

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 085

SP 005 126

AUTHOR Nash, Paul
TITLE The Major Purposes of Humanistic and Behavioral Studies in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 12p.; Paper prepared for the working conference of the National Standing Conference on Humanistic and Behavioral Studies in Education, AACTE, April 14-15, 1971, Washington, D.C.
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Foundations of Education, *Teacher Education Curriculum, Teacher Educators, Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

The author of this paper sees the major purpose of the humanistic and behavioral studies in teacher education as helping students in learning how to feel, how to think, and how to act. He deplores the inability of young people to function independently in their personal and professional lives and blames the dependent nature of their education for this phenomenon. A curriculum in the foundations of education which would help future teachers to break through the circle of "teaching as they are taught" would emphasize sensitivity training and critical and analytical thinking. In this type of program, the role of the teacher educator would change to include continuing experiences in the public schools. He would function as a unique communication link between the university and the schools. The author concludes by pointing up the need for continuing inservice education to keep the teacher abreast of the latest developments in educational theory and practice. (RT)

ED053085

THE MAJOR PURPOSES OF HUMANISTIC AND
BEHAVIORAL STUDIES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by PAUL NASH

Boston University

Prepared for the working conference of the National Standing Conference
on Humanistic and Behavioral Studies in Education, AACTE, Washington, D. C.;
April 14-15, 1971.

2005126



I have assumed that my task has been to reflect on what should be the major purposes of humanistic and behavioral studies in teacher education. As I did this, I began to fantasy: what would it be like if there were no humanistic or behavioral studies in programs of teacher education? Should we be worse off? Would the teachers in training be worse off? And would the children they teach suffer? There can be little doubt that we professors of foundations of education would suffer, at least in the short run, for we would have to find alternative ways of making an honest or dishonest living, perhaps by going back to teach the school children whose needs and abilities we discuss with such easy authority. But that might eventually be a salutary experience both for us and for our students. As for the teachers and their students, I am not aware of any evidence that demonstrates the value of humanistic and behavioral studies in the lives of those who undergo them and of those whom they teach.

Two pictures came strongly to my mind during my fantasy. One was of my own teaching in elementary and secondary slum schools in London after World War II. I remember that many of my colleagues were products of the post-war Emergency Teacher Training Program, which provided six months training for mature people, many of whom had not even completed high school but who had tried other occupations and now wished to move into teaching. In my recollection, these briefly and minimally trained men and women were almost invariably the liveliest, most interesting, most committed, and most effective teachers in the school, often making their graduate colleagues look dull and heavy by comparison.

The other picture that came to my mind was of the large number of doctoral students in education that I have observed and come to know as they have slowly passed through their programs at universities with which I have been associated. As these students build up credits towards their doctorates, the credits appear to pile on top of them, weighing them down. The students become more morose, dull, and stupid as time passes and they approach their appropriately named terminal degree. By "stupid," I mean that they appear to become increasingly unwilling to take decisions and responsibility, to make up their own minds, to trust their judgments, or to be in touch with their own reactions, feelings, or convictions.

What this fantasy said to me was that I should be justified in refusing to take for granted that anything that at present goes on in institutions of teacher education is of self evident value, either to those who experience it or to those whose lives they will affect. Given this stance, I began to think not in terms of what teacher education is, what purposes it now serves, what external and institutional pressures it now responds to, what traditions and thought patterns it brings to the present, but rather in terms of what needs and desires I perceive as being paramount in children I meet and talk with, in my own students who are teachers or preparing to be teachers, and, not least, in myself. These needs and desires stem from one's inner dynamics as they interact with contemporary social forces.

In a preliminary view of this analysis, I see the needs and desires of all three constituents as falling into three parts. We seem to be asking for help in learning how to feel, learning how to think, and learning how to act. I suggest, therefore, that an analysis of the purposes of humanistic and behavioral studies in teacher education might be made under these three rubrics.

I.

First, let me make clear that this threefold division is made merely for purposes of easier handling. It implies no clear or distinct separation between any of the categories. On the contrary, it will be a vital part of my case not only that the three categories are overlapping and interpenetrating but also that their operations crucially affect and influence one another in ways that should be at the heart of our educational concern.

My argument rests on the assumptions that feelings are part of the human personality, that they are important determinants of human thoughts, values, acts, and decisions, that they can be influenced, refined, and modified, that they are of legitimate concern to educators, and on the inference that they can be appropriately included in a program of teacher education.

When I listen to young people, in an attempt to assess what are their strongest needs and desires, a number of recurrent themes come through, themes that evoke strong responses in my own emotional life. These themes manifest themselves in two characteristic ways: a feeling of oppression, of being stifled or being prevented from satisfying a need or fulfilling a desire; and a feeling of hope or aspiration, often utopian or fantastic, about what life might be like. A typical theme is that of feeling purposeless, drifting, not sure where you are going or even where you want to go. In helping students to explore their own feelings of oppression, I have found this mood of purposelessness to be the commonest manifestation. They want to feel more sure of their own values. To achieve this, they feel a need first to know more about themselves. Still not sure who they are, and hence what they might choose to become, they feel unable to get out of the bind of respecting and pleasing only others, never themselves. This oppression is experienced as a feeling of dehumanization, or depersonalization. They want strongly to feel more fully human but do not know how to go about it; and they feel incapable of helping others to grow in this way until they have made some significant progress themselves. Hence, they often feel panic at the prospect of entering teaching as phony pretenders.

Another characteristic theme is the feeling of being isolated. Not only young but also many Middle Aged people among the population of students and teachers I am speaking about hunger for a significant experience of community. They feel this lack as one of the most oppressive qualities of their lives. at a deep level they feel drawn toward their fellows and long for an experience of intimacy and communion. But their personal histories, their education, and their perceptions of social and economic demands keep them apart. In circumstances of great warmth, security, approval, and support they are able to make some tentative advances towards one another. But, given a somewhat more threatening or uncertain environment, they are easily trapped into a mutually fearful, competitive stance. Their old upbringing and training then induce them to seek to win, to beat, to exploit, to manipulate. These old forms of behavior are then further reinforced by the university's mechanisms of grading, testing, examining, and so on.

Thus isolated, they experience another feeling that emerges as a characteristic theme, that is, alienation. An increasing number of teachers and prospective teachers appear to feel alienated from mainstream American values and attitudes. They are outraged when they observe the blindness, indifference, or even condonation with which the majority of the American people permit a small group to profit through the destruction of the culture, the economy and the ecology of ancient civilizations and through the depredation of the cities and natural environment of the United States. Their outrage is felt as a slow-burning anger and yet it is mute and despairing, for another of their characteristic feelings is of impotence.

Although many of these students feel that many things are terribly wrong with their society and fear for the future that faces the children they will teach, they feel largely powerless to do anything significant to save either themselves or their children. In this, they are reflecting a wider malaise in our society. Many people seem to have lost faith in themselves as important, functioning persons and hence it is hard for them to conceive that ordinary people can effect significant change. For this reason they look for leadership to political salesmen, to gurus, to fashionable writers, even to professors of education. It is only when we ourselves become one of those to whom others look for leadership that we realize how appallingly dangerous are their feelings of impotence that render them so easily frightened, led, and deceived.

Most poignant of all these characteristic themes is the feeling of being anesthetized, the feeling of being unable to feel. Many people with whom I talk find their oppression in an experience of the vicariousness of life. Everything is indirect, once removed, fuzzy, opaque. The illustrations range from the bland anonymity of supermarket food to the technological vicariousness of the American bomber crew dropping high explosives and napalm on Vietnamese peasants whom they never see. American business has mastered the art of creating desire and, when we reach out to satisfy it, putting in our hand an intermediate product for which we have no use. Advertising parades an unending sequence of beautiful young women, apparently for my pleasure, but when I move to consummate the arrangement I discover that all that is available is the bottle of beer or package of cigarettes or automobile that the young woman is selling. By being constantly immersed in a polluted ocean of this deceit, by living constantly under the stress of this stimulus - response - substitute - no satisfaction game, we come to distrust our feelings and the guidance they might give us.

When measured against these perceived needs, expressed through feelings of oppression and the desires that are often the reverse side of that oppression, teacher education in this country does not strike me as a particularly relevant, important, or humane activity. Rather, it appears most often to be merely another aspect of the oppressions that these people feel. It usually either ignores feeling or treats it as something to be controlled or transcended. The civilized person is often presented as one who has successfully expunged or controlled all expressions of spontaneous feeling, especially inconvenient or threatening ones like anger, hostility, physical affection, or intimacy. Teacher education programs seem largely unemancipated from the notion of a mind/body dualism; they are vulnerable to the tyranny of pseudo objectivity; they are often guilty of inappropriate uses of scientific method: they are apt to overemphasize the cognitive deminision of learning, especially when it is abstracted from personal experience; and they rarely work as a

constructive force in counteracting the experience of personal disintegrity that is such a characteristic product of formal-education.

In place of these characteristic manifestations of a domesticating education I should like to see the purposes of humanistic and behavioral studies purified in the light of the genuine needs and desires of contemporary students and teachers. This will necessitate, in the first place, considerable emphasis on unlearning. Before most of the students I encounter are able to move forward they must be helped to unlearn many of the habits and assumptions they bring with them. In particular, I refer to their typical marks of domestication: their habits of subordination, obedience, waiting, following, and accepting domination and oppression with resigned patience. They need to unlearn their habitual distrust of their own feelings, reactions, and intuitions.

Then we can go forward into those experiences that can build self trust, self respect, refinement of and sensitivity to feelings - one's own and others! For this purpose all studies can be used, but we need to be much more imaginative and experimental in exploring the uses of the humanities, the arts, religion, and human relations. One of the major revolutions needed in teacher education concerns the role of psychology. In the first place, we need to liberate teacher education programs from their present domination by psychology, thus allowing the field to be nurtured by the many other ways of studying educational problems (not only the philosophical, historical, and sociological, but also the economic, political, aesthetic, comparative, literary, anthropological, and religious) that are at present grossly under-utilized. Secondly, we need to liberate psychology itself from its quantitative and reductionist straight jacket. This will involve giving greater attention to psychiatry, existential and humanistic psychology, social and community psychology, gestalt psychotherapy, and the whole realm of the unconscious as a major element in the study of education. The miserably thin, quantitative pabulum that is fed to students of education in the name of psychology is a caricature of what it could and should be.

Most of all, the dimension of feeling can be explored and developed through the field of human relations. Sensitivity training is both fashionable and much abused. It is being widely introduced, is popular with students, and is often practised by incompetent leaders and advocated by fanatical missionaries. But we would do well not to be misled into errors of policy judgment by its failings. For this is without doubt a tool with tremendous power for good, as well as with corresponding dangers. And the fact that people respond to its invitations in enormous numbers should warn us that, whatever the quality of the experience they obtain, the existence of an undeniable need is remarkably demonstrated. This need is what I have been adumbrating in this section: the restoration of feeling to a respected and significant place in human life and education.

The strongest indictment that could be made of contemporary programs of humanistic and behavioral studies in teacher education is one that I lack the proof to substantiate but that I suspect may be true or largely true. It is that these studies make not the slightest difference to what the trained teacher does either in the classroom or in everyday life. To the extent that this is true, I believe that it is because these studies purport to be intellectual but are merely irrelevant. They are irrelevant because they touch neither the personal feeling level at one end nor the commitment to

action level at the other. A genuinely effective program of studies must help the student to do all three: to get in touch with his feelings and to trust his gut preferences; to conceptualize from these beginnings in forms that can be tested against public standards; and to translate these feelings and conceptualizations into value positions that will ensue in consistent action. But we must start the process with respect for the domain of feeling. This means that these studies must stem from the students' direct experiences, must be felt by them to be both real and important, and must lead to an experientially grounded understanding of the self and others. In practice, this becomes a process of problematizing personal, existential situations. This stage leads naturally to a consideration of learning how to think. But because of the integration of feeling with conceptualizing, our thinking processes will no longer be at the mercy of unexamined emotional drives.

II

I have suggested that a second major purpose of humanistic and behavioral studies in teacher education is to help students to learn how to think. This is a sufficiently ambiguous injunction to need explication. Let me relate this to my remarks about the restoration of the dimension of feeling to education. It can be inferred, I trust, from what I have already said that matters will not be improved if we merely topple intellectualism from its narrow perch and put feeling in place of thinking or body in place of mind. The expression of feeling does not itself lead to new insight or transferable learning. For this to happen, feelings need to be conceptually clarified and understood in relation to one's own life and to the needs and demands of others.

Moreover, the substitution of feeling for thinking would do nothing to relieve the dichotomies I have already criticized. What is needed, rather, is to help students gain understanding of the separation of feeling, thought, and action, of the harmful consequences of this separation, and of ways in which human wholeness can be restored. There is a great need in teacher education, as in education generally, for a primitivization of perception and feeling, a descent to a deeper level of unconscious stirring and spontaneous emotion. But this should be encouraged not in order that we can wallow at that level (although we should not ignore the danger of premature return) but in order to use the fruits of that primitivization to feed the imagination and then harness it in the cause of richer conceptualization and more potent action. It is regression in the service of greater integrity.

Thinking of a sort is not absent from current programs in teacher education. But that thinking is of the crudest and lowest form. Largely memorization, simple organization, and reproduction, it encourages and develops qualities like obedience, docility, passivity, reactivity, and spectatorship. It is not surprising that students experiencing such programs subsequently teach in ways that develop similar qualities in their pupils. Instead, learning how to think should involve primarily a growing confidence in one's own intellectual processes, in one's own intuitions, reflections, findings, personal knowledge, and commitments. It should result in increased intellectual autonomy and less derivative thinking. Success in this endeavor can be measured by the degree to which students of education begin to forsake their customary passive, non-participating intellectual behavior for a more pro-active, initiating, participating style.

We must examine not only the forms and styles of thinking that are encouraged by educational studies but also the content of that thinking. The most promising direction for change would be to encourage students to think more about their own first-hand experiences and feelings, for the cardinal problem is to learn to relate practical experience to theoretical understanding. Our students should become bridge builders between life in the classroom and life outside, both for themselves and later for their own students. Not a small part of the difficulty in achieving this lies in the fact that professors of education consistently teach that learning is more vividly, functionally, and permanently gained when it is based upon first-hand experience and has existential relevance for the learner, and equal consistently ignore this teaching in their own pedagogical practice.

When we begin to develop this greater intellectual autonomy and respect for one's own experiential insights among students of education, then we can hope to raise the generation of teacher skeptics that we need. Teachers should be skeptics not in the more recent sense of evaders of commitment but in the original sense of incurable askers of questions, being aware that no answer ever exhausts the richness and complexity of reality. In particular, teachers should be askers of questions that lead to new forms of thinking about teaching and learning. It is not enough for us to train people to do more efficiently what is already being done: we must educate them to create new concepts about the nature and purpose of education. To continue what is being done is to sentence ourselves to live with conventional notions that are condemned, more swiftly than ever before, to anachronism and irrelevance. Teachers and students should engage in raising questions about every assumption upon which education operates: they should ask why schools need buildings, why administrators need schools, why teachers need administrators, why learners need teachers, why education needs schooling, and other similar and dissimilar questions.

Our greatest enemy is the unreflective momentum that carries us all comfortably forward in familiar and unexamined ways. Our thinking, therefore, should be primarily about the purposes and consequences of what we do. As teachers, we should be constantly asking "why" questions, not only about things like grading procedures and the subjects we teach, but about the overall impact and meaning of our very presence in the classroom. Thence, perhaps, we and the teachers who study with us can learn to become lifelong students of teaching.

How can these purposes be achieved in teacher education? Let us look briefly at the program in humanistic and behavioral studies for some tentative illustrations. A problem immediately arises. Since one learns to become more pro-active, initiating, and participating in part by successfully practising these forms of behavior, it follows that programs of educational studies should not be completely pre-planned. Students should be involved actively in the collaborative designing, planning, and executing of the program, the learning process, and the evaluation procedures. This means that it would be inconsistent for me to lay down dogmatically my plan for a program of studies. However, since my notion of collaboration leaves an important place for faculty initiative and participation, I feel free to offer some of my own preferences, acknowledging that these would in practice have to be tempered and modified in the light of the actual situation facing me and the response or initiative of the students.

Overall, my intent would be to help the student to engage in reflection and dialogue on his feelings and experiences, with a view to the development of concepts, generalizations, evaluations, and applications. As an educational practitioner, the student is going to spend much of his professional life trying to make sense of his experiences, trying to organize them and generalize about them in order to understand them, and then trying to act or decide wisely in the light of his understanding. His program of educational studies should reflect this expected pattern of professional life. It should start by immersing him in personally relevant, non-trivial experiences. There should be significant clinical experience from the first year, as in the best medical schools today.

This clinical approach should merge into a study of significant problems. The so-called disciplines that make up the foundations of education will probably be retained, since established interests in education are hard to dislodge, but we should try to reduce the educational dysfunctionality of their imperialist ambitions, jurisdictional obsessions, and restrictive tone. For the student tends to approach the study of a discipline acceptingly and passively. His relation to it is that of a more or less entertained audience. In order to begin to be an active learner he must become dissatisfied. Problems provide this possibility because of their openness, their incompleteness, and their unsolved nature. Since they await solution, they invite the student to themselves as a creative participant. Their difficulties present a challenge that compels the student to face himself, his resources, goals, standards of evaluation, and willingness to commit himself to a position. When he tackles a problem seriously, he becomes an agent of change, and his decisions affect both himself and society. Thus the study of problems has within itself the possibility of both individual and social regeneration. Various disciplines, their data, methods, and insights, can be used in the study of problems but the disciplines must be demythologized and demystified and restored to their rightful and useful role as temporary vehicles, to be picked up and dropped as convenient, rather than as permanent penitentiaries whose prisoners and guards spend much of their energies agonizing over the limits of their jurisdiction.

The dangers of the discipline approach lie not only in the difficulty of breaking down the barriers between them and thus letting the breezes of innovative and imaginative thinking to blow through, but also in the temptation for the instructor to allow the content to be determined by his own research and theoretical bias rather than by the personal/professional needs of the students. When an instructor in foundations of education teaches as if his students were planning to follow the same career as himself he runs the risk of having them merely write off his offerings as irrelevant theorizing with no bearing on their practical problems. Such pseudoscholarly behavior is as much responsible for anti-intellectualism in this country as are hard hats.

Students who are to be educational practitioners need to develop the ability to conceptualize about educational problems that seem important to them, to be skeptical about common sense and conventional solutions, to analyze, assess, and use relevant research findings, and to formulate significant questions and hypotheses of their own. They should also become aware of the difference between a problem and a mystery, of the dimensions and limitations of human power, and of the necessity for living gracefully with that which cannot be changed.

In order to become skillful and creative agents of social and educational change these students need to learn how to operate in and create the kind of atmosphere where such change can best occur. Here again, skills, methods, and insights from the field of human relations can be invaluable. From this source much can be learned about the nature of interdependent learning and about the gains that accrue from supportive, noncompetitive, collaborative modes of relation. The students can also learn that the group atmosphere that best motivates people to learn to think creatively is one in which there is much real listening, openness, trust, constructive feedback, and free speculation; in which people feel free to think metaphorically, analogically, and absurdly; in which there is great tolerance of fantasy, ambiguity, and new ideas, in which people explicitly give each other credit for their contributions, and point out the strengths and good points in even crazy sounding notions; in which everyone builds on what has gone before rather than knocking down and starting afresh; and in which, instead of some winning (those whose ideas prevail) and some losing (those whose ideas are rejected), all win, because ideas are built upon others' ideas and everyone feels he has a stake in the final outcome.

But even creative conceptualizing is not sufficient as a goal of educational studies. Just as a focus on feeling can become a form of self indulgence, so a focus on thinking can become a kind of academic game. In order to skirt these dangers, feeling and thinking must be integrally related not only to each other but also to appropriate action. A successful program of educational studies will lead the student to a commitment to social, cultural, and educational change that will appear to him as the appropriate outcome of his self exploration and his conceptualizing. Not any action will receive his commitment but only that which grown out of his deeply felt and rationally examined values. Thus those studies that emphasize value clarification should have a central role in teacher education.

III

The principal failure in teacher education is the failure to ask why. We do not question with sufficient vigor why we do what we do. As a corollary, the most important task we can accomplish is to help teachers develop a clear sense of purpose. There is a great difference between knowing how to teach (which tends to provide short term success and the repetition thereafter of the successful formula) and being a student of education (which means being continuously involved in a reappraisal of one's actions, values, and purposes). Our programs of teacher education are, on the whole, better designed for the former than for the latter.

The third major purpose of humanistic and behavioral studies in teacher education, then, should be to develop the ability to relate the affective, cognitive, and conative in an integrated way. This will involve much more attention given to problems of the will to act, decision making, value clarification, freedom and authority, and the quality of life. Perhaps professors are not well equipped to help others do this, for we seem to find it difficult to distinguish between rhetoric and reality, often appearing to believe that once a thing has been said or written it has also been done. A clear example lies in the history of progressive education. If one were to judge from written histories, one would think that the public schools of this country were revolutionized by Dewey's ideas in the first half of the twentieth century. But when one goes into the schools, he realizes that the authors

of these books gathered their data in the archives rather than in the schools. Similarly, professors of education often appear to believe that it is enough for them to advocate progressive pedagogy; it is not necessary for them also to practise it. I am inclined to believe that the relationship between theory and practice in education in this country is represented not so much by a time lag, as is often maintained, as by a complementarity: that is, the theory becomes a substitute for the practice. It is rather like listening to a sermon on Sunday. After hearing some revolutionary educational rhetoric from one of our band of hellfire entertainers and nodding our heads in agreement, we all feel better and return to our jobs on Monday to do the same thing as before.

In order to make it more difficult to indulge in this complacent inertia, programs of educational studies should include a more searching examination of the prevailing values underlying characteristic behavior in American education. These should be measured against both the values that each student pays lip service to and those that his behavior manifests. We should assess the extent to which the idols of the market place dominate American society and education: the values of competition, exploitation, manipulation, control, selling oneself, buying others, gaining "contacts," winning "friends," using people as commodities. And we should estimate what room there is for the values of humane living: cooperation, love, intimacy, equality, authenticity, genuineness, openness, wholeness. There should be in our program a re-examination of the model of man that dominates conventional educational practice. The educational practitioner has a normative model (explicit or assumed) of the educated person towards which he works: we should help him to make his realization of this model clearer and to judge how closely it corresponds to his examined values.

Such an examination may well reveal to him that many "problems" in American life and education, such as the so-called racial problem, are not really problems in a strict sense since they cannot be "solved" within the context of the prevailing value system. Minor ameliorations may be made and some of the grossest abuses can be reduced but there can be no real solution. The so-called racial problem cannot be solved because our value system (actual rather than ideal) pits men in individual competition with one another. It also insists that all must strive for success. But the structure of society ensures that not all can succeed. Many must fail according to prevailing standards and this leads to widespread frustration, which emerges in scapegoating and other repressive mechanisms. Blacks (or some substitute for them) are necessary to American society as failures, drop-outs, also-rans. When society believes in the survival of the fittest there can be no "fit" without also the "unfit." Blacks play the latter role for us, hence making success possible for others. We could not afford to solve this problem for it would threaten our basic values.

Nevertheless, many revolutions are already under way in our society, as in the rest of the world, and as a result many parts of our educational structure (including practices, institutions, and values) are rapidly becoming maladaptive and dysfunctional. Educational studies should make students into educational revolutionaries. That is, they should not only become dissatisfied with things as they are but they should also become equipped with the experience, knowledge, and skill to live in a revolutionary world and to help guide the direction that revolution will take.

In aiding the student of education to learn how to act in an integrated, consistent way, one of the major tasks is to help him to be himself in a world that is trying hard to make him everyone else. It is to be hoped that the process of value clarification will enable him to see that success in conventional terms is success defined by others, in ignorance and carelessness of his own unique needs and possibilities. There is another, self defined notion of success, which involves him in the never-ending task of self discovery, with the goal of establishing his own life style. With success in this endeavor, he can then breakdown the artificial barriers between the personal and the professional. He can perceive, for example, that there can be no so-called "professional ethics" distinct from his personal ethics. Then his feelings and concepts will begin to emerge integrally through his values, choices, and acts.

Clearly, for some of these things to come about, there will have to be other changes in the pattern of humanistic and behavioral studies in teacher education. The whole role of the professor of foundations of education will have to change. He will have spend at least as much time in the schools as in the library. His classroom will have to be an epitome of the ideas and values he expresses. The time so often misspent in attempting to gain respectability according to academic cannons that are themselves gross anachronisms can be put to much better use. He should become a broker between the university and the schools, playing a unique communication role by being in touch with currents of opinion, need, experiment, and discovery in both. Above all, he should be the one who is most concerned with the complex relations between practice and theory and with the difficult task of enriching each with the other.

Furthermore, he should be working to dissolve the harmful dichotomy between the humanities and the behavioral sciences. Not only should both dimensions be found in every student's program, but both ways of looking at the world should inform the attack on every educational problem. Through the behavioral sciences the student can be helped to look at the world as it is, to encounter the impersonal demands made by the world, to respect intellect and cognition, to acknowledge the world of others, to envision civilization, and to meet the outside world as it moves towards him. But to end there is to leave the picture no more than half done. For through the humanities the student can be helped to look at the world as he would like it to be, to encounter the demands of his own personal wishes, to respect his fantasies, feelings, preferences, and values, and to meet the world from inside himself as he moves outwards to encounter others. At the present time, we fail to get maximum power from either approach because we use them in isolation from each other and do not benefit from their mutual strengthening.

Hence, the program in educational studies should include as a central focus the opportunity for the student to gain understanding of the nature of man, to study alternative models of the educated person, and to create his own model, not only from the materials of past and present, from history and science, but also from deep and careful introspection into his own personal past and present, the causes of his dehumanization and the sources of his hope. It is important that those who will become teachers be presented with alternative models of teaching because in their own student experiences they have been exposed for so long to so many bad models. Without an enlarged vision of human potentiality they will tend, under the stress of everyday pressures, to teach the way they were taught.

Even given these richer models of human possibility, however, teachers will quickly become discouraged and disillusioned unless we can also provide them with some of the human relations and organizational skills needed to bring about the institutional changes required to permit these alternative human patterns to develop. Teachers usually lack the experience, knowledge, and skill required to be effective change agents, both in the classroom and in the wider institutional, community, and societal dimensions of education. The program in educational studies should give high priority to these needs. Means of bringing about educational change should be systematically examined. Students should have practice in effecting change in a specific location, perhaps in the university itself, through the development of curriculum, the formulation of educational policy, and the gaining and responsible use of knowledge and power.

Similarly, since in this post-bureaucratic age they are going to have to be able to bring about change by working collaboratively with others in group situations, their program should be conducted in such a way as to foster the skills of collaborative planning, goal setting, and the conducting of courses and programs. It should make available sensitivity training and emphasize knowledge of group processes. One of the ways in which we have kept teachers relatively powerless has been to teach them as if they were lonely scholars preparing for a life of professional isolation in closed classrooms. Isolated people are easily controlled.

The dimension of values should infuse every stage of the educational program. Evaluation should be constant and pervasive. Although we could profitably dispense with most of the grading that goes on in education, we need more evaluation of our processes and performance, especially in the forms of self evaluation and honest feedback. The program should provide frequent opportunities for students to engage, in collaboration with fellow students and faculty, in the evaluation of their own behavior and performance, of the program, and of the faculty.

When all this has been said, however, it remains true that our best efforts at pre-service education are puny. If the teacher does not remain a continuous student of education throughout his career, our work is virtually worthless. But it is much to expect from a teacher working in an unfavorable environment. It is necessary for teacher education to continue day after day in every school. This would be materially facilitated if we could end the unfortunate dichotomy between teaching and administration. There is no good reason why every administrator should not teach, nor why every teacher should not carry some administrative duties. If the principal became again the head teacher he could be a key person in the necessary program of continuous in-service teacher education. But he would need help from the resources of the university. This is where the professors of foundations of education could play a vital role, providing support in the form of research data, human relations skills, consultation, and specialized knowledge. It is to be hoped that they would also represent in their persons models of the humane integration of feeling, thinking, and acting.