

THE STRUCTURE OF TEACHING

This chapter discusses the structure of teaching relations in the public schooling system. It traces that structure from its more general characteristics with respect to school reform, to its more specific implications for teaching practice and relations in the school and classroom. The subject is discussed under the following topics: school reform and the structure of teaching, the structure of teaching and the classroom, the emphasis of teaching, the cellular arrangement of teaching, and teachers' relations with significant others.

School Reform and the Structure of Teaching

Speaking of the bureaucratic constraints dominating traditional schooling, Hurn says, "Schools have proved to be almost uniquely refractory institutions, resistant to our efforts to change them (Hurn; 1985: 302)." Sarason (1990) claims that the reason why educational reforms to date have in the main failed is because they are typically fragmented. By this he means that reformers come to their observations not

only prepared to see what they want to see, but they tend to advocate and initiate reforms only in their own particular parts or the system without reference to the system as a whole. Thus, piecemeal reform efforts over the decades have continued to repeat themselves with the same failed recommendations on the same issues, while the system remained essentially intact and unchanged, because ". . . the characteristics, traditions, and organizational dynamics of school systems were more or less lethal obstacles to achieving even modest, narrow goals (Sarason; 1990: 12)." In fact, the same author contends that, in spite of reform efforts, schooling is seen generally to be deteriorating. He sees both the failure and the deterioration to be due, at least in large part, to the nature of existing power relations throughout the system; that is, to the structure of teaching itself.

Cornbleth (Weis et al 1989), speaking of reform efforts to "push back the rising tide of mediocrity (Weis et al; 1989: 19)" in teaching practice, proceeds generally along the same lines as Sarason (1990) in describing those reforms as being informed essentially by a technocratic rationality. This she describes as ". . . a mode of reasoning, investigation, or planning that gives priority to considerations of procedure or technique (Weis et al.; 1989: 19)." While she concedes that this approach may be appropriate to a field such as engineering, it is entirely antithetical to social change. The author says,

> The irony of technocratic rationality in social affairs is that, by deflecting attention from questions of purpose and substance and their social and political implications, it precludes the institutional reforms that it purports to foster (Weis et al; 1989: 19).

These questions of 'substance and purpose' have to do primarily with the structure of relations within the schooling system. Thus, Cornbleth says,

> Because the structure of an educational system conditions participants' interaction within it, changing the practice of teaching requires structural changes in the educational system (Weis et al; 1989: 24).

She concludes, however, that

> school reform reports eschew structural change. The problems of teaching are seen as being in the teacher, and not in the teaching situation or in the interaction of person and situation (Weis et al; 1989: 24).

Hurn (1985) asserts that whatever changes have managed to come about in the schooling system, which have resulted in alterations in its power relationships - especially between teachers and students - have not been in terms of the nature, but only the extent, of those traditional relations. Nor have those changes been the outcome of reforms initiated within the system itself, but instead have been the results of civil rights gains in the larger society, which were then imposed on the schooling system. In other words, changes in favor of the rights of students have been legislated by the courts. Hurn (1985) goes on to make the gloomy comment that the challenges to the school's authority by the civil rights courts generally

resulted in the erosion of the mutual good will and trust upon which the moral authority of the school and the teacher was built.

With respect to the position of teachers within those power relationships, Lortie (1975) says that the structure of teaching authority has remained stable throughout the history of teaching. It began with citizen control, and continues thus to this day, in the form of school boards. Tharp and Gallimore (1988) speak of these relations in terms of the total context of teaching, which includes society at large at one extreme, represented by the state legislatures, and the students at the other. In between, and in descending order of authority in the hierarchy, are the school boards, school administrators, and finally teachers. This means, according to Lortie (1975), that teachers do not have authority over their work day, as do, for example, doctors and professors; this is controlled by the school board. Nor has that authority been seriously questioned to this day. In other words, control of schooling remains firmly in the hands of the citizenry (through school boards) and the state. The students are not included in this authority arrangement for the simple reason that, according to Sarason (1990), they exercise no formal authority within the schooling system. This is evidenced by the fact that the characteristic functioning of this hierarchy has the higher relating to the lower essentially in terms of what Tharp and Gallimore (1988) call

a 'recitation script,' that is, an instruct-and-assess dispensation. What this means in practice is that, from on high

> schools themselves are given certain "texts" to master, in the form of regulations and authorizations, and they are from time to time assessed or audited to determine if they are in correspondence with those texts (Tharp and Gallimore; 1988: 13).

Teachers, accordingly, treat students with the same 'recitation script'. This means, in effect, that, as Sarason (1990) points out, teachers typically legislate to students just as those above teachers legislate to them. Thus, each of the successive layers of the teaching structure are mutually supportive of the entire system of power relations, differing in scale from one another but identical in form (Tharp and Gallimore 1988). The hierarchical arrangement defines its own parameters for each level of authority. With respect to the actual and specific authority wielded by teachers, Reyes says:

> Today's teachers work in a hierarchical system of state, district, superintendent, and principal authority . . . forming a system of tacit understanding that teachers control their classrooms while others make decisions that affect the school and/or the district (Reyes; 1990: 24).

A disgruntled teacher puts it rather more starkly:

> I don't like the caste system in school today. It seems, you know the old joke, the teacher's afraid of the supervisor, the supervisor's afraid of the superintendent, the superintendent's afraid of the school committee, the school committee's afraid of the parents, the parents are afraid of the kids, and the kids aren't afraid of anything. The teachers are at the bottom of the ladder.

> Everybody counts but the teacher (Lortie: 1975: 180).

What this recriminating statement implies is that, as Lortie says, "Although teachers have managed to dull the edges of administrative power (e.g., through the establishment of teachers' unions), they continue to be employed subordinates (Lortie; 1975: 22)."

The hierarchical arrangement of authority means that the schools, like all complex organizations, are bureaucracies. In an unflattering, but entirely non-cynical portrayal of schools, Hurn (1985) compares them with, on the one hand, prisons, army training camps, and mental hospitals, and on the other, with factories and offices. With respect to the former, their commonalities include: an audience who are compelled to attend no matter what their inclinations to the contrary; rules to insure compliance, designed for the worst offenders; and an order and authority which are problematic because only a few disruptive individuals can make life miserable for everyone. With respect to teacher-student relations such a regime often has the effect ". . . of undermining whatever spontaneous cooperation and good will that exists (Hurn; 1985: 252)."

Like the work in offices and factories, that required of students is often hard and tedious. However, unlike in these institutions, students are not given the incentive of pay for their work. The main motivation for students is grades, which constitute both a reward and a punishment. They are a reward

if students believe in the school, and/or are college-bound. If they don't and/or aren't, however, then grades may be meaningless (a fact which, according to Hurn (1985), applies especially to students from working-class backgrounds). With respect to teachers, their work, unlike that in factories, is not monitored closely by their superiors; teachers are left alone with their students most of the time (Hurn 1985).

The Structure of Teaching and the Classroom

As the discussion of teaching practices will be taken up in detail in Chapter 4, it remains only to be said here that the typical image of the traditional classroom, according to Goodlad (1984) (also Sarason 1990, Tharp and Gallimore 1988, and Schrag 1988) is that of an adult in charge of a large group of students acting in conformity with the teacher's wishes. Sarason (1990) points out that we are not used to speaking of the teacher-student relationship in terms of power, because this sounds too fascistic. But the author adds that the conventional jargon of the teacher having 'authority' which the students 'respect' borders on sheer fantasy. Sarason says,

> From the standpoint of the teacher, especially at the beginning of the school year and especially in the case of the beginning teacher, the name of the game is power: quickly and effectively to establish who is boss of the turf, to make it clear that the authority of the teacher is powered by the power to punish (Sarason; 1990: 79).

The picture also includes, along with some twenty to thirty-five students or more (Goodlad puts the average at approximately 25 to 27), tables or desks in rows (sometimes bolted to the floor), the teacher in front, and students facing toward the teacher, who is lecturing and asking questions. In addition to this:

> Instructional amenities such as library corners, occasionally present in elementary classrooms, were rarely observed in secondary classes. The homelike chairs and rugs sometimes seen in primary classes rapidly became rare with upward progression through the grades (Goodlad; 1984: 94).

Goodlad (1984) explains that though today the physical characteristics of classrooms sometime deviate from this traditional picture in most peoples' minds, nevertheless the great majority of the more than 1000 classrooms visited by his research team were essentially of the traditional type. Furthermore, and perhaps more significantly still, virtually all of those classrooms were characterized by a sameness in pedagogical practice, a finding supported by Sizer (1988) and Schrag (1988). That practice consisted, for the most part, of activities like lecturing, testing, and textbook learning. Where differences (on the positive side) were found, they did not involve important departures from the regular pedagogical practices. They had to do, in the main, with things like increased teacher concern for individual students, less time spent in controlling students, and less competitive atmosphere in the classroom. In short, they were factors which tended to

make the above regimen more satisfying for all (Goodlad 1984).

The Emphasis of Teaching

Goodlad (1984) says that schools have been given much more to do than teach academics. Yet the measures used to judge school effectiveness have focused almost exclusively on academics, in the form of standardized testing. However, this is in line with the fact that intellectual goals are much more emphasized by all groups concerned with schooling than are social, vocational, or personal goals - at all school levels - in spite of the fact that these same groups want attention paid to those other goals. Child and parent studies indicate that a caring approach on the part of the school is as important as its academic concerns; that is, caring for the child apart from academics. Ironically, teachers, according to Goodlad (1984), typically emphasize the personal goals of school even more than do parents and students, while they themselves tend to be removed from the personal lives of their students. Goodlad (1984) concludes that either teachers are unaware of the social lives and problems of their students, or are unwilling to deal with them if they are aware. In short, there is a contradiction here, for teachers see their role as being essentially educative, in the academic sense. This deficit in the personal and social concerns of teaching Goodlad (1984) sees as a serious and sad lack, in view of the

fact that educational research stresses the importance of a balance between the personal/social and the academic in the creation of a viable learning environment.

At the secondary level especially, Goodlad (1984) discerns what appears to be a serious disjuncture between the school and youth culture. For example, the schools' emphasis on academics seems to be totally out of sync with what students rate as important. Far more important for them, according to Goodlad (1984), are, for example, good looks and athletics, rather than classes taken and teachers. With regard to school problems, parents and students see drugs, alcohol and misbehavior as being the main problems. Though teachers also see misbehavior as a problem, their biggest concern has to do with what they see as student lack of interest, too large schools, and overcrowded classrooms - problems which they regard as being beyond their control.

Goodlad (1984) concludes from this that teachers seem to go about their business detached from the 'other lives' of their students, so that what students see as the chief concerns of their daily lives, teachers tend to view as dissonance in the conduct of school and classroom business. Likewise, students seem unconnected with the learnings for which they are supposed to be in school in the first place. Goodlad suspects that somewhere down in the elementary grades

> a subtle shift occurs. The curriculum - subjects, topics, textbooks, workbooks, and the rest - comes between teacher and student. Young humans come to be viewed only as

> students, valued primarily for their academic aptitude and industry rather than as individual persons preoccupied with the physical, social, and personal needs unique to their circumstances and stage in life (Goodlad; 1984: 80).

The Cellular Arrangement of Teaching

Lortie says that two factors in the evolution of teaching have underscored what has become the occupation's cellular pattern: ". . . the school as composed of multiple self-contained classrooms and . . . chronically high turnover in teaching ranks (Lortie; 1975: 14)." This means that teaching has always, with few exceptions, been a very independent job: low interdependence among staff, each teacher doing his/her own thing, either teaching all subjects to one class, or one subject to a number of classes. This cellular structure has two important effects. On the one hand it reduces teachers' educational concerns entirely to the classroom setting, in opposition to everything happening outside the classroom. On the other, it produces in teachers a sense of isolation along with the uncertainties such isolation engenders.

The confining of teacher interest to the classroom itself drives teachers to seek their satisfaction mainly through the accumulation of what Lortie (1975) calls 'psychic rewards', that is, rewards accruing from teaching itself, in the classroom. Lortie says,

> The activities which generate pride among

> respondents are teaching duties. . . . Scant attention is paid to other aspects of the teacher's role; pride is not evoked by participation in schoolwide affairs. The classroom is the cathected forum . . . psychic rewards associated with achievement center on the instructional tasks of the classroom teacher (Lortie; 1975: 131)

Thus, though the majority of teachers in the above study indicated that they would prefer more freedom from organizational authority, it had nothing to do with the idea of altering the organizational setup itself. Freedom was sought solely for the sake of freeing up decision-making in the classroom. These constraints on teachers are underscored by the fact that they are defined - recalling what was said above with respect to their subordinate position - as employees of the school system, their job being to "implement board policies and administrative rulings (Lortie; 1975: 164-65)." Sarason points out that in his discussions with groups of teachers over many years, though they generally and strongly accepted the idea that they should be part of educational decision making,

> As teachers they had no responsibility for matters that they believed affected the educational enterprise - that is, to the extent that teachers had no voice in these matters, they shouldered no responsibility for the negative consequences that their impotence produced. At the same time that they accepted responsibility for what happened in their classrooms, discharging that responsibility was negatively affected by their powerlessness in educational decision making (Sarason; 1990: 60)."

Lortie's (1975) direct questions to teachers with regard

to their roles found their responses repeatedly indicating attitudes confined to the classroom. When asked, for example, how they would like to spend additional work time, the vast majority (5448 out of 5991) selected activities related to classroom rather than schoolwide matters. In response to the question how they defined a 'good day,' teachers' answers were entirely confined to the classroom (as opposed to any other place in the school), and to the teacher with the students (as opposed to all other people: principals, parents, colleagues, etc.). Good days were, of course, the exception, since bad days were seen as those which were subjected to interruptions (from visitors, the P.A. system, or other school activities), which are the usual order of the normal school day. The teachers in the Lortie (1975) study never questioned the desirability of being confined all day with 20 to 35 students. In fact, a good day was exactly that, one devoted entirely to teaching in the classroom without interruption. The paradox in the teacher's position here is that, attempting to live up to the best in the system means distancing themselves as far as possible from it. Lortie concludes,

> A zero-sum conceptualization appears to be at work; the belief that student attention belongs to other activities or to the teacher is probably connected with the wish to separate classroom activities from the rest of the world (Lortie; 1975: 173).

Perhaps the most significant point here is the fact that all others are seen by teachers in essentially negative terms. Lortie says,

> teachers attach great meaning to the boundaries which separate their classrooms from the rest of the school and, of course, the community. Teachers deprecate transactions which cut across those boundaries. Walls are perceived as beneficial; they protect and enhance the course of instruction. All but teacher and students are outsiders. That definition conveys an implicit belief that, on site, other adults have potential for hindrance but not for help (Lortie; 1975: 169).

The fact that teachers are, in the main, alone with their students means that they are separated not only from their peers and superiors within the school, but from the world of adults generally. Hurn (1985) says that being confined to the world of children tends to have a negative impact on the psychology of teachers, a view maintained also by Lortie (1975). Other adults see them as not really living or working in the 'real world,' but to be functioning in the reality of children. This perception leaves teachers in a dubious psychological space, at best uncertain, at worst, defensive. It is a dispensation which informs the privacy ethic surrounding teaching, an ethic which prevents teachers from getting the kind of feedback from their peers or administrators they need to reduce their anxiety over whether they are good teachers. Consequently, there is essentially only one way for teachers to gain the control over their lives they need to be able to function adequately. This is in the classroom. But even here nothing may be taken for granted:

> Once inside the classroom, a teacher knows that all control is tenuous. It depends on a negotiated agreement between students and the

> teacher. If that agreement is violated, a teacher will subordinate all teaching activities to one primary goal: to regain and maintain control. Keeping a class in order is the only visible indication to one's colleagues and principal that one is, in fact, a good teacher. When one loses control, one loses everything." (Hurn; 1985: 14).

This insular position of both teachers and the classroom, physically and psychologically, within the school, moves Sarason (1990) to ask rhetorically why teachers should feel responsible for the school itself when they have had no part in determining the make-up of that school as a socio-educational setting: ". . . who should be teaching there, who the principal should be, and what the agenda for collegial discussion should be (Sarason; 1990: 62). Goodlad (1984) says that teachers experience an increase in their sense of powerlessness as the focus moves away from the classroom to the rest of the school.

This insular situation which confines teachers to the seeking of psychic rewards, and doing so exclusively within the classroom, underlies the particular form teacher autonomy assumes, an isolating individualism. As Lortie says in a short but ironic statement, "The ideology of individualism serves teachers' purpose; it undergirds psychic rewards; the circle is closed (Lortie; 1975: 210)." In other words, the teachers' role as defined within the cellular system means that they must learn to cope on their own. In his own study Goodlad found that teacher autonomy

> seemed to be exercised in a context more of

> isolation than of rich professional dialogue about a plethora of challenging educational alternatives. The classroom cells in which teachers spend much of their time appear to me to be symbolic and predictive of their relative isolation from one another and from sources of ideas beyond their own background of experience (Goodlad; 1984: 186).

Teachers' Relations with Significant Others

The mechanisms of this isolating individualism were manifested, in the Lortie (1975) study, especially in teachers' relations with significant others: parents, principals, and other teachers. As mentioned above by Lortie (1975), teachers typically are seen to regard all others outside the classroom in mainly negative terms. With respect to teacher-parent relations the ideology of public education underlines the importance of a close relationship between teachers and the parents of their students. Parents have the right to be involved with teachers in the education of their children. But such liaisons are fraught with many complications. For example, teachers often come to know family 'secrets' which can put strains on parent-teacher relations. Working-class parents often have bitter memories of school and can be unsympathetic toward teachers. Parents can view teachers as competitors in the socialization of their children. Upper-class parents in particular can put pressure on teachers by going over their heads to administrators, etc. In short, keeping in mind the limits on teacher authority,

parents have considerable influence over teachers, and teachers are dependent on them with respect to the performance of their children in the classroom (Lortie 1975).

Thus, teacher preferences regarding their relations with parents illustrate very clearly a tension between the obligation to cooperate with parents and the strong drive for autonomy. It is reflected in a desire and need to have parental support for their efforts while at the same time eliminating parental intervention in classroom affairs. Lortie says,

> The wish to control the workplace is combined with the wish for support from influential others. . . . The teacher's concerns are placed at the center of the ideal relationship; parents should comply with arrangements which meet teacher needs. . . . There is no indication that respondents worried about the relationship they projected as asymmetrical. . . . These teachers . . . seek to ensure both independence and support, and the mechanisms they invoke are physical separation and teacher control over parents' access to the school Lortie; 1975: 191).

It is not difficult to see the connection between this push-pull attitude on the part of teachers, and the conclusion of adults outside the teaching occupation, as mentioned above, that teachers live in a child's reality.

Teacher-teacher relationships, according to Goodlad were rarely found to involve working together on schoolwide problems, and ". . . teacher-to-teacher links for mutual assistance in teaching or collaborative school improvement were weak or nonexistent (Goodlad; 1984: 187)." Lortie (1975)

found that teacher-teacher relationships are characterized by egalitarianism. The etiquette which seems to rule these relationships involves being responsive to one another, helping when asked, and not imposing one's views upon others. It seems that the isolation of the classroom produces a demand from colleagues that is supportive but somewhat distant. It calls for a warm, accepting atmosphere from peers, but one which is essentially uncritical. It appears that teachers are looking essentially for an atmosphere in which they can relax, where teacher exchange is undemanding and even superficial. Lortie says,

> It seems likely that after hours of self-control, teachers want to relax and . . . enjoy interaction as an end in itself. Perhaps that is why we hear reports that teacher lounge conversation is rarely business like; I suspect much of it is cathartic (Lortie; 1975: 195-96).

Principals are seen by Lortie (1975) to have limited power. They are essentially 'small decision' makers "affecting the social life of the school and those who work in it (Lortie; 1975: 197)." No teachers in Lortie's study questioned the legitimacy of the principal's role, though it was defined differently by different teachers; differences dealing mainly with the amount of supervision principals ought to exercise over teachers' work. Generally teachers' views had to do with the attempt to arrive, again, as with parents and other teachers, at a balance between autonomy and support. Teachers agreed that the principal

> should be knowledgeable and firm with both parents and students . . . should moderate his use of authority over teachers but assert it in relationships with parents, students, and dilatory colleagues. These teachers do not question the rightfulness of the principal's authority, but they seek to appropriate it to their ends (Lortie; 1975: 198).

To repeat, these ends have to do with protecting the classroom and the teacher's work in the classroom, from outside influences. It ends, according to Reyes (1990) (echoing Goodlad above), in a situation which effectively deprives teachers of a primary source of professional support. The author says,

> To isolate professionals from one another is simply to cut them off from the resource that helps them shape the judgements they use to conduct their work (Reyes; 1990: 28).

Finally, Goodlad (1984) points out that the isolation of teachers covers the whole spectrum of teaching and issues connected with teaching: professional development, involvement in educational issues and problems, involvement with other teachers with respect to teaching, etc. The net result is that there is very little awareness among teachers of the deeper aspects of educational problems generally. Goodlad sums up the consequences of the structure of school relations as follows:

> The very nature and conduct of the schooling enterprise appear to operate against the concept of principals, teachers, parents, and perhaps students working together on schoolwide problems. If the schools of our sample are representative, there are not infrastructures designed to encourage or support either communication among teachers in

> improving their teaching or collaboration in attacking schoolwide problems. And so teachers, like their students, to a large extent carry on side by side similar but essentially separated activities (Goodlad; 1984: 188).

Sarason (1990) suggests that the isolationist regime engendered by the peculiar form teacher autonomy assumes, is essentially a manifestation of survival under a dispensation demanding blind conformity. Lortie, giving another twist to this assertion, says that the uncertainties endemic in the position of teachers, may work against the very individualism they strive to maintain, fostering among them instead a need for conformity "to orthodox doctrines to buttress their self-confidence (Lortie; 1975: 210)."

In summary, this chapter has discussed the structure of teaching with respect to school reform and its implications for teacher-student relations in the classroom, the cellular arrangement of teaching, and teacher relations with significant others. It was pointed out that school reform has, in the main, failed to alter the hierarchical arrangement of teaching relations, because it has not addressed the issues of power which direct and inform those relations. As a result of this teachers continue to treat students in the classroom with the same 'recitation script' with which they are treated by those above; that is, just as they are rendered virtually powerless outside the classroom, so they in turn render students powerless within the classroom. It was further discussed that the cellular arrangement of teaching isolates

teachers within the classroom, preventing them from being vitally involved in educational matters beyond the classroom walls, and pressuring them to regard negatively all significant others concerned with the school.

This chapter concludes the first discussion - namely the structure of teaching - toward the drawing of a composite picture of teaching in the public schooling system of the United States, with a view to critiquing that picture through the perspectives of the moral theories of Noddings and Kohlberg.

CHAPTER 4

THE PRACTICE OF TEACHING

This chapter discusses specific teaching practices considered to be prevalent throughout the public schooling system. After a general statement of how teachers obtain and maintain group control in the classroom, the chapter discusses a teaching method considered to be prevalent throughout the schooling system, particularly its use as a method of classroom control. Finally, there is a discussion of tracking, as a technique of school organization which has a crucial bearing on teaching practice and teacher-student relations. The chapter is organized, then, around three topics successively: classroom (group) control, the 'lecture and recitation' method of teaching, and tracking.

Group Control

Sarason (1990) states that teachers' imposition of rules and regulations in the classroom is done without any rationale or even discussion with students. The author goes on to say that this imposition is merely a reflection of the teachers' own position in the hierarchy of school authority. He says,

> Our usual imagery of the classroom contains an adult who is "in charge" and pupils who conform to the teacher's rules, regulations, and standards. . . . We are not used to saying that a teacher has "power" and that students are and should be powerless. That sounds to fascistic. We are more used to saying that a teacher has authority which students should respect. . . . And therein is the irony: teachers regard students the way their superiors regard them - that is, as incapable of dealing responsibly with issues of power, even on the level of discussion (Sarason; 1990: 83).

And, he continues,

> in the modal classroom the degree of responsibility given to students is minimal. They are responsible only in the sense that they are expected to complete tasks assigned by teachers and in ways the teachers have indicated (Sarason; 1990: 91).

Goodlad's (1984) study notes four elements which dominate classroom life: the vehicle for teaching is the group rather than the individual; the teacher is the pivotal figure in the group; norms governing the group have to do in the main with whatever is required to maintain the teacher's key role; and the emotional tone of the classroom is essentially flat, that is "neither harsh and punitive nor warm and joyful (Goodlad; 1984: 108)." The author says that though elementary students participate somewhat more in classroom decisions than do high school students, they would like more of such participation. Nevertheless, students seem to become more and more compliant and accepting of the teacher's dominant role as grade levels rise:

> The picture that emerges from the data is one of students increasingly conforming, not

> assuming an increasingly independent decision-making role in their own education (Goodlad; 1984: 109).

Schrag (1988) describes the classroom situation as one with too many students in class - as mentioned above, from 20 to 35 or more, with an average of 25 to 27 - desks in rows or bolted to the floor, and students being confined to classrooms exclusively or being permitted to leave only at short intervals to get from one place to another. This creates, according to Schrag (1988), a situation in which teachers are forced to keep a tight control over students.

Lortie (1975) says that the fact of 'classness' (teachers being confined alone in classrooms with large numbers of students) puts very special constraints on interpersonal relations. He sees the situation as one in which the idea of equity of treatment in the classroom becomes dictated, not by individual student needs, but by the necessity to maintain order in the group. He explains that, though teachers often experience a conflict between trying to maintain order in the class and dealing with students' expressive needs, the emphasis is on maintaining an egalitarian social order, where no student is treated differently from any other. Students are expected to contribute to this order,

> by responding and cooperating, behaving themselves, and demonstrating positive feelings. They are excellent followers of the teacher's leadership. They participate actively, show interest, and give their full attention. They work hard. They behave themselves by conforming to the teacher's rules. They show positive affect by "wanting

> to learn," "being in a good mood," and "enjoying the classes (Lortie; 1975: 172).

Goodlad (1984) found that this regimen of conformity in the classroom does not evoke extreme reactions from the students. Rather they seem to accept it, and generally attitudes towards teachers are positive. Nevertheless, the study found that the more authoritarian the teacher the less satisfied are the students.

The 'Lecture and Recitation' Approach

Goodlad (1984) states that the popular image of the teacher standing in front of the class lecturing and explaining is born out in most classrooms observed in his study. This form of teaching is less prevalent in the elementary grades, but increases as grade level rises. Schrag (1988), in line with these findings, says that instructional methods are dominated by lecture, and that teacher-student exchange is characterized by what he calls 'recitation'; that is, teachers ask questions (the answers to which they already know) and students try to guess the answer that is on the teacher's mind. Goodlad's (1984) statistics from his study report that of the approximately 75% of class time spent on instruction, 70% is talk (usually teachers to students), and the bulk of this teacher talk is instructing, that is, telling. Very little of this instructing requires students to respond at all, and that which does, calls for practically no

reasoning or student opinion. Goodlad says,

> Usually, when a student was called on to respond, it was to give an informational answer to the teacher's question (Goodlad; 1984: 229).

Sarason even goes so far as to quote from research on classroom behavior, which found that in the modal classroom

> the average number of questions asked by students was two, and those two questions could have been asked by one student. Teachers' rate of question asking varies from about 40 to 150 (Sarason; 1986: 85).

Though Sarason doesn't engage in an analysis of this phenomenon, he suggests that behind students' lack of questioning is either insecurity (fear of getting the answer wrong?), or conformity ". . . to their perception of the rules of the game implicitly or explicitly set by the teacher (Sarason; 1990: 88)." Schrag (1988) points out, citing a study by K. Sirotnik, that teachers out-talk students by a ratio of three to one, and most of that talk is exposition and explanation.

Schrag (1988) maintains that the 'lecture and recitation' approach is essentially a device for maintaining teacher control in a large, confined, and non-voluntary group which constantly threatens to deteriorate into chaos. He points out that it is not his intention (nor is it this writer's) to refute the legitimacy of the lecture as a limited instructional method, but rather to draw attention to its implications - particularly in view of its excessive use - for the control of student behavior in the classroom. Thus, the

author says,

> the teacher's proclivity for lecturing even when he or she knows that many students are bored or lost comes not just from the desire to convey information, but from the advantage it provides from the point of view of control. A few students may close their eyes or whisper softly, but unless the teacher has lost all authority, the classroom will still maintain the appearance of orderly learning which is so important (Schrag; 1988: 98).

Since 'lecture and recitation' is portrayed as being central to teacher-student relations in the classroom, it seems appropriate at this point to examine the method in some detail, in order to see more clearly the mechanisms it involves in teacher control. The essence of this method is characterized as a three-element one of Initiation, Reply, and Evaluation. This is demonstrated very well, though in rudimentary form, in the following typical example, by Mehan, from an early elementary school lesson (Hammersley; 1986: 87):

Initiation	Reply	Evaluation
T: . . . what does this word say? Beth.	Beth: One.	T: Very good.
T: What does this word say? Jenny.	Jenny: One.	T: Okay.
T: Now look up here. What does this word Say? Ramona.	Ramona: Umm.	
T: Kim.	Kim: First.	T: Okay.
T: Let's say it together.	All: First.	T: Okay.
T: Say it together again.	All: First.	T: Okay.
T: Lillian, what does this		

word say?	Lillian: First.	
T: Richard, what does this word say?	Richard: First.	T: Oh, you said it so nice and loud.

As can be seen, the pattern has the teacher initiating the discourse (here in the form of a question, which, it can be assumed, however, is following some kind of 'lecture' about numbers). This, in turn, calls for a reply from the student, which is then followed by the teacher's evaluation of the reply. What emerges clearly from an examination of this kind of discourse is that it is a 'search' on the part of the teacher, for what is not only an answer he/she already knows, but is often, if not always, a search for what is the only 'correct' answer. Apart from its instructional outcomes in terms of the learning of subject matter, this format has important implications for classroom language learning generally. Mehan says,

> One consequence, then, of the teacher's search for answers to known information questions, is that the student does not so much answer the teacher's question, as the teacher and student create the student's answer out of a number of tentative displays (Hammersley; 1986: 100-101).

In other words, the teacher is really answering his/her own question by way of manipulating the students through a guided sequence. This is more clearly seen in the following sequence, again by Mehan, which wasn't used above because it

doesn't include an explicit Evaluation (Hammersley; 1986: 98):

Initiation	Reply
T: Make a red flower under the tree. (Pause) OK, let's look at the red flower. Can you tell me where the red flower is?	Ss: Right here, right here.
T: Dora?	Dora: Under the tree.
T: Tall me in a sentence.	Dora: It's under the tree.
T: What's under the tree, Dora?	Ss: The flower.
T: Tell me, the flower . . .	Dora: The flower is under the tree.
T: Where is the red flower Richard?	Ric: Under the tree.
T: Can you tell me in a sentence?	Ric: The flower is under the tree.
T: Cindy, where is the red flower?	Cin: The red flower is under the tree.
Ric: Hey, that's not red.	

In this sequence the teacher is using the common strategy of 'simplifying' as an aid to manipulating the students' replies through to the answer she is trying to elicit; that is, not only the correct answer to the question (which was, in fact, given in the students' first reply), but in a complete sentence containing all the information the teacher is looking for. The simplifying occurs first when the teacher directs the students to answer in a complete sentence, which is then

guided (through the teachers 'where' question, and followed by repeating the question with another student, Cindy), toward the complete sentence being sought.

There is a final statement in that sequence, by Richard, to the effect that the flower wasn't 'red'. In fact, it turned out that Cindy had indeed drawn her flower with a different color crayon. This prompts Mehan (Hammersley 1986) to suggest that Cindy's arriving finally at the 'correct' answer had to do mainly with her attending to cues provided by other children's responses to the teacher's leading questions. In other words, it had to do, not with a consideration of the information in the drawing she herself had made, but simply with mastering the skills of the discourse.

This brings up an important point raised by Schrag (1988) in his discussion of what he calls 'thoughtfulness.' Knitter refers to the same concept as 'deliberation,' and defines it as 'an attitude of suspended conclusion.' He says,

> the point of deliberation is to withhold judgement until we have examined an issue from different perspectives, weighed evidence, traced consequences of alternatives, and so on (Knitter; 1988: 489).

With this idea in mind, it can be seen that in this instance, Richard was the only person in the group, including the teacher, who maintained (or recovered) a position removed enough from the discourse itself, to be able to detect the actual 'flaw' in Cindy's answer. In other words, Richard was the only person exercising any sort of real deliberation, or,

thoughtfulness. The irony is that the boy's innocent but significant insight produced information totally irrelevant in the context of the lesson being taught and learned: the production of a complete sentence.

Finally, apart from its facilitation of the learning of subject matter, this form of classroom discourse shows itself, first of all, to be a totally teacher-centered approach, and one designed to control student behavior by verbal means. This is clear when it is remembered that, within the 'lecture and recitation' format, all students are compelled to attend to the teacher at all times in order benefit from the lesson. Second, not only when students speak, but what they say and the duration of their speaking, are controlled by the teacher. Third, whether students are sitting in rows, circles, or any other group formation, they are physically constrained to be facing (or at least attending to) the teacher at all times during the discourse. Fourth, students are not only pressured to learn the same thing at the same rate, but are compelled to compete with one another in the process; this is especially true whenever the teacher calls for a show of hands. Fifth, the learning fostered is entirely individualistic; there is no place in this format for collaborative effort among the students. Though they are in a group, they are working alone.

To take a more extended look at the issue of classroom discourse as it applies more generally throughout all grade levels - Heath (1978) discusses it under the general heading

of 'teacher talk' - perhaps the main point of importance is that, unlike discourse in other conversations, where exchanges taking place determine the direction the conversation will take, classroom discourse has rules which reflect the teacher's authority, as stated above, to decide who speaks, what the topic will be, and how long one speaks. Heath (1978) explains that specific strategies used to direct and control classroom discourse include such things as the use of 'tag questions' at the end of teacher statements: " -O.K?" "-right?" "-hmm?" "-isn't it? (Heath; 1978: 6)." Another is failing to wait for student answers. Heath (1978) points out that these strategies give the discourse a conversational tone, but their use - and particularly the teacher's timing - often rules out true conversation.

The same author says that generally classroom discourse is tightly controlled by the teacher, either verbally ('Mary, now is not the time to talk about that') or by gesture (headshake or raised eyebrow), and students must learn how discourse is used if they are to experience success in the classroom (Heath 1978).

Heath (1978) draws attention to the third part of classroom discourse, the Evaluation. He suggests that the positive evaluation given for correct answers may not always be true praise at all, but simply a device to let the student know that his/her speaking time is up, and the teacher is passing on to the next item or question. In this event, the

positive response of the teacher is not reinforcement at all for the student, and if it is used continuously by the teacher in this way, then he/she will be hard pressed to find a response which is truly reinforcing when such is called for (Heath 1978). Speaking along this same line, Goodlad (1984) found that when teachers call for and get a response from a student, they rarely respond to that student directly in terms of supportive language, corrective feedback, or some form of acknowledgement which is meaningful. On the contrary, the response is typically a nonpersonal 'all right,' employed, as suggested by Heath (1978) above, more as a transitional device in the teacher's presentation to the whole class. In fact, the great bulk of the lecturing done at all school levels, is to the whole class. Goodlad says,

> When students did become involved actively in the dominant lecturing mode, it was almost always to respond to the teacher, not to initiate an exchange (Goodlad; 1984: 229).

One study cited by Heath (1978) found that most questions asked by teachers are of the 'what' sort; 'why,' 'how,' and 'when' being less frequent. Also, the present tense is most often used by teachers, suggesting that teachers ask questions about immediate concerns which do not call on students to formulate hypotheses - which require more involved and critical thinking. Also, most questions seek answers which are essentially labels: names of things, actions, or agents. Another study found that teachers who say they subscribe to 'inquiry' or 'discussion' approaches, favor 'what' or 'who'

questions, which, again, call for mainly labeling answers. They are, according to Heath (1978), strategies designed to limit speaking time of students in that they typically elicit short, even one-word, responses, and serve to contain the discourse within teacher-set limits. 'Why' and 'how' questions, on the other hand, elicit more inquiry, and so tend to foster extended discussion. Heath says,

> In the habit of leading general classroom discussion, teachers maintained an unconscious preference for questions calling for brief answers - questions that would not allow one student to 'monopolize the floor' (Heath; 1978: 8).

The author goes on to say that the routines that maintain discipline in the classroom are so much a part of the past experience of teachers, and so embedded in their consciousness, that the rules which govern the language of control are seldom made explicit. Thus, he concludes,

> A positive response is expected from the hearer; the assertion of recognition of a compliant attitude is implied in the use of such modals as 'can,' 'could,' 'will,' 'would,' and 'going to' (Heath; 1978: 13).

Goodlad (1984) says that, though there were exceptions to this kind of classroom discourse found in his study, they were so infrequent as to not warrant discussion. Hurn sums up this dispensation as follows:

> even at the height of the reform movement . . . teachers still relied on lecture and recitation methods of instruction, still addressed the class as a whole virtually all the time, and continued to enforce the traditional close controls over student behavior (Hurn; 1985: 258).

Tracking

Though tracking comes under school organization, it has important and direct implications for teaching practices. Its relevance in respect of the present discussion (the moral atmosphere of the school), is that as it presently operates, it undermines the very thing it purports to be designed to do: provide for individual differences among students. In fact, as will be argued, tracking is a primary source of discrimination against minority students and those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds.

Persell defines tracking as the practice ". . . which places children together in a class on the basis of similar aptitude, achievement, or aspirations (Persell; 1977: 85)." She says that tracking, especially in large racially diverse schools and schools serving mainly lower-class and minority students, is widespread; a claim supported also by Goodlad (1984).

Goodlad (1984) explains that the vocational/academic split which results in tracking, begins in the primary grades, where children are typically grouped for reading and mathematics according to achievement. The consequence of this grouping is that the groups tend to move further and further apart as grade level rises. The author states that, in his study, little movement was found to occur between groups; they

tended to stabilize. He explains:

> One of the reasons for this stability in group membership is that the work of upper and lower groups becomes more sharply differentiated with each passing day. Since those comprising each group are taught as a group most of the time, it is difficult for any one child to move ahead and catch up with children in a more advanced group (Goodlad; 1984: 141).

Goodlad (1984) maintains that the rationale for grouping is based on a myth about human beings and their ability to learn; a myth which, he contends, is widely believed in our society. He says that it has to do with the concepts of 'headedness' and 'handedness,' which mean, quite simply, that some children relate more readily to a manual mode of learning, while others relate more readily to linguistic and numerical symbols. The problem in school is that the manual mode is well established in teachers' minds, not with a fruitful avenue to be utilized as an alternative way of learning to read, write, and compute, etc., but with a nonacademic tendency, and one commonly associated with poor and slow learners.

Goodlad (1984) found, further, that the curriculum is so set up, in terms, for example, of scheduling, as to make it difficult for students in a vocational stream to take academic courses, and vice versa for academic students. The most important implication of tracking for teaching practice, according to Goodlad (1984), is that separating students in this manner constitutes a form of discrimination against minority students. The author found that in schools enrolling

blacks and Mexican-American students as well as white students, the blacks and Mexican-Americans ". . . frequently were disproportionately enrolled in certain specific types of job-preparatory vocational education classes . . . (Goodlad; 1984: 145)." In fact, Goodlad (1984) found that there is even discrimination within vocational tracks themselves. What this means is that disproportionately large numbers of white students are discovered in vocational courses with more general content (e.g., in home economics, agricultural, and business-skills classes), whereas the minority students mentioned above, are found in disproportionate numbers in courses with content oriented more specifically toward preparation for low-level occupations (e.g., cosmetology, auto repair, industrial cooking and sewing, etc.).

Goodlad points out that this discrimination against minority students is underscored by a more general practice in the schools; he says,

> From other studies we know that students who are from economically impoverished homes and frequently are black or Mexican-American are disproportionately enrolled in special, remedial classes in the early school years. We know also that disproportionate numbers of poor children carry learning deficits into the higher grades, where compensatory programs designed to attack socioeconomic disadvantages tend to fall off. It should not surprise us, then, to find disproportionate numbers in occupational training programs in secondary schools, which are probably perceived by students and their parents to offer greater promise of preparation for early entry to jobs (Goodlad; 1984: 146).

Goodlad (1984) set out to answer three questions about

tracking: whether and where there were differences to be found in (1) curricular content, (2) instructional methods, and (3) teacher-student relations and interactions from track to track. The answers to all three were in the affirmative.

Specifically, regarding curricular differences, high-track classes are found to be much more devoted to courses oriented toward college preparation. Goodlad says,

> in English, for example, the reading of standard works of literature, expository writing, grammar as language analysis, preparation for Scholastic Aptitude Tests, and semantics (Goodlad; 1984: 153).

Low-track classes, on the contrary, are more likely to be taught ". . . basic reading skills, simple narrative writing, functional literacy skills (filling out forms, etc.), language mechanics, and listening . . .(Goodlad; 1984: 153)."

Instructional methods in the high tracks involve generally more time devoted to instruction. In addition to this there is more time spent on higher cognitive processes, such as making judgements, drawing inferences, using symbolism, and so on. Low tracks spend much more time on rote learning and applying knowledge and skills. Whereas in high tracks teachers are more likely to expect more independent thinking in their students, in low tracks the stress is on conformity to rules and expectations. In this regard, middle tracks are more like high tracks. Generally, practices supported in the literature as most conducive to student learning are found in the high tracks, and those associated

negatively with student satisfaction and achievement are characteristic of the low tracks (Goodlad 1984).

There are marked differences in teacher-student relations found in the different tracks. Students in high tracks, for example, see their teachers as more concerned about them and less punitive than do those in low tracks. And it was found that teachers in high tracks do, indeed, spend much less time, than those in low tracks, dealing with discipline and student behavior. Peer esteem, as reported by students, is lowest in low-track classes, and highest in high-track classes. Middle-track classes share the characteristics of both other tracks, but favoring the high tracks (Goodlad 1984).

These track-to-track differences were found to be consistent from school to school throughout all parts of the country. Goodlad (1984) concludes that the process of tracking creates a self-fulfilling prophesy about human potential, that some are meant to go high and others aren't. At the same time the author sees real irony in the fact that tracking is used as a pretence at meeting individual differences.

Persell (1977) states that, contrary to conceptual thinking about ability grouping, which stresses flexibility of movement between groups, a common curriculum shared by all groups, and frequent assessment of students, in practice students are assessed infrequently. In addition to this, Persell (1977) found, like Goodlad (1984), that groups tend to

be stable and self-perpetuating, and even where there is a shared curriculum, different groups tend to be taught differently.

According to Persell (1977), the three main criteria for allocating students to different tracks are standardized test scores (with all their proven biases), teacher recommendations, and pupil race and socioeconomic class. With respect to teacher recommendations, student behavior was found to play an important role in grouping; that is, behavior which is in line with, or contrary to, teachers' wishes. In other words, good behavior rates high group placing, while other behaviors rate the contrary. Class and socioeconomic background were found to play an important role in repeated studies of tracking (and teacher recommendations are particularly related to this criterion), even though studies have found a low correlation between I.Q. scores and achievement.

In general, studies reported by Persell show high agreement with the findings of Goodlad (1984); that is, low tracks are associated with

> different instructional styles, teacher effort, educational content and options, with the alternatives more highly valued by educators and students consistently going to those in higher tracks (Persell; 1977: 90).

Specifically (compare with Goodlad (1984) above), Persell (1977) found that curricular choices are more limited in non-college bound tracks. Lower tracks involve teaching processes

stressing basic skills and facts, and the use of drill. In addition to this, the same tracks are found to be further associated with "dull, unimaginative instructional approaches (Persell; 1977: 89)", while in higher tracks students receive ". . . more empathy, praise, and use of their ideas, as well as less direction and criticism . . . (Persell; 1977: 90)." These studies also report lower teacher interest, enthusiasm, attention, effort, and concern with lower-track students. In some cases teacher-student relations are marked by overtly negative and derogatory attitudes from teachers on their low-track students. The majority of studies, according to Persell (1977), report negative consequences with regard to students' self-concepts in lower tracks, which tracks are often found to have a stigma attached to them. Where students in high tracks tend to characterize themselves as smarter, lower-track students see themselves as dumb, ignorant, or lazy. Persell concludes that, since studies have not shown any clear-cut effect of tracking on average academic achievement of students, the discrepancies in achievement found between high and low tracks ". . . appear to be due to differences in the content, materials, and methods of teaching rather than to tracking per se (Persell; 1977: 98)."

Tracking was also found by Persell (1977) to have important influences on teacher expectations of students. The author states that repeated studies of tracking demonstrate that teachers expect more from higher track groups than from

lower tracks, this in spite of student performance and attitudes to the contrary.

Persell's (1977) review of the current research shows that teacher expectations of, and attitudes toward, children tend to reflect the dominant (middle clas') views of society, views based directly upon race and social class. This agrees with Lortie (1975), who also found that teachers tend to hold popular views regarding students. Teacher expectations of students were found, by Persell (1977), co be influenced as well by test scores, appearance, language style, speed of task performance, and behavior; factors which are also culturally defined and related to position in the social structure. Generally, teachers were found to exhibit certain 'mental sets' and prejudices which reflect, not so much individual personality traits, as a conformity to social norms about children from different social classes and racial groups.

New teachers were found to be influenced in their expectations of students, through experienced teachers who explain the problems of disadvantaged children to them, thus helping to confirm them in negative attitudes which already exist (Persell 1977).

It was found that differentiating students is such an ingrained practice of the American school system and the teacher's role, that teachers are apt to evaluate and make judgements on students even when the evidence for doing so leaves much to be desired (Persell 1977).

Teacher expectations, according to Persell (1977), have been shown to manifest in a variety of ways, both verbal and non-verbal. Studies cited by her found the following: Teachers tend to show more warmth to high-expectancy students, as well as engaging in more eye contact; they engage in more affirmative head-nods and smiles with brighter students, indicating that brighter students are more liked by teachers than dull students; more verbal feedback is given to brighter students by teachers; higher-achieving students are challenged more by teachers. Persell (1977) sums up by saying that higher teacher expectations are related to more and warmer interactions between teachers and students. These expectations may be communicated by the teacher through ". . . a general climate of warmth . . . more praise for performance . . . more actual teaching . . . and . . . more opportunities to respond (Persell; 1977: 128)."

Given the consequences of teacher expectations, Persell (1977) points out that it is lower-class and minority students who are likely to be more influenced, and hence negatively affected, by teacher expectations, since those students are rendered more vulnerable because of the lack of power of their social position generally, coupled with the fact that they are in an educational system which is already stacked against them (through testing, tracking, etc.).

In summary, this chapter has discussed how the authority structure of teaching manifests in teaching practice in the

classroom. Teachers, according to the authors cited, treat students essentially in the same way those above teachers treat them. This means that students are, in the main, rendered powerless through a regime demanding conformity to teachers' wishes. The question of classroom discourse was discussed, particularly with respect to its function - as a 'lecture and recitation' script - as a means of maintaining teacher control over student behavior in the classroom. Finally, tracking was discussed in terms of its discriminatory consequences toward minority students and those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds.

This concludes the second discussion, namely the practice of teaching, in the drawing of a composite picture of teaching in the American public schooling system, with a view to determining the possibilities for moral education in that system, according to the moral theories of Noddings and Kohlberg. The paper now proceeds to the last discussion in the composite picture of teaching.

CHAPTER 5

THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS

This chapter discusses the preparation of teachers in teacher-training institutions throughout the United States. It seeks to define the role teacher preparation plays in the creation and maintaining of both the structure and practice of teaching as discussed above. It treats of the following topics successively: the historical context of teacher training, the status of teacher education, the content of teacher education, and the relevance of teacher education for the reality of the classroom.

The Historical Context

It is not the intent, nor is it within the scope, of this paper to recount the history of teacher education in the United States. However, it is important, for a proper understanding of the present situation in teacher education, to point out that it began, as Sarason (1986) says - with the normal schools in the mid 1800s - essentially as a pragmatic step, to meet the unprecedented need for more teachers in a growing and diverse population. From the beginning, both

normal schools and teacher education were viewed by the universities (and the general public), first with apathy, and subsequently (by the university community), with disdain. This attitude was occasioned by the fact that in the beginning the normal schools were largely adaptations from the secondary schools, and also by the belief in the academic community that teaching was an occupation which required no professional knowledge. As teacher training was taken over more and more by universities themselves (and particularly by the research universities), the initial attitudes of the academic community toward teacher education (and teacher educators) served to fuel a dispute between it and teacher-education faculties and programs, one which continues to this day. The factors underscoring this dispute are explained by Sarason. He says,

> There are three characteristics of the development of teacher-training institutions which deserve emphasis. The first is that they arose as a way of meeting a pressing social need, that is, they did not arise to pursue theory and research in education. Second, and related to the first characteristic, the emphasis was on technical, or "practical," or how-to-do-it matters. The third characteristic is that they developed relatively uninfluenced by the traditions and orientation of the universities (Sarason; 1986: 22).

And, as Schneider adds,

> Establishment of teacher education in universities was not derived from a movement to institutionalize pedagogy as a fundamental area of study in the liberal arts curriculum, but rather out of a societal need to upgrade the professional status of secondary school teachers (Popkewitz; 1987: 213).

Consequently, in the academic community there has been a derogation of teacher education's emphasis on the 'how to' of teaching, along with its deemphasis of classical education. On the teacher-training side, the reaction has been characterized by the view that this derogation is typical of the ivory tower (Popkewitz 1987).

As Goodlad (Goodlad et al. 1990) points out, the progression from normal schools - through teachers' and state colleges - to regional state universities, has not entirely fared well for teacher education. This is largely because, as the size and status of arts and science departments in universities increased, teacher education has tended to become overshadowed. In fact, as the author states,

> It was not uncommon for the academic administrators to view the decline of teacher education on their campuses virtually as evidence of a rite of passage signifying a coming of age for their institutions (Goodlad et al.; 1990: 21).

Goodlad (Goodlad et al. 1990) adds that, not only did teacher education decline as a result of the above transition, but the morale of professors of education suffered accordingly. One of the important spinoffs of both this decline and lowered morale, is that teacher education has become fragmented and characterized by discontinuities. Specifically, whereas up to thirty years ago there was a common core to the professional education of elementary and high-school teachers, and professors teaching preparation courses commonly supervised students in the field, today, though the practice continues in

some instances, it has become fragmented. Goodlad (Goodlad et al. 1990), says, for example, that courses in history or philosophy, where they exist at all, are generally given as options. Likewise, the degree to which students observe in the field and participate in school and classroom observation depends on the program in which they are enrolled.

With respect to discontinuities in teacher education, Goodlad (Goodlad et al. 1990) says that teacher-education programs are today rarely oriented toward a conception of what teaching is, or what education is for, with the result that there is rarely any sharing of concepts by the faculty responsible for these programs. In fact, the larger the institution, the greater the number of programs, and the more varied the activities of the faculty, the more likely it is to find faculty members going about their business in isolation from one another. Lasley and Watras (Katz 1991) point out the real, but unfortunate, programmatic convenience of this isolation when they state that

> it is easier to maintain a fragmented curriculum than to develop a theoretically whole one. Fragmentation does not require intrafaculty dialogue, and it allows each faculty member to pursue his or her specialty without concern for the work of colleagues (Katz; 1991: 10).

The consequence of these two conditions is that teachers coming from these institutions - the same teachers who are to effect school reform and renewal - share very little in common from their teacher-education years. Goodlad says,

> We found it to be almost impossible to get from students during hundreds of hours of interviews a vision of responsibilities extending beyond the classroom. Clearly, they were ill prepared to address issues of school organization. Yet the rhetoric of school reform during recent years carries with it the expectation that teachers will take on problems pertaining to schools as comprehensive entities (Goodlad et al.; 1990: 29).

Goodlad (Goodlad et al 1990) places these conditions in teacher education at the heart of why research so regularly reveals the stubborn persistence of the commonly criticized school and classroom practices. He says,

> Teachers teach as they were taught in schools and colleges and pass these ways along to others. It is not reasonable to believe that beginning teachers, just graduated from programs characterized by discontinuities and just recently apprenticed in ordinary classrooms, will deviate significantly from the norm - a norm deemed by many researchers and reformers to fall far short of being satisfactory (Goodlad et al.; 1990: 31-32).

The Present Status of Teacher Education

The persistence of the traditional in teacher education raises the question of its position in universities today. To appreciate this position one must, again, understand something of its inauspicious beginnings. As has already been alluded to, Schneider (Popkewitz 1987) says that teacher-education departments were started in universities without the approval of the academic community, because education was not considered a 'subject'. In other words, it was felt that

studying education as a subject would merely dilute a student's interest in knowledge for its own sake. Schneider goes so far as to point out that departments of teacher education have been ". . . labeled by some to be the 'slums' of the academic campus (Popkewitz; 1987: 212)."

The specific charges against teacher education departments has had to do with such matters as their utilitarian rather than liberal arts orientation, low research productivity, and the perceived lack of value of the knowledge base of teacher-education courses, activities, and research, in the university community. Raths et al. (Katz 1991) point out that the clinical 'how to' mentality of teacher educators has caused them to be viewed by the academic community as norm-breakers. The authors state:

> They (teacher educators) place little value on research, they don't do research, and they don't apply research. And, as is often the case in any organization or society, those who break the norms, or are perceived as norm-breakers, are sanctioned (Katz; 1991: 47).

Schneider (Popkewitz 1987) states that these conditions, though perhaps true, are typically blamed on the individuals in teacher-education departments, rather than on the structure of relations in the departments themselves. Thus, she says,

> Evidence of low prestige, power, and research productivity among teacher educators can be linked to the structural properties and social behaviors characteristic of the schools of education and universities in which they work (Popkewitz; 1987: 219).

Schneider (Popkewitz 1987) points out that there are

areas of specialization in schools of education. Educational psychology, for example, is rated highly in the university as a whole, while teacher education departments are generally rated low. The result of this rating is that teacher educators are typically given more supervisory responsibilities, more teaching duties, more undergraduate courses to teach, less of a role in doctoral seminars and the dissertation process, and less opportunity for research and research publication. Thus, deans of schools of education typically single out educational psychology programs - which are given the greater share of research opportunities, and which activities are the most highly valued in universities - as being among their strongest, and teacher training programs among their weakest. In addition to this, deans of education themselves are reported to have only low to moderate authority in the university. But, Schneider adds that, even if deans of education had more structural authority,

> it is questionable whether they would direct their efforts toward strengthening teacher education. If an educational psychology program is rated the best program in the school, and certainly comparable to educational psychology programs in other schools, diverting resources from this area would require a strong rationale. Moreover, it is unreasonable to assume that educational psychologists would take on the traditional responsibilities of teacher educators, particularly supervision, because of its technical nature and heavy time commitment (Popkewitz; 1987: 233).

In short, according to this argument, teacher-education programs appear to be caught in a kind of catch twenty-two

bind: they can't raise their standing in the academic community because of their low research output, and they can't increase their research output because of their low standing. Schneider concludes,

> It is ironic that the weakest program identified in these . . . institutions is the one most closely tied to the very core of education. Without a strong graduate training program which encompasses training and research in teaching, how defensible is the existence of a school of education (Popkewitz; 1987: 233-34)?

Raths et al. (Katz 1991) state that the status of teacher education will improve only if teacher educators are seen by the academic community as researchers and scholars, and by teachers as practitioners, the implication presumably being that teacher educators will have to embody the, till now, mutually exclusive virtues of both designations.

The Content of Teacher Education

To take a closer look at some of the broader issues seen to underlie the deficits in teacher education, Mattingly (Popkewitz 1987) states that the literature of educational reform ignores discussions of social policy and social power, the very issues which have defined teaching since the early 1800s: ". . . the pressures of urban growth, class structures, gender relations, ideologies of professionalism and models of social science (Popkewitz; 1987: 36)." The author goes on to say that the dynamics of the relations of society to schooling

have served to narrow the autonomy of teaching. This narrowing is manifested in educational discussions, which portray teacher education as issues of

> curricular design, organizational planning, and . . . administrative and psychological accommodations to primary and secondary levels of schooling (Popkewitz; 1987: 37).

Issues get even further reduced, according to Mattingly (Popkewitz 1987), to questions of personal teaching styles and techniques. The result is that educational discussions seldom involve themselves consciously with teachers' theoretical connections to the economic or political realities of social life. In other words, teaching becomes a subject divorced from the very issues which are at the heart of changes in education.

This leads Giroux and McLaren (Popkewitz 1987) to charge that teacher-education institutions are bereft of both social consciousness and conscience. What they mean by this is that teacher education is primarily responsible for the maintaining of teachers in positions of powerlessness. The authors state:

> We believe that one of the great failures of North American education has been its inability to seriously threaten or eventually replace the prevailing paradigm of teacher as a form of classroom manager with the more emancipatory model of the teacher as a critical theorist . . . the political space which teacher education occupies today continues to deemphasize the struggle for teacher empowerment and generally serves to reproduce the technocratic and corporate ideologies that characterize dominant societies. In fact, it is reasonable to argue that teacher education serves primarily to create intellectuals who operate in the

> interests of the state, whose social function is to sustain and legitimate the status quo (Popkewitz; 1987: 268).

This the authors see made clear in the thrust of the neo-conservative movement in education today, which regards the teacher essentially as a "technologist, technician, or applied scientist (Popkewitz; 1987: 269)." In other words, what is lacking in teacher education is a view of the teacher as a "transformative intellectual (Popkewitz; 1987: 268)" capable of defining schooling in ethical and moral terms, as an institution dedicated to the fostering of democracy, social justice, and social equality.

Giroux and McLaren (Popkewitz 1987) point out that in teacher education, schools are typically presented as essentially unproblematic situations, free from the cultural and political struggles and contradictions which constitute the warp and woof of social relations generally. The classroom situation is presented as if it were something other than a socially and historically constructed reality, a proposition which grossly contradicts what the student teacher encounters in the real classroom. Thus, the authors say,

> Student teachers are generally introduced to a one-dimensional conception of schooling. Rather than viewing the classroom as a cultural terrain where a heterogeneity of discourses often collide in an unremitting struggle for dominance, schooling is often encountered in teacher training programs as a set of rules and regulative practices which have been laundered of ambiguity, contradiction, paradox and resistance (Popkewitz; 1987: 273).

Beyer and Zeichner (Popkewitz 1987) state that a growing body of literature attests to the truth of the contention that teacher education today is dominated by this technocratic rationality. Evidence of this can be seen, they say, in

> the widespread acceptance of newer forms of competency-based teacher education, the competency testing of teachers, apprenticeship-based clinical teacher education, systems management approaches to curriculum development and program evaluation, behaviorist psychologies and the nature of national accreditation and state licensing requirements (Popkewitz; 1987: 315).

The result of this orientation, according to the authors, is that teaching is projected by teacher training as essentially an immediate and pragmatically based enterprise driven by the pace and busy-ness of classroom life, which call for immediate and practical answers. This leads to a conception of teaching technology which labors to inculcate in students certain behavior proficiencies which are considered to be effective, but without ". . . any fundamental understanding or conception of what kind of activity teaching is (Popkewitz; 1987: 301)."

Beyer and Zeichner (Popkewitz 1987) argue, in line with Giroux and McLaren (Popkewitz 1987) above, that the philosophy underlying the technocratic rational approach to teacher education projects the idea that the function of educational institutions is a politically and socially neutral one. The result is that technical concerns have tended to overshadow and displace fundamental debate on political and ethical issues in educational debate.

The politically neutral stance of the technocratic rational approach to teacher education, according to Beyer and Zeichner (Popkewitz 1987), creates the misguided notion in teacher educators that curriculum activities designed to foster change in student-teachers outlooks with respect to the status quo are 'political', and therefore not appropriate. This attitude, in turn, feeds into the idea that activities which support the status quo are not political (and hence neutral), and are therefore desirable and 'appropriate'. Beyer and Zeichner (Popkewitz 1987) contend that under such a dispensation the content and organization of teacher education comes to be viewed as something authoritatively pre-given, from 'outside' or 'above'. The consequence of such thinking is that the question of how such content and organization came to be selected in the first place goes unnoticed, which further legitimizes the notion that the school is politically and ideologically neutral. The net result, according to the authors, is an essentially transmissionist conception of pedagogy:

> Accordingly, the message that is communicated to prospective teachers is that being a teacher means identifying knowledge that is certain, breaking it into manageable bits, and transmitting it to students in an efficient fashion. Being a student means acquiring this knowledge and learning how to use it in a context which does not include criticism and has little patience with analysis (Popkewitz; 1987: 316-317).

Parker (Braun 1989) says that most writers on teacher education in the United States regard it as being in a sorry

state. The author agrees that teacher education is fragmented, technical, arbitrary and without depth. However, he argues that the nature of educational debate itself is partly responsible for the lack of cohesion which characterizes teacher education. He explains that the debate takes place mainly on three fronts - three ethical positions - namely, that of cultural initiation, pedagogical efficacy, and critique. Parker (Braun 1989) maintains that each of these ethics is acting essentially in opposition to the others. Accordingly, the positions of each will be briefly examined here, for the sake of the additional light they may shed on teacher education, according to the arguments of the 'contestants'. Specifically, the 'initiators,' who see teacher education's responsibility in a democratic society as being to initiate all children into the "common democratic conversation (Braun; 1989: 163)," blame the undermining of this prospect in recent decades on the 'pedagogues'. They have done this, the 'initiators' charge, through their espousal of instrumentalism, which has emerged through the progressivism of John Dewey. According to the 'initiators,' instrumentalism has been responsible for diverting teacher education away from the core curriculum designed to form the content (liberal arts and sciences) for the 'common democratic conversation'. It has focused attention instead on " . . . contemporary social conditions and the present life interests of the individual child (Braun; 1989: 165)." Parker sums up

the argument of the 'initiators' as follows:

> Teacher education faculties should wise up to their fixation on child-centered education, reading and study skills, higher order thinking, individualized educational learning styles, and the rest of this content-void shibboleth. What matters, and what future teachers need most, is not the piling on of pedagogic knowledge, but of academic knowledge that is itself the content of the needed initiation (Braun; 1989: 166).

Countering this charge, the 'pedagogues', Parker (Braun 1989) says, agree that the contention of the 'initiators' is correct, as far as it goes, but that it doesn't go far enough. The 'pedagogues' point out that the 'initiators' help to ". . . figure out what knowledge is of the most worth, but not how to help children learn it (Braun; 1989: 167)." They argue that lack of attention to pedagogy in teacher education has resulted in an unequal distribution, in the public schools, of a common curriculum on which democracy relies. This unevenness in distribution has been caused by large school-by-school variation in children's access to knowledge, as well as unequal access within schools themselves through tracking.

The third ethical stance is that of 'critics', whose position has already been indicated (see Beyer and Zeichner, and Giroux and Mclaren above). Suffice it to add here that, according to the 'critics',

> Between initiators' fixation on the right content and pedagogues' fixation on the right teaching methods, there is, without critique, no opening through which it can be seen that schools are deeply political places that are embedded in the institutions and power conflicts of the broader society; that they

> generally cater to whatever social groups and ideologies are dominant at the time; and that prospective teachers typically are not encouraged to examine the "implicit contradiction between the promise and reality of American education" . . . nor to envision alternatives that are more democratic and just (Braun; 1989: 172).

Parker's (Braun 1989) proposal for a solution to the problems which polarize these three positions with respect to one another, is that, rather than attempting to resolve the issues in teacher education by moving exclusively toward one ethic - no one of which alone, he believes, contains the standard toward which education ought to move - an attempt ought to be made to raise consciousness, in all concerned, with respect to all three ethics. Parker says,

> This should complement the common practice in the field of debating only within a single ethic, and it should allow prospective teachers, even if only at the awareness level, access to an array of ethics (Braun; 1989: 177).

Teacher Education and the Reality of the Classroom

The above conditions considered to prevail in, and around, teacher education thus far discussed, underscore the more specific charges laid against teacher preparation in the discussion to follow. Sarason (1986) states that the 'great debate' in education, which began in the 1960s, and has been renewed in the 1980s, has continued to be insensitive, in the preparation of teachers, to the culture of the school; that

is, the school's

> behavioral and programmatic regularities, the mode of and rationale for its organization, its conception of its goals, its response to internal and external sources of change, and it relationship to diverse segments of its social surround (Sarason; 1986: p-vi - p-vii).

Consequently, Sarason (1986) says that reports for improving teacher preparation continue to make recommendations which have little or no effect on teaching practice. He states that reports typically call for such things as: better grounding in specific subject matter, as well as in the arts and sciences generally, better supervision, more inservice and continuing educational opportunities, stricter and more objective standards for judging teacher performance and competency, and greater recognition of the merits of superior teachers. Laudable as those recommendations may be, they do little, according to the author, to prepare teachers for the realities of the classroom (Sarason 1986).

Sarason (1986) (in agreement with the above charge of 'transmissionist' in teacher preparation), as a result of years of speaking with teachers, observing them in classrooms, and studying the contents of teacher training programs, makes the, admittedly exaggerated, observation about teachers, that they see education primarily in terms of what it can put into children, rather than what it can get out of them. According to the author, teachers simply repeat with their students the formulae practiced in their own teacher preparation:

The prospective teacher, like all other

> college students, spends a lot of time in a seat in a classroom or library. We do not for a moment wish to derogate this way of learning certain things. However, the passivity with which many college students experience what is told to or read by them can work against eliciting intellectual curiosity and independence in precisely the same way that educational critics fear to be the case so frequently in the public school classroom (Sarason; 1986: 7).

Lasley and Watras (Katz 1991) point out that many prospective teachers experience alienation from the subject-matter of teacher education, because they are not required to internalize the theories and ideas they have to learn. In other words, they see the pedagogical issues treated in these programs as peculiar to the university, and having little or no relevance to the school classroom. These authors regard this as having a lot to do with the passive roles student teachers are made to adopt in their education courses, a passivity they ultimately pass on to their students in return.

Ashton (Katz 1991), in her plea for a democratic pedagogy in teacner education which would empower both teachers and students, expresses doubt, if not pessimism - based on the contention by some critics that teacher educators are "largely rigid, shallow, anti-intellectual, and conforming (Katz; 1991: 100)" - that such a pedagogy is even possible. She says,

> perhaps teacher education for democratic pedagogy is unworkable. Certainly, the past failures of teacher educators to improve teacher practices offer little reason to be hopeful . . . (Katz; 1991: 100).

Lortie (1975) agrees with the view that teacher education is

removed and theoretical, and puts the matter thus:

> The organizational simplicity of instruction in education is seen in its heavy reliance upon conventional classroom instruction: lecture and discussion are the bread and butter of education study. There are variants, of course - workshops, films, and occasional field trips, and some see promise in such innovations as television and "microteaching". But the study of education is mainly standardized around traditional classroom irstruction and private study. It does not routinely feature the varieties of learning settings found in the established professions (Lortie; 1975: 59).

Sarason (1986) says that much of the criticism of teacher training centers on the contention that it does not give prospective teachers a sufficient grounding in science and liberal arts. This argument (recall the 'initiators' argument above) holds that because teachers are poorly educated, they are unable to stimulate children and interest them in the pursuit of intellectual skills. According to Sarason (1986), most educators agree that teachers are not sufficiently well educated. However, in spite of the truth of this claim, the problem still remains. Even if prospective teachers were well educated does not guarantee the ability to be able to arouse interest and curiosity to learn in children (recall the 'pedagogues' argument above). Sarason says,

> The value of the liberal arts and sciences lies not only in the knowledge which they contain and produce, but in the spirit of inquiry which is their hallmark. The communication of this spirit to children is not guaranteed by the amount of knowledge the teacher (college, high school, and elementary) possesses (Sarason; 1986: 32).

Ashton (Katz 1991), like Sarason (1986) and Lortie (1975), sees the problem as residing in the way these courses are typically taught in teacher training programs. She says,

> Courses in the liberal arts and sciences as currently conceived do not enable teacher education candidates to think about their subject matter in ways that empower them to transform their knowledge of the subject into meaningful learning experiences for their students (Katz; 1991: 93).

The problem becomes all the more obvious when viewed in relation to the matter of children's individual differences. Here again, Sarason (1986) draws attention to the fact that the student teacher is usually exposed to the problems of individual differences through lecture courses, where his/her role is, again, essentially that of passive learner. Sarason concludes, "The ability to recognize and cope with such individual differences is, unfortunately, not highly related to the degree of background in the liberal arts and sciences (Sarason; 1986: 34)."

Sarason (1986) also contends that practice teaching, which forms the other part of teacher training, does not guarantee that what the teacher has supposedly learned in theory, is going to be put into practice. The author points out that, besides being of short duration, practice teaching - in its leaning toward the technocratic rationale discussed above - focuses typically on the technical aspects of teaching, such as lesson plans, curriculum materials, record keeping and housekeeping, etc. It does not concern itself

much with such matters as the arousal of children's curiosity, or eliciting children's ideas.

On this same question Ashton (Katz 1991) takes issue with the practice of placing student teachers with supervising teachers. This is done, the author maintains, without considering whether the goals and methods of the latter are consistent with those of the teacher training program. Or, as Goodlad sardonically puts it,

> Surely such a practice assures perpetuation of the very things we want teacher education programs to change. The success of professional preparation, it seems to me, depends on the degree to which programs are able to separate beginners from the primitive or outworn techniques of their predecessors. If we were to set out to provide the most advanced preparation for future doctors, surely we would not intern them with those whose solution to every illness is blood-letting (Goodlad; 1984: 316).

In a statement going Goodlad's one better, Ashton quotes Joyce as saying, "No more effective method has ever been devised for preventing change in a social institution than to apprentice the novice to his elder (Katz; 1991: 84)."

Lortie (1975) discovered another disturbing anomaly among teachers' attitudes. This has to do with their own prior experience as children themselves in the classroom. The author found that teachers do not see a discontinuity between their observations of teaching, as children, and their present views of teaching, as teachers; those childhood views persist in their own teaching. What he found strange about this is the fact that children's impressions of teaching are

simplistic and naive, and teaching is, in reality, a much more complex activity than children are aware of. To Lortie (1975), this appeared to be indicative of the little impact that teacher training has on these teachers. Ashton describes this persistence of childhood thinking in teachers as follows:

> From years of sitting in classrooms, where the textbooks and teacher are the unquestioned authorities and the right answer is the ultimate value, teacher candidates have developed a conception of knowledge as established by experts. . . . Such classroom experiences lead them to a conception of the teacher as transmitter of knowledge and a conception of learning as passive absorption of information. When they begin teaching, bureaucratic constraints contribute further to their acceptance of a passive role. Typically, their background and training have offered no countervailing experience that could enable them to resist the influences of the bureaucracy (Katz; 1991: 88).

In summary, this chapter has discussed the low status with which teacher training programs have been historically identified in universities (with the consequent low morale among teacher training personnel). It is a status which persists today and continues to be instrumental in the perceived poor quality of teacher education. This status, coupled with the predominantly technocratic rational approach to teacher education, has resulted in a regime which sends novice teachers out into the school and classroom ill-equipped to deal with the actual day-to-day situation they encounter there. The reasons for this deficit include the fact that student teachers are typically instilled by their teacher educators with a socially and politically sanitized conception

of their occupation, which renders them incapable of approaching the activity of teaching from the perspective of a realistically and critically informed outlook. In other words, teacher education continues to be insensitive to the culture of the school. In addition to this, prospective school teachers continue to be prepared to function only as conforming agents of transmission of the status quo, in both educational organization and practice, rather than agents of fundamental educational change, reform and renewal. This is because prospective teachers are, for the most part, subjected to a regimen in teacher training which fosters passivity in them, and which they, in turn, carry into their own teaching in the school classroom. The problem is further compounded by the nature of educational debate, which characteristically attempts to resolve the problems in teacher education, and education generally, through the perspective of a single ethic - cultural initiation, pedagogic efficacy, or critique. Though the way out of this constraining and self-defeating dilemma may be through the adoption of a democratic pedagogy, designed to empower both teachers and students, the prospect of such a pedagogy being adopted in teacher-training programs appears at the very best doubtful, given the traditional characteristics of teacher trainers.

To recapitulate, the paper thus far has discussed the basic elements of the moral theories of Noddings and Kohlberg, that of Noddings involving the practice of the caring ethic,

and that of Kohlberg involving progression through the moral Stages to the fully principled level of morality. Completed also, at this point, is the composite picture of teaching in American public schools, from the perspectives of teaching structure and practice, and the preparation of teachers.

The paper will now proceed with the critique of teaching, according to Noddings and Kohlberg.

CHAPTER 6

CRITIQUE OF TEACHING ACCORDING TO THE THEORIES OF NODDINGS AND KOHLBERG

This chapter critiques teaching, with respect to the above discussion, to determine the possibilities for moral education in the public schools, according to the theories of Noddings and Kohlberg. This involves a preliminary examination of both theories with regard to their implications for moral education in the schools. The writer will also continue, for the sake of convenience, to use Noddings' 'male' and 'female' designations when referring to the student and the teacher respectively, in the discussion of Noddings' theory.

Implications of Noddings' Theory for Moral Education

The School's Primary Responsibility

For Noddings (1984) moral education is not something additive; it is of the very essence of education itself in any and every respect, so that her views on moral education are essentially views on education per se, and on what she feels

education ought to be if it is to be truly educational. Her views represent a reordering of values as well as a shift in emphasis, away from a primary concern with subject matter to a concern for the person of the student: the student as subject to be encountered as one cared-for rather than as an object to be manipulated and fitted, as she says, to suit organizational, administrative, or pedagogical imperatives or convenience.

Chapter 2 made it clear that Noddings' essentially affective approach to morality does not exclude cognition. The author categorically rejects any either-or debate concerning the purpose of schooling, whether it ought to be directed to the intellectual-academic or to the social-emotional world. For her the school, like the church or the home, is responsible for the whole person. Quite simply, the school's first responsibility is the nurturing of the ethical ideal in the student. This does not deny the school's responsibility for the intellectual development of the child, but, as Noddings says,

> when we deliberately pose tasks or suggest means that may promote the intellectual but put the ethical ideal at risk, we have confused our priorities dangerously (Noddings; 1984: 173).

Making the school's primary duty the nurturing of the ethical ideal puts Noddings, by her own admission, to some extent in sympathy with educators like Neill and Rogers, who would not teach the child anything until he first showed an

interest. Noddings would not go quite that far. She is willing to take a more active approach with respect to presenting the student with subject matter, but always with the understanding that the student knows he is more important than the subject. Noddings is aware that her caring approach moves contrary to the dominant view of contemporary education. But it is a view which she sees as prone to abstracting the teaching-learning situation - through its reliance on moral principles - to the point of fitting the student to a system. Her insistence on the primacy of the individual caring relationship, rather than on principles, as being the crucial data in the educational encounter, is the essential element of divergence in her views on the purpose of education.

What applies to the one-caring generally, applies equally to the teacher. Consequently, any enterprise which would interfere with caring in any way must be set aside by the teacher in favor of the child. She defines the teacher's role as follows:

> Everything we do, then, as teachers, has moral overtones. Through dialogue, modeling, the provision of practice, and the attribution of best motive, the one-caring as teacher nurtures the ethical ideal. She cannot nurture the student intellectually without regard for the ethical ideal unless she is willing to risk producing a monster, and she cannot nurture the ethical ideal without considering the whole self-image of which it is a part. For how he feels about himself in general - as student, as physical being, as friend - contributes to the enhancement or diminution of the ethical ideal (Noddings; 1984: 179).

All of the teacher's dealings with the student, Noddings maintains, constitute an active influence, but of a special kind. They are informed and directed by 'inclusion'. This, Noddings explains, means that the caring teacher actually becomes a duality. With respect to subject matter, she is able to approach it through the student's own perspective, through his ears, his eyes, and his feelings. This is the only true way the teacher is able to interpret the subject to the student. Noddings says,

> As she exercises this inclusion, she accepts his motives, reaches toward what he intends, so long as these motives and intentions do not force an abandonment of her own ethical ideal (Noddings; 1984: 177).

Noddings is very specific on the matter of how 'inclusion' is to be practiced by the teacher in classroom situations. Two characteristic examples will illustrate how she would have the teacher approach the student in all her dealings with him. The first has to do with the matter of school rules and the question of cheating. Noddings points out that rules are always referred back to their ground in caring, for the simple reason that the caring teacher has no vested interest in rules for their own sake, and is not above breaking them when they threaten caring. Where a student has been discovered in cheating, for instance, she says that the teacher

> begins by attributing the best possible motive to him, and then proceeds to explain - fully, with many of her own reservations expressed freely - why she cannot allow him to cheat.

> She does not need to resort to punishment, because the rules are not sacred to her. What matters is the student, the cared-for, and how he will approach ethical problems as a result of his relation to her (Noddings; 1984: 178).

The second example distinguishes caring from not-caring. Noddings cites the case of a mathematics teacher faced with a student who hates the subject. A not-caring teacher will see the situation as being one in which it is her duty to bring the reluctant student to love mathematics - a noble thing in itself. But, for Noddings, such an attitude amounts, in effect, simply to manipulation, however altruistic the teacher's motives may be. The teacher is merely projecting - albeit perhaps with the best of intentions - her own reality with regard to mathematics onto the student. For the one who cares, the student is always more important than mathematics. Thus, Noddings says,

> What matters to me, if I care, is that he find some reason, acceptable in his inner self, for learning the mathematics required of him or that he reject it boldly and honestly (Noddings; 1984: 15).

Noddings stresses that she is not denying the importance of the subject-matter being taught. Rather, she is cautioning against what she regards as the misguided attitude which equates being a good teacher with being willing to do almost anything to make a student learn. Noddings explains that she would have the teacher help the student understand that the subject-matter is many things: it is both important and unimportant, serious and silly, meaningful and nonsensical,

etc. But above all, she would have the teacher make the student understand that he is infinitely more important than the subject.

What characterizes caring most, in contrast to a rigidly defined system of rules and regulations, is its 'variability'. Caring is moved, Noddings says, ". . . by a broad and loosely defined ethic that molds itself in situations and has a proper regard for human affections, weaknesses, and anxieties (Noddings, 1984: 25)."

School Organization and the Caring Ethic

Noddings regards the organization of the public schooling system, as it exists, as not capable of lending itself to the creation and maintenance of the caring ethic. She points out that institutions of themselves cannot be caring. When applied specifically to the school the danger, she says, is that

> Rules are formulated and the characteristic variation in response to the needs of the cared-for may fade away. Those entrusted with caring may focus on satisfying the formulated requirements for caretaking and fail to be present in their interactions with the cared-for. Thus caring disappears and only its illusion remains (Noddings; 1984: 26).

Noddings' main criticism of the schooling system has to do with what she considers its essentially masculine orientation; an orientation which she claims has shown, and continues to show, itself as opposed to the caring ethic. Her

desire is to make the 'voice of the mother' heard in education. Opposing this voice to that of male psychology - the voice of the father presently controlling schooling - she says,

> Of first importance to the one-caring is relatedness. She is not eager to move her students into abstraction and objectivity if such a move results in detachment and loss of relation . . . the excessive efforts at abstraction, objectivity, and detachment in our schools are a manifestation of the father's psychological need to take possession of the child (Noddings; 1984: 182).

Quoting Madeleine Grumet, who maintains that it is a male need which seeks to control and possess the child, Noddings says,

> masculine identification processes stress differentiation from others, the denial of affective relations, and categorical, universalistic components of the masculine role, denying relation where female identification processes acknowledge it (Noddings; 1984: 183).

What Noddings is alluding to here is the fundamental role which dialogue plays in the caring relationship. Masculine identification, she maintains, precludes true dialogue, and hence a caring relationship. She sees current school practice as being without such dialogue, a deficit resulting directly from the masculine need to control the child. Dialogue would involve discussing with the child anything which is of intellectual interest to him: "God, sex, killing, loving, fear, hope, and hate must all be open to discussion (Noddings; 1984: 183)." Noddings says she is aware that many educators would object to such open discussion because of the dangers of

such things as indoctrination, giving offence to parents, and the like. But these objections she sees as simply strategies to control children. And contrary to the argument that the discussion of values is the proper domain of the home and church, Noddings points out that even if this were so - and she doesn't believe that it is - it would not be enough, because, as she says, homes and religious institutions often deliberately inculcate particular values which are in conflict with one another. She sees the school, therefore, as being the ideal setting for the discussion of such values, beliefs, and opinions, where they can be examined critically and appreciatively. "It is absurd," she concludes, "to suppose that we are educating when we ignore those matters that lie at the very heart of human existence (Noddings; 1984: 184)."

The essence of true dialogue involves a form of dialectic between thinking and feeling. In the treatment of values such a dialectic would lead the student beyond an all-consuming preoccupation with his own particular, if deeply felt, values, to an appreciation of those of others; to a sense of relatedness with those differing others. This would lead students toward an ability to receive others even though they didn't believe what those others believed. Noddings says,

> Watching another in prayer, or at communion, or even brandishing a holy sword, I may feel what he feels even though I reject what he believes. Then I am reconnected to this other in basic caring (Noddings; 1984: 186).

Noddings acknowledges that an authentic commitment to a

caring ethic in education would require fundamental changes in the structure of the schooling system. Thus, her recommendations for such changes, though lacking in specific details, are nevertheless noteworthy. Caring, she points out, needs practice. The provision for such practice would require changes in the legal structure of schooling, to allow for the involvement of students in real, adult activities: for example, in service activities through social agencies in society. Such involvement, she maintains, would give students practice in authentic caring in real situations.

A second change she advocates has to do with the deprofessionalization of education, which, Noddings says, structures it into narrow areas of specialization. She points out that this has nothing to do with eliminating expertise in any chosen discipline. In fact, Noddings stresses the necessity of any teacher being deeply knowledgeable in her chosen discipline, without which she will be unable to practice the all important inclusion with her student:

> If the teacher does not know her subject matter very well, she cannot give her full attention to the students who are approaching it in a variety of ways. She must, instead, maintain absolute control so that things are done her way . . . (Noddings; 1984: 138).

What Noddings is speaking of in deprofessionalization has to do with eliminating many of the skills associated with teaching because of the peculiar structure of modern schooling; skills having to do with so-called management and discipline, which would be unnecessary in a school organized

around caring.

Noddings sees the vital area of curriculum as being another culprit in the defeat of a caring ethic. She regards the curriculum of 'high culture', which characterizes modern schooling, as one which separates the student from his everyday environment. According to her, it inculcates principles and ideas about an abstract world far removed from the student's experience. Again, Noddings sees this as a specifically

> masculine project, designed to detach the child from the world of relation and project him, as object, into a thoroughly objectified world (Noddings; 1984: 192).

These curriculum practices, supposedly essential to the maintenance of standards, Noddings regards as accomplishing just the opposite; the systematic dehumanization of both male and female children ". . . through the loss of the feminine (Noddings; 1984: 192)."

Another obstacle to the establishment of a caring ethic, for Noddings, is the grading system, a practice, however, which she does not see as being in much likelihood of being abandoned. She says that public grading based on a general standard makes an object out of the child; but in relation with the teacher the child cannot be both subject and object. In a caring relationship the student can only be subject. Assuming the grading system is going to continue, however, Noddings proposes what she regards as the only practical solution to the problem: take the grading out of the hands of

the teacher and place it in those of an agency chosen specifically for the purpose. This would at least align the teacher with the student against such grading, and enable the caring relation to remain intact. This doesn't mean that all evaluation of the student is removed from the teacher, but only that one-shot 'measuring stick' which would make an object of the child.

Noddings notes that teacher training does not involve a real apprenticeship, common to many other occupations, and a practice which she feels is admirably suited to teacher training. Consequently, her suggestions for the creation of a caring environment in the school would include such apprenticeship. She would have a new teacher apprenticed to a 'master' teacher for the first three years of teaching. This master teacher would be one who had, of course, demonstrated herself as one-caring, through her own apprenticeship. Noddings says that such an apprenticeship need not be a costly project, ". . . for two teachers working together with volunteer adults and, perhaps, older children can handle almost the equivalent of two classes (Noddings; 1984: 198)."

Finally, Noddings would have steps taken to dismantle the hierarchical structure of the schooling system. Such a structure would be replaced by a 'circular' reorganization of relations in the school. This would mean giving teachers much greater scope as educators. It would involve, for example,

placing them in a variety of positions at different times: administrative, counselling, curriculum planning, personnel administration, etc. The following statement sums up her concept of a circular school organization:

> Teaching, it is well known, is a 'flat' profession; year one and year thirty look much alike. If we were to organize in circles and cycles, teachers could look forward to advances in both financial status and responsibility as they gained experience. Those who have expertise in business, for example, would bring experience to the business office, and would take from their year in that task a host of practical applications and a fuller understanding of the financial problems facing the district. Further, with the enemy - the professional administrator - removed, teachers might be more receptive to innovation and, having a hand in its creation, might implement that which is promising (Noddings; 1984: 199).

The greatest obstacle which Noddings sees to a circular organization of the schooling system is not its supposed inefficiency, but rather the existing masculine orientation, which has a vested interest in maintaining conditions according to traditional standards. She says, "Those who have succeeded in the traditional masculine structure may not easily or graciously give up their hard-won power (Noddings; 1984: 200)."

A school organized on a circular paradigm, she maintains, would change the system from a cellular and individualistic orientation to a more connected one, because it would be more open to parents and other adults, and no teacher would be solely responsible for her students, or left alone with them

excessively.

In summary, Noddings asserts that the practice of the caring ethic in education, as in all caring relationships, is based in a one-to-one relationship between the one-caring (teacher) and the one cared-for (student). It is a relation of mutual dependence which, on the one hand, impels the one-caring toward the one cared-for in an effort to realize in the latter the ethical ideal, that is, one's best self as mirrored in the one cared-for. On the other hand, the caring relationship demands the reciprocation of the one cared-for if it is to exist at all. In the caring relationship between the teacher and the student, the fostering of the ethical ideal in the student always supersedes the subject-matter being taught.

The present (masculine) hierarchical structure of the schooling system precludes the caring relationship between teacher and student because of its differentiating and separating characteristics, which alienate the student from his world, replacing it with an abstraction. It is a structure which seeks to control the student by fitting him into a predetermined and rigid system of rules and regulations. An arrangement more conducive to the fostering of caring in the school would involve a more fluid 'circular' organization, where authority relations and responsibilities changed hands on a regular basis.

Implications of Kohlberg's Theory for Moral Education

Kohlberg's Position

Kohlberg (1976) claims that his theory of moral development is inimical to those, on the one hand, who posit the traditional form of academic education as being politically neutral, as well as being the best kind of education for preparing children for a bureaucratic, competitive society. This view, he claims, is not value neutral at all, but basically conservative. On the other hand, neither does his theory favor the radicals, who claim that the conservatives' approach simply destroys individual growth and sensitivity. Kohlberg (1976) says that both views negate development, the conservatives through the maintenance of the status quo, and the radicals by positing revolution for revolution's sake, rather than for the sake of evolution, which is the thrust of development, and which is by definition a slow process. This argument Kohlberg (1976) puts forth in the belief that society, contrary to the claims of some, is not in a state of moral decay, but rather in one of moral transition from a primarily Conventional (Stage 4) mentality, to a Postconventional (Stage 5) one, and that the developmental - in Dewey's words 'progressive' - approach is the way to go.

'The Crowds, the Praise, and the Power' and Conventional Morality

In speaking of the overall atmosphere of the school Kohlberg says he accepts Philip Jackson's view of the main characteristics of the public schooling system in America, summed up in the terse phrase as "the crowds, the praise, and the power (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 197)." The 'crowds' refer to the large numbers of students, which mandates the keeping of order in the classroom; the 'power' is the impersonal regimen of authority students are subjected to in the school, an authority wielded by the teacher; the 'praise', has to do with the praise (and the blame) handed out by the teacher to the students who succeed (or fail) in the school's competitive atmosphere.

For Kohlberg (1981), the goal of moral development, as was discussed above, is the attainment of a principled morality based on justice. Therefore, the fostering of moral development presupposes a just environment. Kohlberg (Purpel and Ryan 1976) says he is ready to accept 'the crowds, the praise, and the power', seeing them as things not likely to change in the foreseeable future, and being neither just nor unjust in themselves. He maintains, therefore, that a just environment can be created without attempting to eliminate the 'crowds, praise, and power'. He says,

> The teaching of justice requires just schools. The crowds, the praise, and the power are neither just nor unjust in themselves. As

> they are typically used in the schools, they represent the values of social order and of individual competitive achievement. The problem is not to get rid of the praise, the power, the order, and the competitive achievement, but to establish a more basic context of justice which gives them meaning (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 213).

In other words, the 'crowds, the praise, and the power' characterize, not only the schools, but society at large itself, and as such, do not define the moral effects of the school (Purpel and Ryan 1976). However, Kohlberg makes a crucial distinction between the governance of society at large and that of the school. He says,

> While our political institutions are in principle Stage 5 (i.e., vehicles for maintaining universal rights through the democratic process), our schools have traditionally been Stage 4 institutions of convention and authority (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 189).

This means that the schools do not automatically provide for a graduating population ready to assume an active role in a democratic society. Thus, Kohlberg goes on to say, "Today more than ever, democratic schools systematically engaged in civic education are required (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 189)."

While Conventional morality, with its trans-personal and legalistic basis of reasoning, forms the essential glue of group cohesion, thus constituting a basis for the benefit of social stability, one of the problems with it is that it

> fails to reduce the welfare and 'claims' of the group as a collective abstraction to the welfare and claims of its members as individuals (Beck; 1971: 61).

As an extreme instance of the danger of Conventional thinking Kohlberg (Beck 1971) cites the example of the Bolsheviks' letting 10,000,000 Kulaks starve for the greater happiness of the unborn greater number. Putting principled morality in its proper perspective Kohlberg says,

> The case is always higher than the principle, a single human life is worth more than all the principles in philosophy to the mature man. Principles simply tell us how to resolve these concrete claims, when claims compete in a situation, when it is one man's life against another's (Beck; 1971: 61).

Another problem with Conventional morality, according to Kohlberg (Beck 1971), is that it is focused on moral content (recall the discussion on form and content in Chapter 2); it defines its aims in terms of virtues and vices, which, in effect, means defining them in terms of praise and blame of others. In other words, Conventional moral thinking makes praise and blame the core of moral education. The trouble with this approach is that it tends to ascribe virtues and vices to things which are morally neutral (such as, for example, putting one's books away, or being neat and clean, etc.), or to attribute incorrect virtues and vices to actions (see the example of the 'fourth-grade teacher', page 117). Kohlberg says,

> it is the over-concern with conforming behavior characteristic of traditional approaches to moral education that lies behind most of the mistakes of educators in the moral realm (Beck; 1971: 81).

School Democracy and Moral Education

Kohlberg says (recall the discussion of role-taking in Chapter 2) that morality is

> a natural product of a universal human tendency toward empathy or role taking, toward putting oneself in the shoes of other conscious beings. It is also a product of a universal concern for justice, for reciprocity or equality in relation of one person to another (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 189).

It can be seen here that Kohlberg's concept of role-taking has a lot in common with Noddings' concept of 'inclusion', both of which regard dialogue as being essential. For, Kohlberg goes on to say that because of this universal tendency to put oneself in the shoes of another, fundamental to moral education is the process of open, authentic discussion. Thus, conditions with respect to the moral atmosphere of the school echo those described above for moral development generally. Kohlberg says,

> The first basic dimension of social atmosphere is the role-taking opportunities it provides, the extent to which it encourages the child to take the point of view of others. . . . The second dimension of social atmosphere, more strictly moral, is the level of justice of the environment or institution. (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 191-92).

For Kohlberg, the significance of such conditions is that they create the basis for participatory democracy, which he regards as providing the best atmosphere for moral growth, since it offers ". . . more extensive opportunities for role-taking and a higher level of perceived institutional justice

than does any other social arrangement (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 193)." In his guidelines for the specifics of discussion (of moral dilemmas), Kohlberg states that the atmosphere be one of ". . . interchange and dialogue . . . in which conflicting moral views are compared in an open manner (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 190)." Referring to the hidden curriculum - about which more will be said presently - Kohlberg says that its educational use

> is not to prevent the dialogue by calling classroom law and order moral character . . . but to use it to bring the dialogue of justice into the classroom (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 214).

Kohlberg explains the significance of student participation - and hence, dialogue with students - with respect to the social structure of a school which would be a vehicle for the fostering of moral development, when he says,

> Ultimately, then, the issue of participation raises the issue of the social structure of the school and a complete approach to moral education means full student participation in a school in which justice is a living matter. It is clear that the educator's ability to engage in this type of education is to a considerable extent contingent on the teacher herself reaching a principled level of moral judgement (Beck; 1971: 84).

This statement leaves no doubt that though Kohlberg may be prepared to accept the 'crowds, praise, and power', he is advocating that these conditions obtain within a democratic classroom in a democratic school. Elsewhere he says,

> Our approach to moral and civic eduction relates the study of law and government to the actual creation of a democratic school in

> which moral dilemmas are discussed and resolved in a manner which will stimulate moral development (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 189).

The 'Hidden Curriculum' and Moral Education

It is, according to Kohlberg (Beck 1971), through the 'hidden curriculum' that the moral atmosphere of the school is actually created and maintained, the explication of which takes the discussion to the heart of why Kohlberg (Mosher 1980) places such importance on the centrality of the school as an experiment in participatory democracy. He defines the hidden curriculum as follows:

> The term 'hidden curriculum' . . . refers to the fact that teachers and schools are engaged in moral education without explicitly and philosophically discussing or formulating its goals and methods (Beck; 1971: 29).

Specifically, it refers to school and classroom rules, that is, the general governance of the school. The hidden curriculum, like the 'crowds, the praise, and the power' is, according to Kohlberg (Purpel and Ryan 1976) also theoretically morally neutral. What matters in the hidden curriculum is the moral character of the teachers and principal and how the hidden curriculum is translated into the social atmosphere of the school. Kohlberg says,

> the transformation of the hidden curriculum into a moral atmosphere is not a matter of one or another educational technique or ideology or means, but a matter of the moral energy of the educator, of his communicated belief that

> his school or classroom has a human purpose (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 213).

Kohlberg sees the problem with the hidden curriculum as it stands as one involving a confusion in thinking based on the idea of the relativity of ethical values. This confusion, he says, has to do with the generally held idea among psychologists and sociologists,

> that there are no universal, nonarbitrary moral principles and that each individual acquires his own values from the external culture (Beck; 1971: 30).

The external culture in this case being the school, the functioning of the hidden curriculum, based on the above (Conventional) thinking, results in the unfortunate assumption among teachers that, as Kohlberg says, ". . . the discipline of group life directly promotes moral character (Beck; 1971: 28)." Kohlberg points out that the legitimacy of this assumption rests on the idea that moral development, based on the relativity of values, is defined as "the direct internalization of the external cultural norms (Beck; 1971: 30)." In other words, the atmosphere of the school 'as it is' automatically defines morality, which means, in effect, the legitimization of the status quo. Thus, the growing child is trained to behave in such a way that he/she conforms to societal - in this case the school's - rules and values, for their own sake. In short, according to this (Conventional) thinking, what is moral is what society - and hence the school - agrees collectively to be moral (Beck 1971).

The result of this confusion in thinking is, Kohlberg says, a hidden curriculum which focuses "moral instruction on the trivial and immediate, rather than on the universal and important (Beck; 1971: 31)"; as in the example cited above of giving moral weight to the putting away of one's books. To demonstrate this further, Kohlberg (Beck 1971) cites the example of a fourth-grade teacher who, seeing a boy hit another in class, and receiving the excuse that he did so because the other spit in his face, remarked that such a gesture was not 'polite'; that it was 'rude'. Kohlberg points out that the teacher, in an attempt to avoid moralizing - because she was well versed in moral relativity - resorted to the superficial middle-class value of politeness (which was emotionally important to her), thus missing the deeper implications of the gesture's insult to human dignity. Kohlberg concludes,

> When confronted with uncertainty about the relativity of ethical principles, the customary resort of the teacher is to retreat to the committee or group. Uneasy about her own arbitrary authority, she passes this authority over to the group . . . (Beck; 1971: 32)

Thus, in their use of the hidden curriculum for fostering moral development, teachers typically resort to conformity to group authority (Stages 3 and 4); for example, that of school staff and administration. This, of necessity, passes on a message of like conformity to students.

Kohlberg (Purpel and Ryan 1976) argues that, in fact, the

hidden curriculum as it exists at present does not develop morality but rather transmits values other than what educators ordinarily think of as moral values. He says, for example, that though the school may police children with respect to cheating, the values it actually promotes are those of independent competition and achievement. He says,

> from the social system point of view, cultivating independent competition is more important or more moral than cultivating honesty, since our society is built to tolerate a lot of petty cheating but is not built to tolerate a lot of people who are not interested in making it by the institutional achievement standards (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 204).

If the hidden curriculum isn't simply to be a vehicle designed to equate morality with the ideology of the school itself, Kohlberg (Purpel and Ryan 1976) says that it will have to represent something more; it must be a vehicle for the fostering of a truly principled morality. Transforming the hidden curriculum into a vehicle for moral development means, for Kohlberg (Mosher 1980), putting it at the service of a school dispensation founded on participatory democracy, which is the foundation of a just school. He points out that involving students in the discussion of moral dilemmas alone is not sufficient, if those discussions do not take place in a school atmosphere where they are complemented by a democratic school climate. Without such a climate they will only serve to frustrate students and make them distrustful of the democratic process itself. Kohlberg says, "The additional

educational experience required is the experience of civic participation . . . (Mosher; 1980: 32)." And he explains,

> The most basic way in which the high school can promote experiences of civic participation is to govern itself through a process of participatory democracy. The learning and development required for democratic governing must come from doing or making a government, from being an active member of governance with the power to influence government to be more just. The only way school can help graduating students become persons who can make society a just community is to let them try experimentally to make the school themselves (Mosher; 1980: 35).

Kohlberg's Aims for Moral Education Restated

Kohlberg (Mosher 1980) modified his aspirations for moral development in the public schools on two occasions. The first involved a lowering of the goal from Stage 6 to Stage 5. One of the reasons for this retrenchment was the fact that, at the time - 1976, there was an ongoing debate among researchers concerning the very existence of a Stage 6. In addition to this, Kohlberg says,

> Stage 5 is the morality of the social contract and the rights of man that generated the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Our longitudinal research solidly confirmed that this was a natural stage of development found in Israel and Turkey as well as in the United States. While a natural stage, only a small minority of adults, even of college graduates, reached the fifth stage. In 1976 I said Stage 5 was, as ever, in some danger because it was in the possession of a minority (Mosher; 1980: 27).

Kohlberg points out that Watergate also supported his claim

for a Stage 5 goal for moral education, since it vindicated the working of the Constitution; that is, Watergate ". . . provided the scenario to reassert the Stage 5 vision of the founding fathers (Mosher; 1980: 27)."

By 1980 Kohlberg had once again altered his position; he says, "This chapter reports a further retrenchment to Stage 4 goals as ends of civic education" (Mosher; 1980: 28). Kohlberg's rationale for this second retrenchment involved the contention that the main problem facing youth at the time was privatism, a movement which he saw as in danger of undermining the stability of American society itself. He describes privatism as follows:

> "Privatism," the ideology of "look out for number one," is exactly the attitude behind the new-conservative elder's demand for more discipline in the schools and more "back to basics." Behind the back-to-basics movement is the basic of California's Proposition 13, money. In terms of outcomes of education the recent Gallup Poll indicates the most endorsed educational outcome is the ability to write a job application letter with correct grammar and spelling. In terms of educational input, the most endorsed input is not spending money. This is the privatism underlying the back to basics (Mosher; 1980: 30).

Looking out for number one is, as Kohlberg explains, Stage 2 moral reasoning. Hence, the retrenchment to a Stage 4 aim for moral education in the schools was for the sake of preserving the social stability which Kohlberg saw as in danger of being undermined by this Stage 2 mentality creeping into and through American social relations among the youth.

The writer would like to draw attention here to the idea

that it would seem reasonable to assume, in the light of this second retrenchment to Stage 4, that such would render Kohlbergian recommendations for moral education redundant in the schools. As has already been explained, the schools already supposedly operate at Stage 4, which should mean that they ought to be able to foster Stage 4 morality in students as things stand. However, for Kohlberg (Mosher 1980), such does not seem to be the case, that is, he does not appear to trust the school, as it functions at present, to be a vehicle for the attainment of a Stage 4 morality; or more correctly, its attainment in the manner he envisions. Hence, he says that his philosophy of civic education (in the light of his retrenchment),

> is, in a certain sense, then, conventional or fourth stage. Only its educational approach is unconventional and new. The approach is the governance of a small school community by participatory or direct democracy. Rules are made and enforced through a community meeting, one-person-one-vote whether faculty or student (Mosher; 1980: 28-29).

What this means is that, although now aimed at the attainment of Stage 4 morality, the school, in addition, would need to operate along the lines of participatory democracy in order to guarantee that attainment in a manner which does not represent mere conformity to school's status quo; that it would, in addition, prepare students to take an active role in the democratic process of society. This is made clearer in the light of Kohlberg's (Mosher 1980) answer to his own question: given the importance of actual experiences of participation in

a political community, why does it rest upon the high school to provide it; why not leave it to spontaneous experience after high school? His answer is,

> unless a person leaves high school already at the fourth stage and with corresponding interests and motivations, he or she is unlikely to be in a position to have the capacities and motivation to enter positions of participation and public responsibility later (Mosher; 1080: 34).

He goes on to explain,

> I have made the Socratic argument for school democracy in terms of participatory experience for development to a fourth-stage citizenship role orientation, as well as for developing some awareness of our fifth-stage citizenship principles of constitutional democracy. The negative argument is perhaps even more compelling. This is the argument that bureaucratic-authoritarian high school governance actually teaches alienation and ignorance about a democratic society. In this argument, while the high school social studies curriculum teaches equal liberty and due process, the high school "hidden curriculum" (the governance and informal social relations of the school) teaches something very different (Mosher; 1980: 36-37).

The argument for democratic schools is given further weight by Kohlberg's (Mosher 1980) maintaining that, even among college graduates, very few reached beyond Conventional morality. Kohlberg concludes, ". . . school democracy is the central experience of participation necessary for moral and civic development (Mosher; 1980: 36)."

Studies Using Kohlbergian Methods

A multitude of studies, experiments, and programs have been carried out in school settings using Kohlberg's principles and methods. In fact, there was a period when there was a virtual Kohlbergian 'band wagon' (Mosher 1980) of moral education enterprises as a result of the theory's popularity. Several studies will be briefly cited here to illustrate the kinds of results and conclusions produced.

A study by Sullivan and Beck (Purpel and Ryan 1976) in the early 1970s, in a Canadian elementary school and two high schools over a four year period, brought the researchers to the following conclusions:

1. With respect to the role of the teacher the authors concluded (in a statement characterized by its democratic spirit) that

> In particular, teachers must learn to give full acknowledgement of, and make constant use of, the expertise of students. Only in this way can a spirit of cooperative search for knowledge and wisdom be developed in the classroom (Purpel and Ryan; 1976: 230).

2. The structure of school relations (through the hidden curriculum) encourages a certain kind of morality, which, in an authoritarian climate, may frustrate teachers' attempts to facilitate moral development in their students. The authors go on to state that most school systems are, unfortunately, run along broadly authoritarian lines, with the result that a

relationship of mutual trust and the cooperative effort between teacher and student is extremely difficult to come by.

3. Most teachers are Conventional (Kohlberg's Stages 3 and 4), and most classes teacher-centered.

4. The authors state that teacher training is largely responsible for the creation of Conventional norms in teachers' outlooks. They say,

> The teacher who finishes training is well aware of the "tried and true" conventions that have kept the school going for years. These conventions are known as the collective wisdom which all new teachers need in order to get by and succeed in their task. The final outcome of this whole process, which is subsequently supported by the very structure of the school is a predominance of teachers who remain for the most part in the conventional stages (Stages 3 and 4) of morality (Purpel and Ryan; 1976; 232).

Two other studies, carried out by Kohlberg (Mosher 1980) himself, involved the retrenchment (to the Conventional level) discussed above. They employed the standard method of the discussion of moral dilemmas in two Cambridge alternative high schools where participatory democracy was being tried with working-class black and white students. In these studies, however, the dilemmas were real-life rather than hypothetical. The experiment took place over a four-year period. The results, Kohlberg says, involved a movement in the students

> from preconventional to conventional morality, and concomitant changes in life style, in the ending of delinquent behavior, college attendance, and so on (Mosher; 1980: 48).

A further study carried out by a student of Kohlberg's,

Moshe Blatt (Mosher 1980), during this same period, triggered a series of studies which replicated the findings of Blatt in a number of high school settings. One major project conducted by the Stone Foundation involved some 20 schools in the Boston and Pittsburgh area. Teachers were trained in Kohlberg's methods. The experiments also used control groups who discussed the moral dilemmas, but without the teachers having been trained in Kohlberg's methods of using them. As expected, the desired gains were made by the experimental but not by the control groups. The studies produced the following conclusions:

> Moral education is best conceived of as a natural process of dialogue among peers rather than as a process of didactic instruction or preaching. The teacher and the curriculum are best conceived of as facilitators of this dialogue through presenting challenging dilemmas or situations, through probing for student reasoning and listening to reasons, and through presenting reasoning at a higher stage (Mosher; 1980: 52).

Finally, the implications of Kohlberg's theory for education, as well as research studies using Kohlbergian principles and methods cited in this paper, conjointly support the following with respect to the school's role in the moral development of children:

1. Ideally, teachers who themselves possess a principled morality (Stage 6) are best equipped to facilitate moral development in children;

2. Only a setting characterized by participatory democracy can effectively facilitate moral development; that is, a

setting which fosters dialogue among students, and between students and teachers;

3. With respect to moral education, the teacher is essentially a facilitator of dialogue and discussion among the students;

4. Authoritarian school structures may militate against moral development of children;

5. Schools characteristically operate at the Conventional (Stages 3 and 4) moral level.

In summary, this chapter thus far has elaborated on the implications of the moral theories of Noddings and Kohlberg for moral education in the schools. This was seen, for Noddings, to involve a clarification of the school's primary role as the fostering of the ethical ideal in the child, through the process of 'inclusion', fundamental to which is dialogue with the child. All other considerations are to be seen in the light of, and for the sake of, that primary role. Secondly, Noddings challenged the hierarchical 'male' organization of teaching authority as being inimical to the fostering of a caring ethic in the school and classroom. This she would see replaced by a 'circular' arrangement of teaching authority, with would involve giving wider powers and responsibilities to teachers, under a dispensation characterized by collaborative effort among all persons involved in the education of the child.

With respect to the educational implications of

Kohlberg's theory, it was discussed that Kohlberg sees his view of moral education as preparing for a society in transition for a mainly Stage 4 level of moral development, to Stage 5. It was pointed out that, according to Kohlberg, the schools are characterized essentially by a Stage 4 moral level, which means, especially in an authoritarian school climate, the fostering of a regime of conformity in students, which is designed to frustrate moral development through the Stages. Kohlberg, therefore, called for a schooling system organized around the principles of participatory democracy, in which the 'hidden curriculum', which is primarily responsible for the moral atmosphere of the school, could become a vehicle for the fostering of moral development in students. It was further explained that Kohlberg modified his views on the aim of moral education, which involved a retrenchment from Stage 6 to Stage 5, and subsequently to Stage 4. However, the crucial factor was that Stage 4 be fostered in an atmosphere of participatory democracy - fundamental to which is the process of dialogue with students - in order that students might be prepared to take an active role in the democratic process upon entering society; that is, preparing students to be able to advance to Stage 5. Finally, the chapter thus far has discussed several experiments and programs using Kohlbergian methods, which undertakings were seen to support Kohlberg's views with respect to participatory democracy in the schools.

To recapitulate, the paper has to this point discussed the moral theories of Noddings and Kohlberg, drawn a composite picture of teaching in the public schools of the United States, and, thus far in the present chapter, elaborated on the educational implications of those two moral theories. The paper will now proceed to the final discussion of this part of the paper, namely, the critiquing of that composite picture, with a view to ascertaining the possibilities for moral education in the public schools.

Critique of Teaching according to Noddings

The Structure of Teaching: The Hierarchical Arrangement of Teaching and the Caring Ethic

Noddings maintains that one of the primary elements in the structure of teaching relations which militates against the school's fostering of a caring ethic is their hierarchical arrangement. She describes that arrangement as a quintessentially masculine one, based on the need to control people, and hence one which fosters a climate where true relatedness is rendered impossible. It is one which results, according to the author, in moving relations between teachers and students into the realm of "abstraction, objectivity, and detachment (Noddings; 1984: 182)." As an alternative to this authority structure Noddings proposes her 'circular' arrangement of teaching relations, as being more conducive to

the fostering of a caring ethic in the school.

That most major institutions in society - first world and otherwise - are run by men, would still seem to pass for a self-evident fact. The structure of schooling, according to the arguments put forth in this paper, is indeed a hierarchical one of top-down control. That that control is exercised in the main by men - though it has not been a contention in this paper - seems hardly disputable. It has been argued that this arrangement keeps teachers in a position of subordination to all those above them, and regarded as employees of the school board, their function being to carry out the directives of their superiors. In short, the structure of teaching relations has been described as a dispensation which imposes a high degree of arbitrary and unreasoned conformity upon teachers in the conduct of their teaching duties.

Specifically, the hierarchical structure of teaching relations, which imposes upon teachers a top down arrangement of control, was seen to induce in them, in turn, the predisposition to impose a rigid system of rules and regulations on their students. This is done typically without rationale or discussion, and designed essentially for the maintenance of group order and conformity. It is an imposition dictated by the nature of 'classness' itself (Lortie 1975). The typical classroom was argued to be a situation in which the teacher's overarching aim and purpose

is to establish who is 'boss', and with an authority based on the power to punish. In other words, it was posited as a system of control which, if the argument is true, militates against that very approach, in relations between teachers and students, which Noddings calls one of 'variability': an approach which enables the teacher to bend and change with the circumstances brought to bear in the one-to-one relation between the teacher and the student. That 'variability' was described by Noddings as a disposition which leaves the teacher with no vested interest in any particular arrangement of rules for their own sake, so that in their application, her behavior toward the child is always governed by the ethic of caring, which puts the welfare of the child before any other consideration. The caring teacher was portrayed as one prepared, in fact, even to break rules if they are seen to endanger the fostering of the ethical ideal in the child. For Noddings, it was pointed out, authority which puts rules, or any other consideration, ahead of the fostering of the ethical ideal in the child, precludes the practice of caring because it destroys the all-important bond of 'relatedness' between the teacher and the child.

Noddings also challenged the curriculum of 'high culture' as defeating the possibility of a caring ethic in the school. She described that curriculum as being another manifestation of the male need to control the child. This is because, as she said, it separates the child from his world, replacing it

instead with an abstraction, removed from his experience. In this regard, it was argued by Goodlad (1984) as typical of practice in the schooling system that, as grade level rises, a shift tends to occur in the relationship between the teacher and the student; a shift in which the curriculum (of 'high culture') - "subjects, topics, textbooks, workbooks, and the rest (Goodlad; 1984: 80)" - was seen to come between teacher and child. In other words, the child comes to be viewed primarily, if not entirely, in terms of academic abilities, rather than as a human being with physical, social, and personal needs as well. As Noddings made clear, in a caring relationship the 'student' can never take precedence over the 'person'. The author pointed out that the caring teacher would, in fact, rather see a student reject a subject, than be coerced or manipulated to take it against his will, for whatever reason. Any approach to the child, therefore, which would seek to regard him primarily as student would not serve to foster the caring ethic.

The Practice of Teaching: 'Lecture and Recitation' and the Caring Ethic

Teaching practice has been described, by the sources cited in this paper, as being characterized in the main by the 'lecture and recitation' approach. It was argued that 'lecture and recitation', constitutes the predominant form of instruction in the schooling system, at all grade levels, but

particularly so as grade levels rise. This method is, the argument continued, apart from its instructional purposes, a primary means of teacher control over student behavior in the classroom. It was further argued that this method of instruction establishes and maintains control over student behavior by confining teacher-student exchange to a verbal regimen in which teachers greatly out-talk students, where student involvement is often limited to short, even one-word, factual responses to mainly 'who' or 'what' questions by the teacher, and where real discussion and inquiry are eschewed in favor of the elicitation of 'correct' answers. In short, 'lecture and recitation' was argued to be a method which precludes the practice of 'thoughtfulness' in the classroom.

As has been discussed, Noddings sees dialogue between the teacher and the child as fundamental to the practice of the ethic of caring. It was also pointed out that, for Noddings, dialogue means that the teacher is open to discuss with the student any topic of interest or concern to him, controversial or otherwise. In another place Noddings said of dialogue that it is

> about talking and listening, sharing and responding to each other. It is vital in every aspect of education. In teaching subject matter, the teacher must learn to listen as well as to talk. As the student thinks aloud, the teacher may direct and correct him, but he is thinking, initiating, trying things out (Noddings; 1984: 186).

It is clear, therefore, that the 'lecture and recitation' approach to teaching, as described in this paper, by

definition precludes dialogue as presented by Noddings. As an approach which can only be seen as part of teachers' detachment from the 'other lives' (Goodlad 1984) of students, it would represent, for Noddings, the antithesis of caring. As was explained by Noddings, the caring teacher is not one determined to make the student learn at all costs. On the contrary, Noddings stated that the caring teacher is prepared, if need be, to not only allow, but even, if it were in the interest of caring, to encourage a child to reject a subject, so long as he did so "boldly and honestly" (Noddings; 1984: 15). In short, Noddings stressed that a teacher who is prepared to try to make a child learn at all costs, no matter how altruistic her motives, does not act from a caring frame of reference, but is instead, simply employing a more or less subtle form of manipulation of the child. It is precisely such manipulation of the child that 'lecture and recitation' was accused of encouraging. Furthermore, the 'other life' of the student was seen by Noddings as vitally important to the teacher practicing caring, for the simple reason that, as she pointed out, what the child thinks and feels about himself as a human being as well as a student, must be a part of the teacher's connection with him if she is to practice the all-important 'inclusion'. Since 'lecture and recitation', especially when used to excess, as Schrag (1988) maintained, precludes dialogue in the classroom, it therefore precludes caring as well.

Tracking and the Caring Ethic

The issue of tracking was argued to be an organizational arrangement prone to encourage teacher discrimination, especially against minority students and those from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Specifically, tracking practices were found, by the authors cited, to predispose teachers to view such students from stereotypical points of view; to see those in lower tracks, as less academically oriented or able. These practices were said to include: scheduling which makes it difficult for students in one track to take courses in another; curricular differences which favor high track classes in terms of preparing them for university; instructional methods which, while focusing on higher cognitive processes and more independent thinking in higher tracks, stress basic skills, drill, rote learning, and conformity to rules in the lower tracks; teacher-student relations, which show greater teacher concern, more warmth, encouragement, and higher expectations for students in high tracks, but more concern with discipline, less effort at effective teaching, more punitive and negative treatment by teachers, and generally lowered expectations toward students in the low tracks (Persell 1977).

Such 'grouping' of students on racial or socioeconomic grounds would be clearly anathema from a caring perspective, since it, like the other separative practices discussed above,

would be seen by Noddings to destroy the very condition of 'relatedness' upon which the caring ethic is founded and maintained; a 'relatedness' anchored in, and informed entirely by, a one-to-one relationship between the teacher and the child. From the caring perspective, which requires the teacher, as Noddings says, to see the child from the child's own point of view as well as from her own, a teacher who would identify and relate to students on the basis of a stereotypical concept of a group - any group - could not possibly practice the all-important 'inclusion' (through dialogue) of the caring ethic. To repeat, as Noddings says,

> As she (the teacher) exercises this inclusion, she accepts his (the student's) motives, reaches toward what he intends, so long as these motives and intentions do not force an abandonment of her own ethical ideal (Noddings; 1984: 177).

Clearly, tracking, particularly with respect to those in low tracks, does not, according to its description in this paper, 'reach toward what he (the child) intends', and is, therefore opposed to the ethic of caring. In fact, tracking, as it has been discussed here, discriminates against all students. It is simply that, in the higher tracks, that discrimination happens to operate in favor of the students. But any discrimination, based on group characteristics, would, for Noddings be inimical to the ethic of caring.

Teacher Preparation and the Caring Ethic

The one specific reference Noddings made to teacher preparation may be seen as having to do with what would amount to an extended, and improved, version of today's practice teaching; that is, a real apprenticeship for beginning teachers, which is missing from teacher preparation although, as Noddings pointed out, such an arrangement seems admirably suited to teaching. She explained the value of such an apprenticeship with regard to its benefits for new teachers, in terms of teaming them with an experienced teacher who had proven herself - through a like apprenticeship - as one-caring. This arrangement was described as one which would not only immerse the new teacher in the day-to-day practice of caring with her students, but would also involve her in collaborative exchange with significant others - other teachers, volunteer adults, and even older children, etc. - as part of the 'relatedness' of the caring ethic.

This paper, according to the arguments of the authors cited, has described practice teaching as being of short duration and rather superficial, focusing, in the main, on technocratic issues: lesson plans, record keeping, methods, housekeeping, etc. It was portrayed as failing to deal with the more fundamental issues of teaching, such has the arousal of children's interest or the eliciting of their ideas. In addition to this, the supervision of student teachers was

described as being carried out without considering whether the supervisor's goals and methods were consistent with those of the teacher-training program. In short, practice teaching, according to the argument, was portrayed as rather insuring that new teachers would be schooled in all the old and outworn practices already dominating in teaching, so that their introduction to teaching would amount to little more than a pre-training to take their place in the hierarchical, technocratically oriented arrangement of school relations. Such a technocratic, casually supervised approach to practice teaching, which puts methods and other clinical concerns before serious consideration of the person of the student, would have little to recommend it in terms of the caring ethic.

Noddings described her caring ethic as one which applies to all relationships which involve the one-caring and the one cared-for, and that it is, for that reason, fundamental to any teaching-learning situation. Accordingly, though the author had nothing further to say directly about the preparation of teachers, it may be reasonably assumed that what she said about teacher-child relationships in school, ought to apply equally to relations between education professors and prospective teachers; for here the situation of the one-caring and the one cared-for clearly obtains. In this respect, the charge made by the authors cited, regarding the discontinuities seen to be characteristic of teacher

education, contained the assertion that, because of those discontinuities, teacher education is rarely oriented toward a conception of what teaching is, or what education is for. Further, it was argued that this deficit is coupled with and underscored by the tendency, especially in larger institutions, for faculty to operate in relative isolation from one another. This double lack of real educational cohesion and dialogue - among programs and faculty, and between faculty and student teachers - which such fragmented programs suggest, serves, it was argued, to turn out new teachers ill prepared "to address issues of school organization (Goodlad et al.; 1990: 29)", or to deviate from the norm. In short, the argument concluded that teachers teach as they were taught, that is, without the ability either to discuss the deeper and larger educational issues, or to engage in real authentic dialogue at all.

The fundamentally crucial place of dialogue between the teacher and student in the caring ethic has already been explained. It may be reasonably assumed that such dialogue would be, for Noddings, fundamental to a caring relationship between education professor and prospective teacher. Therefore, it may just as reasonably be concluded, that a teacher-training program which is characterized by an atmosphere of isolation among faculty, and of consequently tending to foster a like attitude in prospective teachers - as was argued it does - works against the fostering of that

'relatedness' which involves active, ongoing collaboration with all significant others. This was, indeed, argued to be characteristic of the 'cellular' arrangement of schooling. Hence, teacher preparation, as has been described here, and if such is the case, works contrary to a caring ethic.

It was argued that the technocratic orientation of teacher education, which seeks to make teaching a technical and competency-based activity, strips it of social consciousness and conscience. It presents the school and classroom, the argument maintained, as culturally and politically neutral situations, instead of places where "a heterogeneity of discourses often collide in an unremitting struggle for dominance (Popkewitz; 1987: 273)." Teacher preparation was held, on the contrary, to serve to keep teachers in positions of powerlessness, instead of preparing them as 'transformative intellectuals' capable of seeing the school as 'an ethical and moral enterprise designed to foster democracy, social justice, and social equality' (Popkewitz 1987). It keeps teachers, the argument stated, confined within the mental set of agents of transmission, equipped mainly to sustain and legitimize the status quo.

The caring ethic was seen, on the contrary, as one designed, not to reduce the child to a state of powerlessness, or ignorance, in any domain of interest or concern to him, but to empower him through what Noddings described as 'confirmation', which ". . . accepts, embraces, and leads

upward. It questions, it responds, it sympathizes, it challenges, it delights (Noddings; 1984: 67)." Hence, a teacher-training program fostering a disposition in prospective teachers designed to launder out controversial issues for the sake of maintaining a facade of neutrality in the interests of the status quo, may reasonably be seen as acting against the interests of a caring ethic. For, as Noddings pointed out, the caring ethic must always be prepared to put the nourishing of the child's ethical ideal before institutional, or any other, considerations. The essence of the caring ethic, as Noddings described it, is clearly transformative, so that teacher preparation which would relegate prospective teachers to passive, transmissionist roles - to be passed on in turn to their future students - would certainly be antithetical to the caring ethic.

In summary, according to the arguments put forth in this chapter thus far, the structure and practice of teaching, along with the preparation of teachers in teacher-training institutions, have been seen, in the main, to create and maintain an atmosphere in the public schools, as well as an orientation in teachers, essentially counterproductive with respect to the exercise of the caring ethic.

Noddings' portrayal of the caring teacher, it was seen, depicts a person imbued with and motivated by a relatedness with the child, which puts the person of that child, through an authentic commitment to dialogue with him, in all his

complexity, both socially and individually, before any other consideration, academic or otherwise. Caring was seen as a relatedness which includes, on the child's behalf, all significant others: students, teachers, parents, etc. The caring teacher was described as a person with a profound capacity to see the child as her own best self, as one representing her own ethical ideal, and as striving to foster that ideal in the child at any cost short of abandoning her own ethical ideal. What was described as typical teaching practice in the schools was, on the contrary, argued to be an enterprise determined to put academic achievement before other considerations vital in the life and growth of the child, and as one carried out by the teacher in relative isolation from significant others. The typical teacher, it was argued, works in and imposes upon the child, a regimen of conformity to a set of arbitrary rules and regulations designed to insure teacher control in a teacher-centered classroom. This arrangement was seen as one devoid of dialogue with the child, or of any real discussion on matters concerning his own education. Under such a dispensation, if the arguments put forth in this paper do indeed depict the school as it typically functions, there seems little room or hope for any significant practice of the ethic of caring as Noddings has described it.

This concludes the critique of teaching, along the dimensions of structure, practice and preparation, in the

American public schooling system, according to Noddings. The discussion now proceeds to the critique of these same issues according to Kohlberg.

Critique of Teaching according to Kohlberg

Introductory Remarks

Before entering upon the critique, according to Kohlberg, the writer wishes to draw attention to the fact that the discussion of Kohlberg's theory and its implications for moral education have raised the word 'authoritarian' in relation to school governance. It was used explicitly by Sullivan and Beck (Purple and Ryan 1986) to describe conditions generally in public school governance. Since the writer has not come across, either by Kohlberg of any of those associated with Kohlbergian studies or programs of moral education, an explanation of what they mean by authoritarian, he assumes that it carries the meaning commonly found in dictionary definitions; or as the Oxford American defines it: "favoring complete obedience to authority as opposed to individual freedom (Ehrlich et al.; 1980: 40)."

The Structure of Teaching: The Schools and Conventional Morality

It has been pointed out that the two main vehicles for moral development, according to Kohlberg, are role-taking and cognitive-moral conflict, and that the teacher's role with respect to these is essentially that of facilitator of discussion. Role-taking was described as the ability to view issues from the perspectives of others, that is, others as 'other selves', and was said to be founded on the creation of a school setting which fosters a high degree and quality of student participation through the opportunity to engage in authentic dialogue. In other words, such participation presupposes, according to Kohlberg, a teacher disposed to view issues from the student's perspective. As Kohlberg said, "If . . . adults do not consider the child's point of view, the child may not communicate or take the adult's point of view (Kohlberg; 1987: 313)."

What applies to role-taking applies equally to cognitive-moral conflict, since both were seen to involve open, authentic dialogue. In fact, it is cognitive-moral conflict, in the discussion of moral dilemmas, which Kohlberg said provides the basis for role-taking, since such discussion has students at one stage of moral development being exposed to the reasoning of students at a higher stage - and vice versa.

The important point for both role-taking and cognitive-moral conflict, as Kohlberg explained, is that they help

foster conditions in the classroom conducive to the creation of participatory democracy, that is, a situation of ". . . interchange and dialogue . . . in which conflicting moral views are compared in an open manner (Purpel and Ryan; 1986: 190)." This provides the best atmosphere for moral growth. Kohlberg, then, not only called for dialogue, but dialogue within a democratic school and classroom environment. His insistence that the school be a democratic one was explained above in the discussion of the retrenchment of his aims for moral education, in connection with the issue of privatism. To repeat, he contended that unless students in high school were involved in participatory democracy, it was unlikely that they would be capable of assuming such responsibility after they left.

As has been pointed out, Kohlberg claimed that ". . . our schools have traditionally been Stage 4 institutions of convention and authority (Purpel and Ryan 1976)"; that is, institutions fostering conformity to the status quo in both teachers and students. That the author didn't regard the schools as otherwise - as democratic institutions - is implied in his call for just such participatory democracy in the schools as well as in his own programs. This contention is given added weight by Sullivan's and Beck's charge above that most schools are not only not democratic, but are run along authoritarian lines. Thus, like Noddings, Kohlberg advocates radical, if different, changes in the structure of teaching,

if the school is to foster an atmosphere conducive to moral development. This call for structural changes in teaching would seem to be fundamental to any serious endeavor in moral education. John Wilson (1990), for example, the prominent English moral philosopher, also proposes significant structural changes in teaching relations, along the lines of 'houses' modeled on the home and family. His proposals, like Noddings', are designed to create more caring school and classroom environments, and, like Kohlberg's, settings conducive to the operation of moral reasoning.

According to Kohlberg and associates, then, teaching relations as they are presently structured make unlikely both the possibility for role-taking and the provision for cognitive-moral conflict in students, and hence militate against moral development. In short, they eliminate the likelihood of authentic dialogue taking place - the basis of participatory democracy - or any real discussion, for that matter, between teachers and students, as well as between students themselves.

The writer feels that, based on the evidence presented in this paper, it would be overstepping the bounds of the discussion to take a stand, either for or against the contention by Sullivan and Beck, that most teachers are at the Conventional level of moral development. The writer maintains this, notwithstanding the fact Kohlberg himself places the great majority of adults there (and also imputes a Stage 4

mentality to teachers when he charges schools with being institutions of 'convention and authority'), and Durkheim (1979), in a general way, supports Kohlberg's claim, placing the majority of people in a position of passive acceptance of the reigning morality of their time. Nevertheless, the writer still maintains that arguments put forth in this paper do support Kohlberg's contention that schools typically operate at the Conventional level, and hence, foster conformity. Whether it is possible for higher levels of moral development in individual teachers to be consistent with the Conventional morality of the institutions in which they teach (and to which they at least outwardly conform) is beyond the scope of this discussion and paper to argue.

That the schools foster group conformity - and are therefore institutions of Conventional moral thinking - was argued by Lortie, in his description of 'classness'. To repeat, his summary of a great number of statements by teachers with respect to teacher-student relations, had the students contributing to the maintenance of the egalitarian social order in the classroom,

> by responding and cooperating, behaving themselves, and demonstrating positive feelings. They are excellent followers of the teacher's leadership. They participate actively, show interest, and give their full attention. They work hard. They behave themselves by conforming to the teacher's rules. They show positive affect by "wanting to learn," "being in a good mood," and "enjoying the classes" (Lortie; 1975: 172).

This statement points clearly to a regimen of conformity to an

established system of imposed rules in the classroom, where group order takes precedence over individual needs, characteristic of Conventional (Stage 4) morality. In fact, the call for 'positive feelings,' 'being in a good mood,' and 'enjoying the classes' while conforming to the teachers rules suggests also a Stage 3 ('good boy - nice girl') orientation as well.

That schools and classrooms not only foster conformity, but are run along authoritarian lines, was argued particularly by Sarason in his description of how teachers exercise their authority in the hierarchy of power relations in teaching. It was described as an approach which regards students as ". . . incapable of dealing responsibly with issues of power, even on the level of discussion (Sarason; 1990: 83)." Also, in the discussion of the structure of teaching, it will be recalled that Reyes said,

> Today's teachers work in a hierarchical system of state, district, superintendent, and principal authority . . . forming a system of tacit understanding that teachers control their classrooms while others make decisions that affect the school and/or the district (Reyes; 1990: 24).

This statement is typical of a number of statements which have been made in this paper on the structure of teaching, pointing to a regime of often rigid control over those below from those above, the teacher and the student being at the bottom of the pyramid. Perhaps the strongest statement in this regard was made, again, by Sarason, when he stated that

> From the standpoint of the teacher, especially at the beginning of the school year and especially in the case of the beginning teacher, the name of the game is power: quickly and effectively to establish who is boss of the turf, to make it clear that the authority of the teacher is powered by the power to punish (Sarason; 1990: 79).

In fact, this statement speaks not to a Conventional, but to a Preconventional level of morality in school authority; that is, to a specifically Stage 1 level, the 'punishment and obedience' orientation. It was also pointed out by Hurn, that teachers, even at the height of the reform movement, continued to exercise rigid control over students in the classroom.

According to the above arguments, a teaching structure which has been argued to be disposed toward a regime of conformity, and one with at least a tendency toward authoritarianism, is ill-equipped to facilitate the kind of cognitive-moral conflict and role-taking, in an atmosphere of participatory democracy, called for by Kohlberg.

The Practice of Teaching: 'Lecture and Recitation' and Tracking

With regard specifically to teaching practices in the classroom, 'lecture and recitation' was argued, again, to be the predominant approach used throughout the public schooling system. Likewise, that approach was described as favoring a situation of teacher-centered authority and group conformity to that authority. To repeat, as Schrag charged that the

teacher's excessive use of lecturing does not come from the desire of simply conveying information but ". . . from the advantage it provides from the point of view of control (Schrag; 1988: 98)." Again, this arbitrary imposition of control over the students is a manifestation of the use of Conventional moral thinking on the part of the teacher. The approach of 'lecture and recitation' as a means of maintaining conformity in the classroom was also discussed with reference to Goodlad (1984), Heath (1978), and Mehan (Hammersley 1986), and drew essentially the same conclusions, to the effect that 'lecture and recitation' constitutes a form of group control of students by teachers. Such a regimen of teacher-centered, group-oriented and therefore dialogue-discouraging conformity is, again, clearly not conducive to the moral development of students from a Kohlbergian perspective.

The practice of tracking, according to the arguments in this paper, must also be seen, as it was for Noddings' ethic of caring, to create a school and classroom situation inimical to a Kohlbergian concept of moral development, since that practice was shown to encourage a discriminatory attitude among teachers, based on stereotypical images, against minority students and those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. Such discrimination, as was pointed out in the discussion of Noddings' caring ethic, by definition, precludes the possibility of dialogue, and hence, from a Kohlbergian point of view as well, the possibility of either role-taking

or the facilitation of discussion involving cognitive-moral conflict. It renders the teacher incapable of viewing issues from the student's point of view. In short, a school which relegates students to positions of inferiority with respect to curriculum content, instructional methods, and teacher-student relations, on the basis of race or socioeconomic background, as has been argued is does, is not likely to place itself in the self-contradictory position of involving those same students - through dialogue - in a program of moral development designed to empower them, as does a Kohlbergian program, with higher levels of moral, and hence critical, reasoning.

Kohlberg and Teacher Preparation

In the discussion of teacher training Giroux and McLaren argued that ". . . teacher education serves primarily to create intellectuals whose . . . social function is to sustain and legitimate the status quo (Popkewitz; 1987: 268)." The maintenance of the status quo, as the description of the moral Stages makes clear, is the foundation of Conventional moral thinking.

Though Kohlberg, in this writer's knowledge, has not made any explicit statement on the preparation of teachers, two of the researchers discussed, Sullivan and Beck (Purpel and Ryan 1976), it will be recalled, held teacher training to be

largely responsible for the prevalence of what they saw as Conventional norms in teachers' outlooks. They also maintained that, not only did teacher training simply expose teachers to ". . . the 'tried and true' conventions that have kept the school going for years (Purpel; 1976: 232)," but that it contributed to the structure of the school which keeps teachers typically at the Conventional level of moral thinking.

These 'tried and true' conventions of teaching practice can only be seen as referring to the predominantly technocratic orientation of teacher training discussed above. To repeat, it was described as a training which: is fragmented, technical, arbitrary, and without depth; speaks to the teacher essentially as a 'classroom manager'; fosters passivity in prospective teachers; and ". . . creates intellectuals . . . whose social function is to sustain and legitimate the status quo (Popkewitz; 1987: 268)." In other words, it is, according to the arguments, a training which disposes teachers to attitudes of conformity, and hence, Conventional moral thinking. If the above arguments are accurate, their implications for a Kohlbergian idea of moral education would seem evident. A teacher-training program which renders prospective teachers passive, technically oriented, and disposed toward the status quo is, again, not one which could be said to be designed to foster in prospective teachers a predisposition to involve students in

the kind of high-level (democratic) participation called for in a Kohlbergian program of moral education.

As was stated above, teacher training presents teaching as a politically neutral enterprise. But teacher training has been described, in fact, as bereft of social consciousness and conscience, serving "to reproduce . . . technocratic and corporate ideologies" (Popkewitz; 1987: 268). And as was further pointed out, Kohlberg sees traditional teaching as not being neutral at all, but conservative, and as such, inimical to moral development. Teachers coming out of such programs would likewise not be predisposed to facilitate the kind of open discussion involved in the cognitive-moral conflict fundamental to a Kohlbergian program. Such teachers coming from such training could only be expected, on the contrary, as Sarason (1986) pointed out, to teach as they themselves were taught.

The 'Hidden Curriculum'

Finally, with respect to the hidden curriculum in the school, it was shown that Kohlberg sees it, as it exists at present in the schools, to be in danger of frustrating the moral development of students. This is because, as Kohlberg explained, in an authoritarian-bureaucratic school climate the hidden curriculum confuses the issue, and merely serves to alienate students. It does this, as Kohlberg said, through

concentrating on the trivial (calling spitting in another's face 'impolite') or attributing moral implications to things which aren't moral at all (keeping one's books, etc., tidy). To make the hidden curriculum a vehicle for moral development, it must, Kohlberg explained, be put in the service of participatory democracy in the school.

In the discussions of the structure and practice of teaching a number of statements were made which spoke to the working of the hidden curriculum in the school. One was Reyes' reference to the top down arrangement of school authority as a ". . . a system of tacit understanding that teachers control their classrooms while others make decisions that affect the school and/or district (Reyes; 1990: 24)." Another was Hurn's (1985) unflattering comparison of schools with prisons, mental hospitals, and factories. These were, in effect, descriptions of the organization of rules and regulations (recall Kohlberg's designation of the hidden curriculum as residing in the rules governing school operation) defining the atmosphere of teaching relations, schools and classrooms. These two descriptions, it is clear, and particularly Hurn's, refer implicitly to a hidden curriculum in an essentially authoritarian-bureaucratic climate (recall the definition of authoritarian above).

Goodlad's (1984) charge regarding schools' excessive emphasis on academics, and their underemphasis of social, vocational, and personal goals - in spite of their expressed

aims to the contrary - is, again, a reference to the operation of the hidden curriculum; that is, it sends a tacit message to the students regarding what is really 'important' in their schooling. Goodlad's (1984) other charge, that teachers are detached from the 'other lives' of their students - their lives other than the academic - again speaks to a modification in teacher-student relations springing directly out of the operation of the hidden curriculum: what is 'unimportant' in teachers' relations with students.

Another manifestation of the hidden curriculum, this time resulting from the cellular arrangement of teaching, as described by Lortie (1975), is teachers' distancing themselves from other adults: teachers, administrators, and parents, etc., in an attempt to mitigate control exercised over them by these others. It was seen that this results, ironically, in the attempt, by those same teachers, to exercise that very same control over their students in the classroom.

With respect to teaching practices, Sarason's blunt statement about the 'power' relations between teachers and students, as a result of which teachers regard students as being incapable of dealing with issues of power "even on the level of discussion" (Sarason; 1990: 83), is another implicit reference to the politics of the hidden curriculum in the classroom.

Lortie's (1975) description of 'classness', which forces teachers to deal with students primarily, if not exclusively,

in terms of the group, and where deviation from group norms have to be censured, in short, where successful classroom operation means students' conforming to the rules laid down by the teacher, is a clear manifestation of the hidden curriculum.

Finally, the elaborate and varied system of verbal controls imposed by teachers on student behavior through the 'lecture and recitation' approach perhaps indicates most fully, and at the same time most subtly, the way the hidden curriculum is used directly in the classroom to maintain a dispensation of teacher control and student conformity.

These examples of teaching practice, as well as those cited above for the structure of teaching, speak to a school regime informed by a bureaucratic and essentially authoritarian approach to teacher-student relations, and one which manifestly flies in the face of the kind of hidden curriculum which, according to Kohlberg, would create a school atmosphere in which participatory democracy, and hence, moral development, could flourish.

The issue of moral education in the schools with respect to Kohlberg, it is clear, is rather less straight forward, though hardly less bleak, than that described for Noddings. The one thing which is plain, according to the authors cited in this paper, is the support of their arguments for Kohlberg's contention that the schools function typically at the Conventional moral level, which, as Kohlberg says, is the

orientation towards authority, fixed rules, and the maintenance of the social order for its own sake.

There was also an even darker side implied in Sarason's (1990) description of the 'power' struggle in the classroom, where the teacher's authority is founded upon the power to punish. This, it was explained, suggests a more specifically authoritarian school climate which, as Sullivan and Beck (Purpel and Ryan 1976) pointed out, may not only fail to facilitate, but positively frustrate the moral development of students. In other words, in such an atmosphere moral development may be retarded at the Preconventional level, specifically Stage 1, of 'punishment and obedience'. The discussion of tracking also supports this picture, where students in lower tracks were seen to be exposed to teacher attitudes described as colder and more punitive (Persell 1977). Kohlberg's (Mosher 1980) own study in the Cambridge alternative high schools with working-class black and white students - who, it will be remembered, are disproportunately enrolled in lower tracks - further supports the Preconventional claim. In this particular study all of the students in Kohlberg's program started at the Preconventional level - though they all advanced to the Conventional level during the program - suggesting that they had been exposed to a regimen of authoritarian control in school prior to entering the program.

The picture, then, which emerges is the following: Under

the circumstances of schooling described thus far in this paper, it would seem that the most which could be hoped for in the schooling system as it stands, is moral development of students to Stage 4. It seems unreasonable to assume that students could typically develop beyond the level of the school itself - especially recalling Kohlberg's findings that even the vast majority of adults are at Stage 4 - since, according to Kohlberg, moral development is dependent upon an atmosphere conducive to that development. Furthermore, the greater the extent and severity of an authoritarian orientation in the school and classroom, the less likely it would seem that any students would reach to even the Conventional level of moral development.

However, as was seen, Kohlberg introduced a crucial and qualifying element into the moral atmosphere of a school (the just school) which would foster moral development, namely, the process of participatory democracy. In other words, for Kohlberg it is not sufficient that the school be capable of fostering development in its students to Stage 4 (conformity for its own sake), but that that Stage be accomplished through participation in a democratic process within the school. This would prepare students to be capable of taking an active role in the democratic process once they entered society; that is, of advancing to Stage 5, the stage at which they would be capable of having a more critical perspective with regard to the status quo.

With this point in mind, it is clear, according to all the arguments put forth in this paper, that the schools are typically unqualified for preparing students morally to enter the democratic process upon graduation from high school. They are, it would seem, equipped to facilitate moral development only, and at best, to a Stage 4 level of simple conformity to authority and the status quo.

In summary, this part of the critique has demonstrated, according to Kohlberg, that the structure of teaching is responsible for a school regime characterized mainly by a Conventional morality of authority and conformity to the status quo. Teaching methods, which include 'lecture and recitation' and the practice of tracking, were seen, each in its own way, to preclude the all-important dialogue essential to role-taking, and hence, to contribute to a regimen of conformity in the school and classroom. Teacher training, which was seen also to preclude dialogue between teacher educators and prospective teachers, and as a result of this to exclude any real participation on the part of the latter, was found to send new teachers into the schooling system predisposed to impose a like conformity upon their students. The 'hidden curriculum' in the schools was shown to reflect this conformity, both in the structure and practice of teaching, and to create, as a result, a school atmosphere inimical to moral development. It was finally argued that the best which could be hoped for in the public schooling system

as it has typically presented itself is moral development in students to Stage 4, conformity to the status quo. In more authoritarian school climates that development might very well not get beyond the Preconventional level of punishment and obedience.

To recapitulate, the paper has thus far discussed the moral theories of Noddings and Kohlberg, presented a composite picture of teaching in the public schooling system in the United States, and critiqued that picture, according to the theories of Noddings and Kohlberg, to determine the possibilities for moral education in the schools. This concludes the discussion of the public schooling system in its more general aspect.

The paper now turns to a discussion, and critique, of teaching within the same public schooling system, but this time from the perspective of several schools considered to be unusually successful.

CHAPTER 7

SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS

Introductory Remarks

This chapter examines and critiques four middle schools (grades 5 to 8) described extensively by Lipsitz (1984). They are schools within the public schooling system considered, by the author, to be unusually successful.

The discussion does not attempt to refute, or even redress, what has been said about the possibilities for moral development in the public schools thus far in the paper. Rather, it seeks to discover whether and/or to what extent any schools within the public school system in the United States may be capable of providing climates in which moral development can take place, according to the theories of Noddings and Kohlberg.

It needs to be pointed out that the discussion of these schools is somewhat problematical with respect to critiquing them, according to both the caring ethic and Stage theory, in a way that the critique above was not. It is, in fact, the virtues of these schools, as will be seen, in respect of their capacities for fostering moral development, which create the

problem. All of them will be shown to be possessed of a more fluid, democratic arrangement of teaching relations, while at the same time none will be seen, in their teaching relations and practice, to be either completely democratic (as advocated by Kohlberg), or entirely 'circular' (as advocated by Noddings). In other words, these schools lie somewhere in a middle ground between the more authoritarian orientation found to be characteristic of the schools in the above discussion, and the ideal advocated by Noddings and Kohlberg. In addition to this, Lipsitz's study is more limited in its examples of actual classroom activity in terms of teacher-student interaction and teaching practices, than were, for example, the studies above by Lortie (1975) and Goodlad (1984). This presents a difficulty particularly when talking about Kohlberg. The reader will recall that the two vehicles for moral development according to Kohlberg are role-taking and cognitive-moral conflict, the former provided for by participatory democracy, the latter through the discussion of moral dilemmas. Consequently, since specific examples of activities which would indicate the presence of either or both of these practices are in short supply in the Lipsitz study and, in any case, are equivocal in how they may be interpreted, statements made about the possibility for moral development in these schools - which, to repeat, fall short of the ideal for both the caring ethic and Stage theory - must of necessity be made in a more general and tentative manner.

Recalling, therefore, the fundamental role of dialogue in both Noddings' and Kohlberg's proposals for moral education, judgements about the moral atmospheres of the schools in this discussion will be made primarily on the basis of the extent to which they provide opportunities for dialogue, especially between students and teachers.

Finally, the Lipsitz study does not lend itself conveniently to separate descriptions of the structure and practice of teaching. Therefore, those two headings will be collapsed in this discussion.

Overview of the Schools

Lipsitz points out that each of the four schools in this study have teaching staffs for the most part hand picked by their principals, specifically for the purpose of fostering the principals' philosophy for their schools. Also, the majority of teachers in these schools are at graduate level, and noted for their teaching excellence. One thing which is clear, therefore, is that these are unusual institutions run and staffed by unusually qualified people, academically and otherwise.

Though each of the four schools is unique in terms of its structure and teaching practices, they have several important things in common. All seem to have approached a democratic arrangement in teaching relations, between administration and

staff, in terms of decision-making on school policy, curriculum, and the methods and conditions of teaching. For example, at Noe School, an open-plan school, and large for a middle school, with over 1000 students, teachers are given the freedom by the principal ". . . to make decisions about curriculum, allocation of time, grouping of students, and student choice (Lipsitz; 1984: 99)." In short, they have the freedom to make decisions regarding their work generally. In Western Middle School, a rural school serving a mixed professional population, small business people, and farm and factory workers, teachers are given some control over the organization of their school day, what they teach, and over grouping and scheduling. Shoreham-Wading River Middle School, which began, with the encouragement of the district's affluent, mostly white parents, as an experimental school, has its teachers involved

> in most aspects of decision making through faculty meetings, staff council (composed of two teachers from each wing), a weekly morning breakfast, and a weekly internal newsletter (Lipsitz; 1984: 150).

All the schools, like Noe, are also organized either entirely or partially around an open classroom structure, where teachers plan curriculum and even compete as teams. This arrangement calls for larger classroom spaces, resulting in a sense of spaciousness and less crowding. It also means that students are not confined alone with one teacher for long periods of time, a factor which has a great bearing on

discipline, which has proved not to be a problem in any of these schools. This teaching arrangement generally serves to create a more relaxed atmosphere in the schools.

While most rules of behavior in the school are decided on democratically by school staffs, they are evidently imposed on the students by the teachers, apparently without discussion with the students. However, in one school at least - Noe - some additional and incidental rules, such as gum-chewing, are decided upon in discussion with students.

Teaching Practices

All of these schools do well academically, though not all excel; but academic achievement is not excessively pushed in any of them. At Noe, for example, while teachers see their primary responsibility to be academic, they regard their second responsibility to be the enhancing of social skills.

Western Middle School, which, like the others, has a diverse curriculum in addition to academics, resists pressure from the 'back to basics' movement. Their academic program is solid, but they experiment in other curricular areas as well, such as one they call 'Exploratory'. This program

> enables teachers to introduce areas that are rarely discussed in middle schools. For instance, one class learns about the country's services, like the rape and crisis center, alcohol and substance abuse prevention, and suicide prevention . . . (Lipsitz; 1984: 45).

The schools characteristically foster a diversity of

teaching styles, from direct whole-class instruction to individualized instruction. At Noe, for example,

> Most teachers encourage students to talk to each other about their work, to get up and move around without first getting permission, to select their own seats, and to change them according to the demands of particular activities (Lipsitz; 1984: 118).

In one class at Shoreham-Wading River Middle School, while a teacher in a math class is engaged in traditional lecture in order to prepare students for a Standardized Achievement Test,

> In another classroom the day begins with an advisory session of eight students. After SSR (silent reading), the teacher talks with several students about their choices of books for Booktalk. Others are reading on a fine sofa and wicker chair in a corner of the room. . . . The room has the air of a modern, well-kept study, replete with plants and posters of paintings by Edward Hopper and Georgia O'Keeffe. The room has class. It is a haven in the midst of all the tumbling, cluttered, busy environments of the school (Lipsitz; 1984: 147).

The schools typically make it policy to be aware of and steeped in knowledge of adolescent development. At Noe, for example, teachers ". . . are extremely aware of the diversity of early adolescent development, especially the social, cognitive, and physical changes young adolescents experience (Lipsitz; 1984: 119)." At Shoreham-Wading River, in-service training in the school centers a lot on pre- and early adolescent development, as a vital part of the entire school program.

Lipsitz points out that the schools take a keen interest in the personal and emotional lives of their students. They

do this by providing structures whereby students have ample opportunity to discuss life and other issues of interest to them with adults in the school. At Noe,

> The school's commitment to giving its early adolescent students opportunities for self-exploration and self-definition is expressed in the curriculum through the teacher-based guidance program. In the advisor-advisee session, a minimum of twenty minutes daily, students say they discuss their problems, such as divorce or the death of a new sibling. It is a time when they can express their feelings with no fear of ridicule. They also discuss alcohol abuse, prejudice, school and life survival skills, risk taking, and human sexuality (Lipsitz; 1984: 124).

At this same school the guidance counsellors started a student liaison program in which teachers meet with students to get their ideas about the advisor-advisee program, which is similar to that at Shoreham-Wading River.

At Region 7 Middle School, in one of Detroit's decentralized zones, with a predominantly Black student population, open and honest sex education is part of the regular science program. In addition to this,

> When asked what opportunities they have for self-expression and self-definition, students give two answers. First, they emphasize, as do their parents, that there is a great deal of respect for divergent opinions in the school. They are encouraged to express themselves, to explore their thoughts and opinions, and to discuss them with adults who are open and not threatened by contradiction (Lipsitz; 1984: 75).

Shoreham-Wading River has an 'Advisory' program, which gives each student a teacher-advisor. The purpose of 'Advisory' is to insure that each student has at least one

adult with whom he or she can talk. The program is based on the idea that even in homes with strong relationships young adolescents often feel reluctant to speak with their parents, since it is often a time of reaction against parents. Accordingly, the school provides a disinterested adult with whom they can develop a trusting and open relationship. The 75-minute 'Advisory' each day provides guidance, personal counselling, a mechanism for taking care of routine chores, and a provision for a calm beginning to the school day. Also, each student meets with his or her advisor at least once a month for a one-to-one discussion revolving around schoolwork, plans, feelings, discipline, television programs, and anything else the student and advisor want to talk about. Lipsitz says,

> Teachers say there is an unexpected benefit from the advisory system, since they get feedback about curriculum and instruction during talks with their advisees. "It's a form of evaluation," one says. "I can pursue what's working and drop what isn't because of students' willingness to communicate." (Lipsitz; 1984: 133)

In all of these school the programs include involving students in authentic, responsible service activities within the school, and/or out in the community. At Noe, for example, students help orthopedically handicapped students maneuver around the school if they need assistance. At Western students visited the minimum security prison unit in the county. At Shoreham-Wading River,

> students worked with younger children in the

> district's elementary schools, with preschoolers at the Head Start Centers, with the elderly in a nursing home, with retarded children at BOCES (Board of Cooperative Educational Service) centers, and on career apprenticeships (Lipsitz; 1984: 133).

Lipsitz says that students at Western also served at a nursing home, interviewed senior citizens, and later wrote a book about their experiences.

Leadership

An important factor in the success of these schools is that they all have principals who provide strong, usually inspiring leadership to the staff and the student body. These principals are unusually committed individuals with a strong vision and school philosophy, which they inculcate in their staffs by establishing and maintaining a vital team spirit in which discussion and collaboration is the order of the day. At Noe, for example, the principal encourages teachers "to establish openly their expectations of one another (Lipsitz; 1984: 118)." At Western, the principal keeps after teachers to move out of traditional methods of teaching. Lipsitz says that this principal

> wants to see more talking among students, working together, helping each other, moving around the room. She wants students selecting their own seats. She wants teachers working with an entire class less frequently (Lipsitz; 1984: 49).

At Region 7, a principal's report to parents ". . .

stresses the school's 'unique organizational plan,' less use of regular texts . . . " and " . . . a new reporting system developed by students and parents . . . (Lipsitz; 1984: 62)." At Shoreham-Wading River, the principal established an open and democratic leadership inviting discussion and criticism from all quarters, in and out of the school. Lipsitz says, "Dennis (the school's principal) was most brilliant in his ability to let his staff take on as much responsibility for the school as possible (Lipsitz; 1984: 157)."

In summary, these middle schools typically have highly qualified teachers who know their subjects well, and are sensitive, through being deeply knowledgeable of adolescent development, to the needs of their students in all areas of development. All have established a democratic arrangement of authority relations between administration and staff. Although that arrangement does not extend officially (except at Noe, where some incidental rules are made in collaboration with students) to the student body, ample and regular opportunity is provided for dialogue between teachers and students, particularly in such programs as 'advisory' and 'exploratory'. The schools experiment with a diversity of teaching styles designed to shift the emphasis away from teacher-centered classrooms, toward greater involvement and participation among students. Though the schools are academically successful, they do not over-emphasize academics, but concern themselves with the personal and social

development of their students as well. Finally, the schools give their students regular opportunities to practice authentic civic responsibility, both in the school and out in the community.

Critique According to Noddings

The general climate of positive relations in each of these four schools has been created by a collaborative system of sharing responsibility among the administration and faculty, through inspiring leadership from principals, and from unusually gifted and motivated teachers. These factors have provided for a teaching-learning situation in which the spirit of Noddings' views of caring would seem to be able to take root and even thrive.

Specifically, the open classroom structure in all of the schools, which creates a less restrictive teaching-learning atmosphere, provides a situation in which discipline, and hence teacher control over students, ceases to be a problem or a preoccupation. Such an atmosphere can be seen to be conducive to the practice of a caring ethic, if only in terms of easing tensions in relations between teachers and students in a situation where academic achievement is not the overarching preoccupation, but where social development is also an ongoing concern.

Structures have been set up in each of these schools

which facilitate authentic discussion between teachers and students on real and important topics of interest to all. Each school, for example, has some sort of 'advisory' system which insures that students regularly are provided with the opportunity for open, honest discussion with a special teacher on issues, even contentious issues, of importance to them. It was pointed out that, at Shoreham-Wading River, 'advisory' provides an opportunity as well for teachers to get feedback from students about their teaching and curriculum. Finally, at Region 7 the sex education program fosters a climate encouraging divergent opinion. These factors are given further support by the in-depth knowledge of adolescent development being provided for both in and by each of the schools, a program designed to give teachers a greater appreciation of and sensitivity to, the changes their students are experiencing.

It was pointed out that the teachers in these schools are exceptionally qualified, academically and otherwise. This means that, besides being sensitive to the needs of their students generally, they are in a better position to be able to practice the all-important 'inclusion' with their students through their subjects. This is because, as Noddings explained, being deeply knowledgeable in their field of expertise frees them up with respect to subject-matter, to be able to approach the subject through the eyes of the student.

Finally, in each of these schools students are given

practice in what Noddings considers the other important dimension in caring, that is, caring beyond the classroom. For example, at Western it involves student visits to prisons; at Noe student help for handicapped students; and at Shoreham-Wading River, student help for elementary students and senior citizens.

Practices in each of these schools, then, point clearly to a situation designed to foster real dialogue between teachers and students - as well as discussion and collaboration among students themselves - and hence, to give teachers both opportunities and incentives to practice 'inclusion' with their students; in other words, to practice caring.

Critique According To Kohlberg

If a Kohlbergian 'just community' school is run on an entirely democratic basis, then it is obvious from the above discussion that none of the schools in this study would qualify. Nevertheless, these schools do provide for a great deal of such participation between faculty and students - especially through the 'advisory' programs discussed above. At Noe, particularly, students are getting, although on a small scale, direct experience in participatory democracy, through deciding on some of the incidental rules of behavior in the classroom.

Equally significant - and perhaps more so - the opportunities students have in all the schools to engage in authentic discussion and dialogue, and to take divergent views on important, and even contentious, issues, are instrumental in providing the climate for the democratic basis Kohlberg speaks of. In other words, there is ample opportunity for students in the four schools to engage in the all-important role taking, and, to some extent, though informally, cognitive-moral conflict, which, for Kohlberg are the foundations of an atmosphere conducive to moral development.

The significance of the teachers' knowledge of adolescent development, which was pointed out with respect to the caring ethic, can be seen to be especially significant from the Kohlbergian perspective, since that theory, as was shown in Chapter 2, is founded essentially on the principles of child development. From the Kohlbergian point of view a knowledge of childhood development is crucial to a practice of teaching which would seek to foster moral development in children, since it provides teachers with an appreciation and understanding of developmental stages, directly related to Kohlberg's Stages of moral reasoning. The knowledge of adolescent development - though Lipsitz doesn't draw direct attention to the fact - can be seen to have an extremely important bearing on the diversity of teaching styles being encouraged particularly at three of the schools, Noe, Shoreham-Wading river, and Western. It is a diversity crucial

to the teacher's ability to meet the individual student on his or her own ground, and hence, to be able to engage in dialogue with the student.

All four middle schools, then, clearly appear to qualify as settings favorable to the fostering of moral development according to the principles of Kohlberg's Stage theory. They are all characterized by atmospheres of open, caring, and collaborative relations, in which the more punitively oriented Pre-conventional level of moral reasoning is obviously absent.

These factors would seem to indicate that the moral climate in these schools is capable of fostering development in students, not merely to the Conventional level of conformity to authority and the status quo, but (recalling Kohlberg's retrenchment to Stage 4) with the qualification that that development would contain the added ingredient of providing students with a greater readiness to take their place in a climate of participatory democracy, either later on in high school - provided such a climate were available - or in society at large. In other words, these schools appear to be capable of fostering in their students the predisposition to advance to a Postconventional level (Stage 5) of moral development.

In summary, the four schools discussed by Lipsitz indicate that teaching relations in these schools, through liberal and creative leadership from principals, generally involve not only a more democratic and collaborative

arrangement between teachers and administration, as well as among teachers themselves, but that serious attempts are being made to create school climates in which authentic discussion and dialogue is taking place between teachers and students, and through teachers, among students themselves. In addition to this an open classroom structure, in which a variety of teaching styles is encouraged and practiced, helps establish a classroom atmosphere in which teacher isolation is broken down, and where discipline ceases to be a primary concern. Though the schools are academically successful, academics are not excessively pushed but social development of students is also a primary concern. This orientation is further enhanced in teachers by their being steeped in a knowledge of adolescent development, which renders them more open and sensitive to student needs academically and otherwise. Finally, students are given regular experience in service activities to young and old, both within the school and out in the community.

These conditions were seen to create school and classroom atmospheres which were truly conducive to the practice of both the caring ethic, and moral development according to Stage theory. Specifically, the kind of dialogue and concern shown to be active among teachers and students indicates the very real possibility of the practice of 'inclusion' among teachers in respect of the caring ethic. From the Kohlbergian perspective, it was seen that such school climates also

suggested the possibility of moral development in students, not merely to the Stage 4 level of conformity to the school status quo, but with the added possibility of further development to Stage 5.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The theories of Noddings and Kohlberg have been seen to represent complementary views on how schooling may modify its approach to education in order to become a better vehicle for the fostering of moral development in the youth of society. For Kohlberg particularly, this modification, in respect of the American scene, was seen to involve making schools into institutions reflecting more fully the proposals in the American constitution. It was designed ultimately to assist society in its moral growth from a mainly Stage 4 level of conformity to the status quo, to Stage 5. This would involve a more critical approach to the status quo, and hence foster a greater ability to assume a more active role in the democratic process.

In this writer's experience, the contemporary scene appears to have special, and even ironic, implications in respect of Kohlberg's moral aspirations regarding participatory democracy and its place in the moral climate of America. For this reason these concluding remarks will be made mainly with reference to Kohlberg's cautions regarding the threat of 'privatism' to the democratic system, and hence,

to the moral climate of America generally.

For Kohlberg, it will be recalled, the ruptures in the social fabric of America were not signs of imminent moral decay, but were rather the manifestations of a society already in transition from a primarily Stage 4, to a Stage 5 level of morality. If that transition was not generally recognized as self-evident at the time Kohlberg made the claim a decade and a half ago, it is perhaps even less recognizable today. For, the privatism which Kohlberg saw then as capable of undermining the process of moral transition, appears still very much alive, and perhaps even on the up-surge.

The debate over schooling in America in the 1990s continues, so far as this writer is able to ascertain, to employ much the same rhetoric, and call for essentially the same reforms, that it has been doing for decades: the raising of national standards for education; the de-regulation of schools in order to give more power to parents; a stronger program of accountability for schools and teachers; radical changes in curriculum content away from educating the few, and toward educating all to use their minds in higher-order ways; rewards for high performance in students and teachers; and the lengthening of the school year. In other words, reforms continue to focus essentially on teaching practice, just as they persist in avoiding the issue of teaching structure.

In addition to this, the money-driven conservatism informing educational debate, which Kohlberg saw as underlying

the privatism of the early 1980s, is also, in the writer's experience, as active as ever in the early 1990s, particularly in the recent stance of protectionism informing economic policy in the U.S. The main culprit from this protectionist point of view seems to be Japan (followed closely by Germany), and the complaint, curiously, appears to be coming loudest from the American automobile industry. This is curious, but not surprising when one remembers that it is the automobile industry which is the foundation upon which the 'American dream' was built, the symbol of which is the 'freedom of the road'. And now that dream, according to warnings from the industry, is in danger of being dismantled forever, and primarily because, the warning continues, the U.S. auto industry is beginning to lose the 'competitive edge' to the Japanese. As one spokesman for the industry recently warned, if the Japanese take over this market America will be reduced to the status of a second-rate world power. This seems to have raised a cry of alarm in corporate America, to the effect that the world is witnessing yet again another scenario of aggressive imperialism from the land of the rising sun, all the more insidious this time for being economic rather than military.

Nor is it surprising that America is looking to the educational system - and it would be naive to deny corporate America's leading involvement in this - as the means of reclaiming again the 'competitive edge', and restoring the

country to its place of world leadership in the economic market-place. This has occasioned a great deal of looking over the fence at the Japanese educational system, to discover the secret of that people's ingenuity and indefatigability. Informed, no doubt, by the philosophy of the 'American way' - that if more is better, much more is best - what the educationists are seeing is predictable: a Japanese schooling system which indeed appears to have more, if not much more, with a school year running to some 240 days, as opposed to 180 or so in the U.S., and an average of three and one-half hours of homework against forty-five minutes in the U.S. The idea, supposedly, is to follow suit (again the focus on teaching practice).

The point here is that the national concern over education in the U.S. today seems to be centered very much, if not entirely, around the question of not simply securing America's economic survival, but restoring the nation to its position of 'number one' - a blatant manifestation of Kohlberg's Stage 2 - in world economic leadership.

The irony is that all this talk of educational reform is taking place in a sagging American economy which is creating a program of governmental budget cut-backs in which domestic affairs, including education, continue to get the short end of the fiscal stick. In short, this climate of economically-engendered contraction is feeding, so far as this writer can see, directly into the regressive ideology of privatism.

It is difficult not to see, in the call for the raising of school standards, accountability, and back to basics, the continuation of mainly economic concerns which Kohlberg saw in 1980; that is, just another form of rationing a short supply of goods in lean times. There are even signs of a budding movement afoot, led by corporate America, and fueled by the troubled American economy, as well as by disquieting predictions for the economy's foreseeable future, to entice the brightest high-school minds away from the prospect of a university education toward the technical colleges. This is, of course, in the interests of securing an adequate labor supply for a uncertain future. The appeal is, again, pure Kohlbergian Stage 2: the prospect of personal advantage, in terms of economic rewards which include job opportunity and monetary returns.

In this climate of political and economic conservatism - a conservatism which seems at times reactionary - to see even four middle schools prepared to resist this popular tide of privatism, and engage in an educational endeavor at least partially in line with the thinking of Noddings and Kohlberg, seems curiously out of step with the times, almost anachronistic. To be seriously concerned with the growth and development of the whole child, as these schools show themselves to be - a concern which appears to have little relevance to a national, and international, situation in which the home powers are taking fright because they see their hard-

won enterprises in the market-place in danger of losing the 'competitive edge' - might very well be regarded as a waste of limited resources (as well as time) from the point of view of an ideology which seems to have great trouble seeing the human species as other than predatory.

It was Goodlad (1984) who offered the hopeful, and perhaps wise, statement on the future of education in America, when he said that that future depends not on reform of the 'system' (which is essentially an abstraction, and hence removed from the human condition it pretends to embody) but on the character of individual schools; in other words, on schools prepared to subvert an ideology which, while championing the rhetoric of change, clings tenaciously to the status quo.

What all this means in terms of a society in moral transition, however, it would seem is yet to be seen.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aronowitz, Stanley, and Henry A. Giroux. Education Under Siege: The Conservative, Liberal and Radical Debate over Schooling. New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1985.

Ashton, Patricia. "A Teacher Education Paradigm to Empower Teachers and Students," Advances in Teacher Education: Volume 4, edited by Lilian G. Katz. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1991.

Beyer, Landon E., and Ken Zeichner. "Teacher Education in Cultural Context: Beyond Reproduction," Critical Studies in Teacher Education, edited by Thomas S. Popkewitz. London: The Falmer Press, 1987.

Cornbleth, Catherine. "Cries of Crisis, Calls for Reform, and Challenges of Change,", Crisis in Teaching: Perspectives on Current Reform, edited by Lois Weiss, Philip G. Altbach, Gail P. Kelly, Hugh G. Petrie, and Sheila Slaughter. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.

Ehrlich, Eugene, Stuart Berg Flexner, Gorton Carruth, and Joyce M. Hawkins, editors. Oxford American Dictionary. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Giroux, Henry, and Peter McLaren. "Teacher Education as a Counter Public Sphere: Notes Towards a Redefinition,". Critical Studies in Teacher Education, edited by Thomas S. Popkewitz. London: The Falmer Press, 1987.

Goodlad, John, I. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Goodlad, John I. "Connecting the Present to the Past," Places Where Teachers Are Taught, edited by John I. Goodlad, Roger Soder, and Kenneth A. Serontnik. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990.

Heath, Shirley B. Teacher Talk: Language in the Classroom. Arlington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

Hurn, Christopher, J. The Limits and Possibilities of Schooling: An Introduction to the Sociology of Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1985.

Joy, Donald M. Moral Development Foundations. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1983.

Knitter, William. "The Informing Vision of the Practical: The Concepts of Character, Virtue, Vice, and Privation." Journal of Curriculum Studies 20 (1988): 483-492.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "Stages of Moral Development as a Basis for Moral Education." Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches, edited by C.M. Beck, B.S. Crittenden, and E.V. Sullivan. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

Kohlberg, Lawrence, and Elliot Turiel. "Moral Development and Moral Education." Psychology and Educational Practice, edited by Gerald S. Lesser. London: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1971.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "From Is to Ought: The Naturalistic Fallacy," Cognitive Development and Epistemology, edited by Theodore Mischel. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. Education for a Society in Moral Transition. (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975), sound cassette.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "The Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Moral Education." Moral Education: It Comes With The Territory, edited by D. Purpel, and K. Ryan. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1976.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "The moral Atmosphere of the School." Moral Education: It Comes With The Territory, edited by David Purpel and Kevin Ryan. Berkely: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1976.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "High School Democracy and Educating for a Just Society." Moral Education: A First Generation of Research and Development, edited by Ralph L. Mosher. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. The Philosophy of Moral Development. San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers, 1981.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. Childhood Psychology and Childhood Education: A Cognitive Developmental View. New York: Longman Inc., 1987.

Lasley, Thomas J. and Joseph Watras. "Teacher Education at the Crossroads," Advances in Teacher Education: Volume 4, edited by Lilian G. Katz. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1991.

Lieberman, Ann, and Lynne Miller. Teachers, Their World, and Their Work. Alexandria: ASCD Publishers, 1984.

Lipsitz, Joan. Successful Schools for Young Adolescents. New Brunswick (U.S.A.): Transaction, Inc., 1984.

Lortie, Dan, C. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Mattingly, Paul H. " Workplace Autonomy and the Reforming of Teacher Education," Critical Studies in Teacher Education, edited by Thomas S. Popkewitz. London: The Falmer Press, 1987.

Mehan, H. "What Time Is It Denise?: Asking Known Information Questions in the Classroom," Case Studies in Classroom Research, edited by Martyn Hammersley. Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1986.

Mosher, Ralph, L., and Paul Sullivan. "A Curriculum in Moral Education for Adolescents," Moral Education: It Comes with the Territory, edited by David Purpel. Berkely: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1976.

Noddings, Nel. Caring. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Oliver, Hugh, editor. How to Assess the Moral Reasoning of Students: A Teacher's Guide to the Use of Lawrence Kohlberg's Stage-Development Method. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972.

Parker, Walter. "New Directions in Teacher Education: Which Direction," Reforming Teacher Education: Issues and New Directions, edited by Josepn A. Braun Jr. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989.

Persell, Caroline Hodges. Education and Inequality: The Roots and Results of Stratification in America's Schools. New York: The Free Press, 1977.

Peters, R.S. Moral Development and Moral Education. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1981.

Pickering, W.S.F., editor. Durkheim: Essays on Morals and Education. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.

Popkewitz, Thomas P. "Ideology and Social Formation in Teacher Education," Critical Studies in Teacher Education, edited by Thomas P. Popkewitz. New York: The Falmer Press, 1987.

Raths, James, Amy McAninch and Lilian Katz. "A Plight of Teacher Educators: Clinical Mentalities in a Scientific Culture," Advances in Teacher Education: Volume 4, edited by Lilian G. Katz. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1991.

Reyes, Pedro, editor. Teachers and Their Workplace. London: Sage Publications, 1990.

Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1982.

Sarason, Seymour B., Kenneth S. Davidson, and Burton Blatt. The Preparation of Teachers: An Unstudied Problem. Cambridge: Brookline Books, 1986.

Sarason, Seymour B. The Predictable Failure of Education Reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1991.

Schneider, Barbara. "Tracing the Provenance of Teacher Education," Critical Studies in Teacher Education, edited by Thomas S. Popkewitz. London: The Falmer Press, 1987.

Schrag, Francis. Thinking in School and Society. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Sizer, Theodore, R. Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School. Boston: Boughton Mifflin Company, 1984.

Sullivan, Edmund, V., and Clive Beck. "Moral Education in a Canadian Setting." Moral Education: It comes with the Territory, edited by David Purpel and Kevin Ryan. Berkely: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1976.

Tharp, Roland, G., and Gallimore Ronald. Rousing Minds to Life. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Wilson, John. A New Introduction to Moral Education. London: Cassell Educational Limited, 1990.