

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 894

SF 001 428

REVIEW OF "CONCEPTUAL MODELS IN TEACHER EDUCATION," BY JOHN R. VERDUIN, WASHINGTON, D.C., AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR COLLEGES OF TEACHER EDUCATION, 1967, PP. 140.
BY- TRAVERS, ROBERT M.W.

FUB DATE 67

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.32 6F.

DESCRIPTORS- #BOOK REVIEWS, #CONCEPTUAL SCHEMES, #EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE, #EDUCATIONAL THEORIES, #MODELS, #TEACHER EDUCATION, TEACHING MODELS

THE REVIEWER FAULTS THE AUTHOR FOR "SIMPLE AND UNCRITICAL PRESENTATIONS OF IDEAS" THAT FAIL TO RESULT IN THE PROMISED "WORKABLE DOCUMENT FOR PRACTICING TEACHER EDUCATORS TO USE." THE MATERIAL "SHOWS SO COMPLETE A LACK OF CONCERN FOR SUCH MATTERS AS WHETHER A MODEL HAS OR HAS NOT BEEN DERIVED FROM EMPIRICAL RESEARCH, WHETHER THE MODEL HAS OR HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED UTILITY, OR WHETHER THE MODEL IS JUST A HAPPY WHIM OR HAS A MORE SOLID FOUNDATION." FOR THE WORK OF B. OTHANEL SMITH, HILDA TABA, M.L. GAGE, NED FLANDERS, ARNO BELLACK, J.W. GETZELS, HARRY BROUDY, ALBERT HICKEY, JAMES GALLAGHER, J. RICHARD SUCHMAN, ASAHEL WOODRUFF, DAVID KRATHWOHL, AND ELIZABETH MACCIA, THE REVIEWER OFFERS BRIEF EVALUATIVE CHARACTERIZATIONS, USING THE CRITERIA THAT THE AUTHOR SHOULD HAVE EMPLOYED BUT DID NOT. WHILE THE VERDUIN BOOK MIGHT BE EXPECTED TO "STIMULATE DISCUSSION OF WHAT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM," THE REVIEWER SUGGESTS THAT ONE MIGHT LOOK IN THE DIRECTION OF THE WORK OF SUCH PERSONS AS THORNDIKE, PIAGET, HEBB, SKINNER, AND BRUNER AS MORE FRUITFUL SOURCES OF EDUCATIONAL IDEAS AND PRACTICES. WHILE THE RESEARCH ON TEACHING IN THE CLASSROOM SHOULD NOT BE ABANDONED, "ITS USEFULNESS AS A BASIS FOR ANYTHING EXCEPT FURTHER RESEARCH WILL BE QUESTIONED BY ANYONE WHO EXAMINES CLOSELY THE OUTCOMES PRESENTED IN RESEARCH REPORTS." (AW)

ED015894

Review of Conceptual Models in Teacher Education, by John R. Verduin. Washington, D. C. American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1967, pp. 140.

The title of this book is well-chosen to attract the attention of those engaged in the training of teachers. In addition, the sponsorship of the publication by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education may be taken to suggest that here is a volume designed to provide conceptualizations that should be incorporated in teacher education. The preface further reinforces expectations that the book will contain material that has direct application to teacher education, for the author states that he was advised to prepare some "workable document for practicing teacher educators to use." The introductory chapter of the book adds that the research reviewed in subsequent chapters could form the essential content of the course work in a teacher education program. In the ~~subsequent~~ ^{that follows} chapters a review is presented of the research and speculations from the last decade of B. Othanel Smith, Hilda Taba, N. L. Gage, Ned Flanders, Arno Bellack, J. W. Getzels, Harry Broudy, Albert Hickey, James Gallagher, J. Richard Suchman, Asahel Woodruff, David Krathwohl, and Elizabeth Steiner Maccia.

The reviewer who glances over the names of those whose research and thinking is reviewed cannot but be impressed with the diversity of the materials covered. The work of Smith, Taba and Flanders in recent years has been empirical research, Broudy and Maccia are philosophers,

Getzels is best known for bringing the technical language and conceptualizations of sociology to the professional literature of education, Woodruff is an interpreter of research on concept learning, Krathwohl has been a taxonomist, and Gage has been a collector and organizer of research on problems of teaching. Despite this extraordinary diversity, Verduin has managed to write a book with a chapter on the work of each of these luminaries as if they all fell into a single common pattern. The fact that some have pulled models of teaching out of common experience while others have attempted to derive models from carefully collected data seems to have completely escaped him. Indeed, rarely has this reviewer read material that shows so complete a lack of concern for such matters as whether a model has or has not been derived from empirical research, whether the model has or has not demonstrated utility, or whether the model is just a happy whim or has a more solid foundation.

Examples of overwhelming differences between the models reviewed that should have been brought out are lost because Verduin has shown little or no concern for evaluating the evidence on which any particular model is based. Flander's interaction analysis is discussed as having "far reaching implications for the teacher education process," and yet the fact is that there is no substantial evidence to show that anything measured by the system has any relationship to pupil achievement. Measures derived from the system do show well-established relationships to the pupils' liking for the teaching situation, but any relationships to pupil achievement that have faintly appeared in some data are only will-o-the-

wisps that most research workers believe to be spurious effects. Flanders is a splendid empiricist who has vigorously pursued the collection of data and cannot be blamed for the fanatical belief of some of his followers that here is a device for improving both inservice and pre-service teacher education and that here is a way to improve teaching. Verduin would have done much better to have reviewed Flander's interaction analysis technique as a research procedure together with a brief summary of the few well-established findings, and then have raised questions about the extent to which the system had potential utility outside of research. At present it cannot be regarded as anything more than a research tool. Much the same criticism could be leveled against the chapter on Suchman's inquiry training. In the case of this latter chapter Verduin seems quite unaware of the flimsy evidence on which the model is based and does not seem to realize that Suchman's role has been that of a creative writer, who has generated enormous comment and criticism from others, but who has yet to provide a substantive footing for much of what he says. Verduin likes to worship the latest conceptual idols, but does not have the eyes of the empiricist who sees them as made of common clay -- one of man's more useful substances when used for appropriate purposes.

Verduin's handling of those chapters dealing with what might be termed analytic models are somewhat more adequate. His case for teaching Broudy's analysis of the uses of knowledge to students of education at least makes some sense. His case for teaching Gage's speculations in the ill-defined areas of paradigms and theories of teaching is not so

convincing, but one would certainly expect the student of education to be stimulated by Gage's work even though he might have a hard time in applying it since it is a framework for organizing scientific knowledge rather than an organization of established knowledge. Then there is the chapter on the work of Maccia. Because of Maccia's high degree of philosophical sophistication, her work is likely to remain far outside of the intellectual competencies of most professors of education, let alone students of education. Maccia will stimulate many ideas among others who have had substantial philosophical training and, ultimately, her work may have some impact on teacher education, but not for a long time to come.

Simple and uncritical presentations of ideas can be disturbing, but some of the quite meaningless statements scattered through this book makes one wonder whether the volume was thrown together in haste. For example, in the discussion of the Guilford model of the intellect we find such statements as (p. 91) "The model itself is a theoretical system for categorizing the various factors associated with the intellect, and thus is not practical in itself..... like the periodic table, it can be used in part to bring about different combinations at the analytic level for some laboratory teaching." Another example comes from a discussion of Krathwohl (p. 122) "Both the affective and cognitive domains can assist the curriculum builder to achieve a high degree of consistency at the intermediate level of goal statement specificity within a school, school system, or series of schools." This reviewer could find no cue in the context concerning what these statements mean.

Perhaps the most that can be expected of the book is that it will stimulate discussion of what should be included in the teacher education curriculum. Verduin's preference is obviously for research and thought directly related to classroom teaching. This is a common sense approach, but to describe an approach in such terms puts the scholar immediately on his guard. Common sense has a common way of being wrong. The fact must be faced that research on teaching has produced few results that have had any impact on either classroom teaching or teacher training. Even considered strictly as a research enterprise, research on teaching has not been very successful for it has produced few positive and well-established findings. Indeed, if one were to identify the programs of research that have had impact on education during the last half century, one would look in an entirely different direction to such names as Thorndike, Piaget, Hebb, Skinner, and Bruner, none of whom have undertaken work in classroom settings. Most of their research has been of the classical laboratory pattern but it has been prolific in the amount of knowledge it has yielded in contrast with the very meagre yield from research on classroom teaching. Although nobody should take the position that research on teaching in the classroom should be abandoned, its usefulness as a basis for anything except further research will be questioned by anybody who examines closely the outcomes presented in research reports. From the viewpoint of the reviewer, Verduin seems to be arguing that teacher education should be based on those areas of research that have had little impact on education and abandon those that have. He does not build a case for his position.

He cites no empirical evidence. He presents conceptualizations as if their worth had been validated for the use to which he proposes to put them, when they have not been validated at all. The misfortune is that a book so wholly lacking in scholarship should be published with a note of commendation by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Robert M. W. Travers
Western Michigan University