

Three Professors' Teaching Philosophy of Education: Strategies and Considerations for Undergraduate Courses

Caroline R. Pryor, Kris Sloan and Funmi Amobi¹

Abstract: This study investigated the impact of teaching about philosophical approaches on preservice teachers' coherence-non-coherence perspectives. Participants were 56 preservice teachers from two research universities in two states, and three professors at these universities. Data were collected using (a) a 105-item Philosophy of Education Scale (POES) (Pryor, 2004b), and (b) professor and student self-reflections. A correlational matrix was used to determine the relationship among five philosophical orientations and seven dimensions of educational practice. Results indicate that students are more consistent in their ratings of approaches they are less likely to adopt in their teaching than those they are more likely to use. Implications include suggestions for enhancing foundations courses and the use of the POES as a reflective tool.

I. Introduction.

Professors of undergraduate teacher education courses often hear students express anxiety about demonstrating their teaching skills. Although they ponder, write and re-write lesson plans and reflect about possible problems they might face (i.e. student behavior, appropriate content), we suspect that instead of solely seeking advice on tools, tips and tricks for their lessons, these preservice teachers might be better served by drawing on foundational understandings to support the tools they use. Foundational knowledge in teacher education (philosophy, history and sociology of education) has long afforded teachers a means for self-knowledge about their beliefs about the goals of education—a self-knowledge that leads to clarity in making classroom decisions (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004; Oliva, 2005; Wactler, 1990 and others).

However, many who teach in preservice teacher education programs have noticed that foundational courses (in particular philosophy of education courses) have become either less a staple or have entirely disappeared as stand alone courses in undergraduate programs. One response to this concern is that other areas (e.g., mathematics education) have become more attractive to doctoral students than coursework leading to foundations concentrations in the degree plan. Or, perhaps the paucity of trained foundations professors (Carbone, 1991; Henry & Shea, 1986) suggests that these professors have been courted to teach graduate level courses. If this latter statement is true, will undergraduate teacher education programs concentrate solely on pedagogical practice (methods, management and media)? To determine how professors who do teach in undergraduate programs might enhance students' expression of their philosophical beliefs about teaching (i.e., their beliefs about how to approach teaching decisions), this study reviewed strategies and course methods used in three undergraduate courses. Because foundational courses help pre-service teachers better understand the philosophic beliefs that underlie their goals and purposes of education (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004) or selection of

¹ Department of Secondary Education, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Box 1122, Edwardsville, IL 62026, capryor@siue.edu, College of Education, St. Edward's University, kris@stedwards.edu and College of Teaching Education and Leadership, Arizona State University, funmi.amobi@asu.edu.

particular teaching pedagogies (Pryor, 2004b) —the study investigated students’ cohesive and internally consistent philosophic approach to teaching.

Teaching about philosophical foundations of education has a long-standing and well-regarded position in teacher education, a status that has remained fundamentally unchanged (Hlebowitsh, 2005, Oliva, 2004; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). For example, an overwhelming number of teacher educators continue to [state that] they believe philosophy of education plays an important role in undergraduate education (e.g., Gunzenhauser, (2003); Rainer & Guyton, 1999 and others). Teacher accreditation organizations also remain dedicated to the benefits of including educational foundations in undergraduate course work. The National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (2000 revision) states that candidates of accredited institutions should be prepared with a sound foundational base of the role of the teacher in education. In order to respond to this requirement, The Council of Learned Societies in Education (CLSE) developed two standards used in NCATE institutional evaluation: (a) Standard II, candidates demonstrate skill in interpretation of the goals of education, and (b) Standard VIII, appropriately prepared faculty³. It seems appropriate then that the mission to enhance philosophy of education courses should not be underestimated. Morey (2001) compared the quality of teacher education programs in universities with programs offered by for-profit providers with a discernable effect noted in programs with a provision for the translation of theory into practice. Morey states:

A disturbing fact about [for-profit providers] is its reliance on practical experience and practitioners at the expense of theory. The ability of these practitioner-trained teachers to make judgments about effective educational practices could be seriously impaired by their lack of understanding of educational theory [and] probably will not produce the type of reflective practitioners that many believe are essential for the improvement of today’s schools (pp. 309-310).”

It appears, therefore, that the long-standing inclusion of foundations knowledge integrated into an undergraduate course is not a poorly thought out idea. Anyone who has tried his or her hand at carpentry knows that predicting the outcome of a project built with a poor foundation is not difficult. What is difficult is how to respond to two programmatic concerns, vibrant course delivery and professor preparation. Central to program delivery, Butin (2004) suggests, is the provision for “substantive inquiry, intellectual debate, and deep reflection” (p. 7). Unspoken in this second concern is a substantive discussion of high-impact strategies that support faculty delivery of this foundational content and an understanding of the insights students’ might derive as a result of learning about their philosophical approach to teaching.

II. Literature Review.

The suggestion that knowledge of philosophy of education can be extrapolated as practical knowledge, that is, it can serve to inform, frame, justify and clarify the work of practitioners, is well regarded by many (Arnstine, 2002; Leahy & Corcoran, 1996; Petress, 2003; Pryor, 2003a; Schonwetter, Sokal, Friesen, & Taylor, 2002; Soltis, 1986). For preservice teachers, however, these benefits sometimes appear oblique. To counter this difficulty, Petress

³ In 2002, NCATE included these two standards as part of the narrative in all standards; see for example, standard 3 on teacher dispositions.

(2003) urged us to provide students with “guideposts” or opportunities for students to draw on their developing philosophies when thinking about classroom instruction, a reflexive *weighing* of educational decisions. Similarly, Schonwetter, (2002) favored the notion that understanding one’s philosophical approach would foster evaluation of teaching decisions, particularly as teachers find themselves evaluated on external measures such as students’ standardized test scores. As professors seek to link philosophical understanding with classroom decision-making, the actual beliefs held by these preservice teachers can become marginalized to more pressing issues of learning how to teach (e.g., how to administer a spelling test, or grade essays) (Leahy & Corcoran, 1996). Providing students with a means to identify their beliefs is one strategy from which they might draw clarification when selecting teaching strategies.

A. Benefits of Philosophical Coherence.

The aim of reflecting on philosophical approaches is not to cement preservice teachers’ orientations into pre-figured, categories that could minimize their efforts to make sense of the complexities of classroom life. Rather, the aim is for preservice teachers to draw upon prompts such as a metaphoric image or an analytic survey to facilitate a self-examination process. The goal of this self-examination is the creation of a coherent philosophic framework, which makes possible the navigation of classroom complexities. A coherent philosophic framework is one that is internally consistent epistemologically, ontologically, and axiologically. Antonovsky (1987) uses the phrase “sense of coherence” to describe a belief system in which the world is viewed as comprehensible, manageable, and meaningful. Comprehensibility is the degree to which one perceives a predictable, ordered, and explicable world; manageability is the degree to which one believes that he or she has the personal and social resources to handle a demand. Complementary to these beliefs is meaningfulness in which one believes that demands are challenges worthy of investment and commitment.

The research on cohesion indicates that *sense of coherence* is a construct that significantly influences an individual’s adjustment to the complexities of daily experiences (Antonovsky, 1987; Korotokov, 1998; Lustig, Rosenthal, Strauser, & Haynes, 2000; Motzer & Stewart, 1996; Soderberg, Lundman, & Norberg, 1997; Szymanski, Hershensen, Enright, & Ettinger, 1996). A framework that lacks internal coherence is apt to result in what Emerson (1841) called a “foolish consistency,” that in the end leads to novice teachers either misapplying or misusing theory (Haggerson, 2002). At times this misapplication might not appear salient to the preservice teacher as their urgency to “get my lesson ready” is --understandably—prescient, but inadequate for resolving dissonance within practice. Thus for many preservice teachers, an incomplete understanding of assumptions underlying coherence can result in later professional frustration or stagnation (Kalimo & Vuori, 1990). *Growing* a preservice teachers’ sense of philosophic coherence might moderate these effects (Noddings, 1995; Szymanski, Hershensen, Enright, & Ettinger, 1996). Thus some discussion regarding programmatic pathways to growing these understandings might prove helpful to teacher educators.

B. Program Concerns.

The case that foundations courses can be well taught, and relevant to students and faculty remains a programmatic challenge (Bredo, 2002; Burbules, 2002; Edel, 1972). Steiner (2004) claims the preparation of teachers is intellectually barren and focused on indoctrination, which

has been refuted by Butin (2004). Foundations *topics* do appear in undergraduate education programs, however there are some concerns about the delivery of this content. The first concern is that philosophy of education is often presented as a limited section within an introductory course, thus fragmenting philosophy from the overall course topic (Appleton, 1979; Petress, 2003; Steiner, 2004). The second concern regards unevenness of content delivery when often it is taught by under-prepared faculty (Shea, Sola & Jones, 1987). Towers (1991) suggests that even among prepared faculty, teaching philosophy and history of education is less favored than coursework in current social issues. However, in *particular* programmatic constructs, when course activities facilitate practical decisions (deciding on a grading policy, a homework policy) Towers posits, understanding the foundations of education can become highly valued by both students and professors.

Some course activities are particularly well regarded by students. For example, Gross (1996) used a didactic questioning framework to foster the link between preservice teachers' reflections on the role of the teacher, course readings, and observations during students' field experiences. Wactler (1990) found that student teachers' journal reflections on the role of the teacher were efficacious to understanding personal teaching beliefs. Rainer & Guyton (1999) noted that learning about their philosophical approaches provided preservice teachers with a basis for discerning which of their mentors' practices they might want to adopt in their own teaching. Lastly, Fen (1967) suggested that acquiring a personal philosophy of education enables preservice teachers to answer questions about *how* they substantiate their practice, particularly when conferencing with a classroom mentor teacher.

C. How can teacher educators help pre-service teachers understand philosophy?

Teacher educators face several challenges as they attempt to support students understanding of their philosophical approach to teaching. First, although the benefits of understanding one's approach to education is well described, some literature on the legitimacy of philosophy of education presents an unflattering picture of its place and possibility for survival in teacher education (Bredo, 2002; Burbules, 2002; Carbone, 1991). In part, this survival is challenged in the present educational climate by an emerging predominance of competency-based outcomes (CBO); there are some indications that CBO might serve to marginalize efforts to portray the effectiveness of understanding one's educational philosophy (Guzenhouer, 2003). Second, the construct of traditional approaches to teaching philosophy might also have exacerbated the perceived lack of importance of learning about philosophy. For example, in most educational foundations textbooks, the traditional approach is didactic, using explicit content delivered in a linear-lecture model (Butin, 2004). This approach typically begins by defining the term "philosophy" and related explanatory terms such as "realism," "idealism" and others. Having provided this scaffold, the instructor delves into an exposition of the various systems of educational philosophy, beliefs about the purpose of education, curriculum and role of teachers and students. Before moving on, the instructor, mindful of the need to have students construct their own philosophies of education, offers a concluding exercise to that effect.

Critics therefore can easily point to the dissonance between philosophers' and educational practitioners' perspectives about the application of philosophy of education in finding workable solutions to educational issues. In this regard, philosophy of education is often deemed too abstract to provide guidance to the everyday concerns of practitioners (Carbone, 1991). In the everyday realities of classroom life teachers are not always guided by *episteme* —a

theoretically created procedural of teaching. Invariably, teachers' reactions are driven by what Korthagen and Kessels (1999) termed *phronesis*, that is, situation-specific knowledge of teaching created by the teacher. Programmatic concerns would do well to consider processes that help preservice teachers combine an *episteme-phronesis* gestalt to good advantage during their preservice preparation. To facilitate this gestalt to teaching educational philosophy, teacher educators increasingly turn to more reflective approaches.

Reflective Approaches. Reflective approaches provide experiences that elicit introspection on the assumptions and implications of philosophies of education (Preskill, 1979). A common method of promoting reflection is through the use of educational surveys, such as the *Witcher-Travers Survey of Educational Beliefs* (1999), which assesses tendencies toward transmissive or progressive beliefs. This instrument is composed of stem items related to educational beliefs ("Tests are a good measure of student knowledge") each of which is rated on a five-point Likert-type scale and scored for two oppositional philosophical approaches—behaviorism and progressivism. Another instrument, and the one used in this present study, the *Philosophy of Education Scale (POES)* (Pryor, 2004b) proffers cross-classification of five approaches to teaching (executive, humanist, subject specialist, citizen, and explorer) with seven dimensions of instruction such as classroom environment, lesson plans, or classroom management. Other reflective approaches involve the development of metaphors of teaching or reflection based on field experience observations, or journal writing (Wactler, 1990). According to Amobi (2003), "...writing a metaphor of teaching requires tapping into one's personal experiences to inform one's teaching" (p. 28). Thus, the main focus of employing reflective strategies in teaching educational philosophy is to expand preservice teachers' self-understanding at a time when they are developing value judgments about teaching decisions.

Professors' Expectations. Belief in reflective approaches are the work of the three professors involved in this present study; however each utilizes different strategies to achieve reflexivity among the preservice teachers in their classes. Below, we offer first person descriptions of our goals for (a) students' understanding of the purpose of education, (b) the deficit of current affordances used in our courses (i.e. philosophy statements, metaphor, autobiography), and (c) expectations of the use of the *Philosophy of Education Scale* in each of our courses. These offerings are reflections of authors A (Pryor), B (Sloan) and C (Amobi). Although we used reflection strategies in our courses, our expectations for this reflection differed. Our common expectations for our students was that reflection on philosophic approach would enable a student to (a) become more philosophically coherent in selecting teaching strategies, (b) make sense of coherence in their approach, and (c) use philosophical approach to disaggregate school controversy. At the end of the results section, we reflect on some changes we plan to use in our courses.

Professor A: My purpose in using the POES was to provide students with a strategy to evoke a personal reservoir of meaning, or at least an approximation of meaning of beliefs about teaching (Wactler, 1990). Not unlike the experience of Professor B, I found my preservice teachers either lacking or hesitant in their ability to draw from their autobiographical memories of school, or from case studies provided in initial coursework when they attempted to explain their educational beliefs. For example, when asked to explain the role of the teacher, the prompt questions I used were, "Think about the stories you remember about teachers and school," and "When you consider the role of the teacher, what comes to mind?" In response, one student wrote: "My role is to help each student become the best person they can be." What appeared missing from this student's beginning explanation was a deep understanding of how her

perception of the role of the teacher will be acted on; that is, given her belief, what is her target teaching action and how consonant is this action with this her beliefs about teaching? The prompts (indicators on the POES described below) appeared to me to function as markers (events in *currere*, (Pinar, 1975) much as Ausubel's (1963) advanced organizer functions as markers of experiences remembered and useful in the projection of expectations and hopes. I hoped the POES prompts would unveil coherence-non-coherence of beliefs en route to a students' next ontological step about selecting teaching practices. My thinking was that the POES could provide students with a strategy for disaggregation of their beliefs about schooling and enhance their understandings of the beliefs underlying the decisions they would make about classroom practice.

Professor B. Although autobiography has been a rich source of inquiry and theorizing in the curriculum field and teacher education since the 1970s when Pinar (1975) first purposed *currere*, I have frequently been frustrated in my attempts to utilize autobiographic techniques in my teacher education courses. Although *currere* has been described as both a method and theory of curriculum (Pinar & Grumet, 1976), a significant number of pre-service teachers in my courses struggle in their attempts to produce self-focused autobiographical narratives that further their own philosophic understandings of curriculum and pedagogy. Worse, I sense that some pre-service teachers simply perform autobiography to prove to their professor they have "learned" something. Thus, I turned to the use of the POES as yet another reflective strategy, admittedly a more structured strategy that both promotes self-understandings and helps pre-service teachers develop a more coherent philosophic understanding of their educational decisions. In this investigation, I hoped to learn how the use of the POES might help me better understand pre-service teachers' perspectives on philosophic approaches and develop additional strategies to foster self-understanding and philosophic coherence.

Professor C. I had hoped to use the POES to provoke students to make sense of experiences that structures their emergent philosophies of education. I hoped the instrument would become a triggering event for students to reflect on past and present knowledge and experiences—and spur their philosophic classifications (Dewey, 1933; Pryor, 2003a). I compared the *POES* to *The Witcher-Travers* (1999) philosophy scale, finding these complementary to each other on three points: (1) the Witcher-Travers provides three broad classifications, while the POES provides five philosophic themes; (2) the Witcher-Travers incorporates questions that subsume *indistinct* commonplaces of teaching, while the POES includes prompts that are derived from *distinct* commonplaces of teaching and learning (i.e., classroom environment, lesson plans, classroom management knowledge/instruction); and (3) the Online Witcher-Travers provides immediate, detailed feedback to survey-takers, while the POES results are calculated and aggregated by participants, and/or external researchers.

I respond in this article to my use of the POES and its efficacy for providing a contextual environment for class discussions. Given our interest in understanding the philosophical beliefs of our students this study investigated philosophical coherence-non-coherence among preservice teachers. As an outcome of this investigation, we will present course strategies that might enhance preservice programs.

III. Methodology.

A. Participants.

The 42 students in Instructor A and B's courses were enrolled in a Research I university. Instructor A's course was composed of 27 first semester seniors enrolled in a field-based course in *Elementary Methods of Teaching Social Studies*; Instructor B's course was composed of 15 second semester juniors enrolled in *Curriculum Development and Instructional Strategies in Early Childhood Education*. Instructor C's students (N=14) were second semester secondary education juniors and seniors enrolled in *Critical Issues in Secondary Education* at a branch campus of a Research I university in another state. All three professors were trained in philosophy of education in their doctoral programs.

B. Course Procedures.

Professor A. In a program entitled *Citizen Teacher* (Pryor, 2003b; 2004a), students discussed theories related to three themes of democracy, liberty/freedom, justice/fairness/ and equality/equal opportunity using one text on democratic practice and a second on philosophy of education. The social studies methods course was linked to a 20-hour per week field- experience in which preservice teachers observed and participated in limited entry-level teaching. In addition to discussions related to social studies content, the course experience included reflection on: (a) educational biography, (b) observations of mentors' practice, and (c) observation forms centered on identifying democratic practices. The capstone activity included completion of the POES and development and analysis of a philosophy of education statement.

Professor B. This course examined the curriculum and pedagogies used in early childhood education, often of opposing viewpoints, included: classroom debates, viewing of films, and presentations by community-based educators. Students were encouraged to think critically about the promises and limitations of various models of curriculum and pedagogy and afforded extended opportunities to mine their previous experiences through reflective essays. Lastly, students were asked to develop, over the length of the semester, metaphoric images of the classroom and their vision of teaching practices (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988). These metaphors were considered "figurative tropes" (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 84) that helped preservice teachers better access their own philosophic framework as well as epistemological, ontological, and axiological assumptions about curriculum and pedagogy. Such imagery unveiled personal and situated knowledge that might otherwise remain unrevealed, or, as in a failed or mixed metaphor, revelations of levels of confusion or ignorance not otherwise seen (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996).

Professor C. This course examined past and current controversies regarding public schooling focusing on secondary education. Students were encouraged to develop their own viewpoints about controversial issues. It was hoped that exploring these viewpoints through the lens of philosophic background knowledge would enhance students' experience and abilities to analyze the underpinnings of ideas espoused by "respected voices" in education whose writings spanned the readings for the course. Students completed the *Witcher-Travers Survey* and the POES and reacted to the outcome of classifications, after which the class interpreted the philosophical tendencies of major characters in popular high school movies such as *To Sir, With Love*, *Dead Poet's Society*, *Dangerous Minds*, or *Mr. Holland's Opus*. Following this activity,

students wrote metaphors of teaching, which were then compared to their perceptions of a teaching metaphor in their chosen ‘movie’ teacher. The purpose of combining traditional and reflective approaches in teaching was to encourage the propensity that “philosophy of education is not just the way we think, but also the way we do” (Amobi, 2003, p. 27), and to provide students a framework for analyzing the philosophical assumptions that previously stranded the controversial issues brought forth in the course.

C. Instrument.

Philosophical Orientations. Five categories of philosophical orientations or beliefs central to the POES have been described in the literature as philosophical teaching *approaches* (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004; Oliva, 2005; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2000; Tanner & Tanner, 2000). The five approaches used in the POES are: (a) executive (behaviorism, a production model), (b) humanist (progressivism, student centered), (c) subject specialist (perennialism, content focused) (Tanner & Tanner, 2000), (d) explorer (deconstructivism, revealing social myths, Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2000), and (e) citizen teacher (essentialism, core civic values, Ravitch & Thernstrom, 1992). Additional description of these approaches is found in Appendix A (see also Pryor, 2004b).

Dimensions. The Philosophy of Education Scale (POES, see Appendix B) is composed of seven dimensions of teaching, derived from the core standards of the *Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Council* (INTASC) (1992), and the *National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education* (NCATE) Standard One (2000 revision) of effective teaching: classroom environment, lesson plans, classroom management, activities, grading/evaluation, knowledge, and teacher’s role. The seven dimensions of the POES are triangulated across five philosophical teaching approaches described in the literature. In all, the POES is comprised of 105 indicators, each independently rated, and 35 philosophical approach items, each ranked. Studies of the 105-item POES investigating preservice teachers (Pryor, 2003b; Pryor & Eskirmireh, 2004), report reliability ranging from .61 to .68, considered well above the benchmark range of 0.50 to 0.60 set by Nunnally (1967) for an instrument intended as an analytic tool.⁴ Reliability in this present study is $r = .71$.

D. Data Analysis.

Philosophical Classification. Each philosophical approach (e.g. executive) calculation was determined by classifying an individual into an approach type—termed an *identifier*—if their obtained score reached one half of one standard deviation above the mean score of the total sample score; the total score possible is 105. For example, if the average score for this sample of

⁴ Within each dimension (e.g., lesson plans), five cells represent each approach; each cell is composed of three indicators representing a particular approach. Each *indicator* is independently rated using a five point evaluative scale, after which the cell is compared across the five approaches of a dimension and each approach is ranked using the five-point scale. The summated ranked scores derive an overall philosophical orientation score. These ranked scores also portray the contribution of each dimension to overall philosophical approach. Reliability studies of the POES were developed by (a) determining indicator-cell coefficients (Cronbach’s alpha), (b) determining coefficients for each of the seven dimensions and five corresponding philosophical approaches, and (c) averaging the mean coefficients of either the five approaches or the seven dimensions, leading to the same result. In this present study, data were collected by each professor from participants at the middle of the semester as part of their coursework, and results were discussed in class; small sample size prevented replication of reliability.

students for the executive approach is 80 (SD=10), then a score of at least 85 will result in an executive categorization. An individual can be classified into more than one approach category or not classified into any one particular category. The sum of the number of participants in each category, then, will not total the sample n. This procedure was selected to respond to the analytic nature of the instrument in which participants draw on more than one philosophical approach when evaluating classroom practice (Wactler, 1990).

Coherence Matrix and Coherence Pairs Analysis. A correlational matrix was developed to determine the degree of coherence in each philosophical approach. This matrix was developed by correlating the seven dimensions of teaching on the POES with each of the five philosophical approaches. Further analysis was conducted to disaggregate the coherence matrix data to determine the high and low correlations pairs for each philosophical approach (e.g., coherence of lesson plans and classroom management in the executive philosophy). Correlational pairs of at least $r=.50$ were considered highly correlated. In order to provide information to enhance development of instructional course construct, the data pairs reported below regard only those pairs in which high correlation exists; the remainder of the correlational pairs were considered low and not reported here.

IV. Results.

A. Do preservice teachers hold a coherent philosophical approach to teaching?

As portrayed in Table One, students were more consistent in what they believe *they are not* (philosophically) than what they believe *they are*. This is true among all the philosophical approaches except the executive approach, in which students who are primarily categorized as “executive” consistently indicate low coherence to all of the approaches. The average correlations describing the level of coherence for those who are identified as belonging to a particular approach are: executive ($r=0.19$, $SD=0.27$), humanist, ($r=-0.01$, $SD=0.21$), subject specialist ($r=0.23$, $SD=0.28$), explorer, ($r=0.14$, $SD=0.18$), and citizen teacher ($r=0.06$, $SD=0.25$). Students were consistent about which philosophical approach they *were not*. For example, students who were classified as humanists were not only the least aligned to their own overall philosophical orientation (-0.01), they were also most consistent in describing themselves as *not executive* ($r=0.63$, $SD=0.15$), *not subject specialists* ($r=0.49$, $SD=0.13$), *not explorers* ($r=0.48$, $SD=0.16$), and *somewhat not citizen teachers* ($r=0.32$, $SD=0.19$).

Table 1. Correlations among Philosophical Identifiers by Approach Category.

	<i>Executive</i>		<i>Humanist</i>		<i>Subject Specialist</i>		<i>Explorer</i>		<i>Citizen Teacher</i>	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
<i>Classified as Executive</i>	.19	.27	.16	.19	.26	.24	.31	.21	.14	.23
<i>Classified as Humanist</i>	.63	.15	-.01	.21	.49	.13	.48	.16	.32	.19
<i>Classified as Subject Specialist</i>	.27	.25	.42	.27	.23	.28	.55	.19	.49	.18
<i>Classified as Explorer</i>	.67	.13	.29	.23	.38	.18	.14	.18	.25	.25
<i>Classified as Citizen Teacher</i>	.67	.14	.11	.24	.30	.19	.28	.21	.06	.25

The seven dimensions of teaching on the POES provide contextualization of the five philosophical approaches that frame initial understandings of teaching decisions. Of these, four relate to pedagogy (classroom environment [CE], management [CM], lesson plans [LP], and activities [A]), one to domain area (knowledge [K]), and two are related to school policy (grading [G] and the role of the teacher [TR]). As an example of information that can be learned from the disaggregation of students' teaching beliefs across these seven dimensions, we provide in Table 2 one type of disaggregation of the POES using the Executive approach as an example. In order to more fully understand the [dimensional] source of these Executive identifiers' coherence-non-coherence, we portray in Table 2, high correlational pairs indicating the Executive identifier coherence to the approach, and high correlational pairs indicating their non-coherence to the approach.

The data in Table 2 was developed as we asked the following question: Do student scores indicate an internally consistent approach as we look across the seven teaching dimensions? We learned that some non-coherence to an approach can be identified, and which teaching dimension pairs were related to this non-coherence. In this study, executive identifiers are coherent in their approach on the dimension pairs of lesson planning, classroom management, and classroom activities. These three areas were important to the Executive identifier—students valued (and might likely use) the executive approach in these three dimensions of teaching. In a classroom activity about the findings of the POES, a student in Professor A's course explained why she might use the executive approach in classroom management:

My mentor teacher knows the students in her classroom very well. She knows how to respond to students when they are off task and she understands the reasons behind their actions. I am learning to understand the students, but I don't want the entire class to "fall apart" when I teach my first few lessons. I want things to go smoothly, so I give them rules

However, when these Executive identifiers think about the "knowledge" (content or domain area knowledge) dimension, they are not coherent in their philosophical approach. Their pair ratings regarding the nature of knowledge were higher in approaches other than the Executive. Thus, even as Executive identifiers, these preservice teachers held non-Executive beliefs about the construct of knowledge. As one student pondered her goals as a teacher she noticed how strongly she believed in the value of students' opportunity to experience the breadth and wide perspective of knowledge. She explained:

Here I want students to become critical thinkers. To do this, I will plan in-depth content units, such as a very broad unit on Texas history, or a really good unit about money in my math lesson. I want them to be critical consumers, to know what a society has to offer them. If they only memorize facts, they lose out on thinking about possibilities—they miss reflection on content (Professor A).

Through discussions and reflections, we also noticed how a teaching dimension such as "knowledge" might add or detract from coherence within a particular approach. For example, finding that those classified as Executives were not influenced by the structure or content of domain area content knowledge (i.e., "I believe history or mathematics information should be taught only in a linear-behaviorist approach—that is teach the facts) when making classroom

decisions gave us some insight into these students' beliefs about how they might frame a lesson plan, or which activities they might select to use in the classroom. We noticed however, that although the knowledge dimension does not predict coherence for executive identifiers, we now have information that allows us to pay attention to the attributes of knowledge that *does* motivate the executive identifier. In this case, the executive identifiers' high coherence pairs regarding their beliefs about the construct of knowledge was found *not* in the executive approach, rather in the humanist, subject specialist, and explorer approaches, and these three approaches were then paired to several other dimensions of teaching ("I'm an executive overall, however, I am a humanist in my beliefs about the relationship between knowledge and classroom management, $r = .52$).

It is important to note that these scores portray a consonance-dissonance correlation at an identified point *in time* in students' professional development. The scores also enhance professors' understanding about what students believe about teaching and where gaps in their teaching knowledge might exist. When viewed by professors of preservice courses the sample correlations among dimensions can provide information that suggests revisions in course strategies. For professors teaching undergraduate courses, using strategies such as *currere* in which a students learn to project possibilities (Pinar, 1975)— of a teaching approach- provides students with an opportunity to develop a "conceptual fund" upon which they might draw their future decisions about approaches to teaching (Wactler, 1990).

Professor A asked her students to project/reflect on which teaching strategies comes to mind when addressing the issue of consonance-dissonance within a practice—such as grading policies:

I always use the dimension of grading as a probe about student beliefs. I ask if they believe their professors grade fairly and if so, how would these same policies be used in K-12 settings. After all, they see us grade their work, they have had K-12 teachers grading their work over the years, yet we expect these preservice teachers will develop a broad repertoire about approaches to teaching that will lead them to decisions based on a typically undiscussed rationale--their philosophy of education.

Few students link their philosophy statements to the choices they think they might make in classroom practice. They tell me that philosophy is abstract—like a made up story about teaching. They do not see how philosophy is useful in the field experience where they have to demonstrate what they know about teaching. In other words, pedagogical decisions, such as grading is not seen as a philosophical act (Professor A).

Mindful of the suggestion of Preskill (1979) to seek opportunities to discover how philosophy and practical activities might align, another common dimension of teaching—grading—is used as a discussion topic here. In this particular study, only the dimension of *Grading/evaluation* was highly aligned with the other six dimensions (in each of the five approaches). This finding indicates that the dimension of grading more than any other dimension best represents the direction of an individual's philosophical orientation. Given the nature of grading, an evaluative process resulting in self-categorization (good student-bad student, Kohn, 1986), it is not

surprising that novice teachers, still in the evaluative environment of a university, can easily target coherence within their own approach using the grading referent.

B. Which dimensional pairs contribute most to coherence or non-coherence within each approach?

As seen in Table 1, high pair correlations differed between philosophical approach identifiers (e.g., “The executive approach is *most like* me) and non-identifiers (“The executive approach is *not like* me.”) These identifier-non-identifiers were also different when their philosophical approach ratings were triangulated using the seven POES dimensions of teaching (see, for example, Executive approach correlations such as LP correlated with CM in Table 2). We continue our use of the Executive approach as an example in the discussion and Table 2 below in order to highlight correlational pair results of approach identifiers and non-identifiers.

Preservice teachers who were categorized as “executives” were highly consistent in their ratings of two paired correlations, Lesson Planning and Classroom Management and Classroom Activities and Classroom Management. Among *non-identifiers*, numerous dimension pair correlations were found above the .50 level. This finding corroborates the notion that pre-service teachers appear to know what they *are not*, rather than what *they are*. One example of *non-identifier* high pair correlation concerns the dimension of grading, which is common among approaches of highly correlated pairs. For example, the correlation of CA and GR is $r = .55$ in the citizen teacher approach, indicating that citizen teachers strongly believe that they are *not executive* when they consider the relationship between CA and GR.

Table 2. High Correlational Pairs on the POES Using an Executive Identifier Example.

Executive Ratings of Executive Approach

LP & CM (.68)

CA & CM (.62)

Executive Ratings of Humanist Approach

KN & CM (.52)

Executive Ratings of Subject Specialist Approach

LP & KN (.64)

KN & GR (.64)

CM & GR (.54)

LP & GR (.52)

Executive Ratings of Explorer Approach

CM & KN (.71)

CM & GR (.58)

LP & KN (.55)

CA & TR (.53)

Executive Ratings of Citizen Teacher Approach

CA & GR (.55)

Note. CE represents the dimension of classroom environment, LP represents lesson planning, CM represents for classroom management, CA represents classroom activities, GR represents grading, KN represents knowledge, and TR represents teacher’s role.

Interviews with our students provided us with feedback about how the POES helped with the process of self-identification of philosophical approach. One of Professor C's students told her:

The *POES* classified me as a Humanist. The results were very similar to the *Witcher-Travers* survey results. A pro [positive attribute] for the [POES] Scale was the simple and clear way to categorize yourself. There were no awkward sentences to un-jumble. It was just picking what sounded more like you.

One of Professor B's students told him:

Taking the [POES] survey was particularly meaningful to me because I was able to see myself more clearly, or the teacher I DON'T want to become. Often times, while I am working with my students [in my field placement], I find myself wanting to control the situation or guide them to the right answer. Too often I will underestimate their intelligence or understanding of the situation and just sort of "give" them the answer for fear that they will become frustrated or lack the confidence to produce the right answer. In my head, I know that this is NOT the approach that I want to take, but something inside of me just wants to "baby" my students.

In addition to seeking clarity in the format of scales or surveys, students also wanted instruments to help them make sense of their philosophic approach. Wactler, (1990) found that in addition to word or phrase prompts, students wanted to discuss their approach with their professor – somehow checking to see if their approach is coherent in light of school concerns. As one student explained to her professor:

The [POES] seemed to classify me correctly as well. I do feel that the teacher's role is more than that of a facilitator, even though I am math [secondary]. The [POES] was easier to complete than the *Witcher-Travers*. However, I felt that the items were just scratching at the surface instead of asking directly about the issues (student in course, Professor C).

Another preservice teacher responded to Professor B:

[Our discussion of the POES] showed me my "executive" tendencies. For example, as a teacher I hope to plan lessons and activities a year in advance, but I also know that I have to take into account problems and situations that might evolve. My humanist tendencies, however, remind me take into account that I do not yet know the children I will have for that school year. Overall, I've come to realize that it's okay to be have different tendencies so long as I am flexible and responsive to children in my class.

Finally, we noted that students turned to their professor for guidance and discussion about the breadth of philosophical approaches that they might hold (i.e. Do I approach teaching solely using one approach? Should I only have one approach?). Here, these students tell us, it is helpful

for professors to contextualize school settings, so students can recognize how they might change approaches during their field experiences. A third student in Professor C's course explained:

A con [negative] for both surveys is, from a statistical point of view, how accurate can they be? Overall, I felt that both surveys were very accurate *at this time* [emphasis added] in my evaluation. I am eclectic and [likely think of myself as] a teacher as an Executive

To access the complete analysis of correlational data pair information see Pryor¹.

C. Which attributes of philosophical approaches might explain coherence or non-coherence?

Personal beliefs about the goal of education frame teachers' stated lesson objectives (Wactler, 1990) and these beliefs provide insights about how the approach might be applied in the classroom. As preservice teachers become experienced in describing their ideas about the goal of education, a tool such as the POES can be helpful in the developing the remaining construct of their approach to teaching. Questions such as "under what teaching conditions would you want to use a particular approach?" are a helpful prompt to use. The POES offers students information beyond that of self-identification as it provides an opportunity to disaggregate which of the seven dimensions contribute to philosophical coherence. For example, teaching efficiently (using a quickly paced approach with linear and easily observed procedures) is the purpose of the executive approach; it would follow therefore that consistent, internally harmonious curriculum decisions would be developed by a teacher selecting this approach (Ediger, 2003). Table 2 above portrays these results.

However, for other approaches, particularly those composed of attributes less objectively observed, complex, or non-unilaterally defined, approach coherence is often less apparent to the novice teacher (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004). The explorer approach is one example of complexity as this approach is centered on beliefs that abhor externally imposed objectives. In less objectively observed approaches, identifiers select teaching objectives that demythologize the benefits of the changing nature of knowledge (Haggerson, 2002). Kincheloe (1999) suggests that a democratic (citizen teacher) approach is strengthened by the discourse of chaos, and personal interpretation of objectives. From the perspective of the humanist approach, objectives should be unbounded without formulae (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004). Similarly, in this present study, the subject-specialist approach was prescient in non-coherence, as the construct of this approach rarely includes use linear procedures, particularly on the dimension of grading (see Pryor for full correlational data).

Students participating in this study noted that a two-dimensional survey such as the POES provides for convergence in their thinking about their teaching approach. This convergence within philosophical approach supports students as they begin to try out their teaching practice, in part because they have yet to establish a currere or experiential base in which their philosophical rationale resides (Wactler, 1990). They need to practice their beliefs—try out what works, and seek convergence in what appears to them as "best practice" (Rainer & Guyton, 1999). Dewey (1933) supported the need for application—trying out beliefs—stating, "the formation of purposes [philosophical approach] and the organization of means [practices] to execute them are the work of intelligence" (p.72). Unlike the Witcher-Travis survey in which a student must judge a stem item in a Likert-type question, the cells in the POES are composed of

three indicators of a dimension, and the dimension is composed of five approaches. The rating of three indicators within a cell function in a less dichotomous manner than a stem item/Likert rating format (Huck, 2000). The three-indicator/cell format allows the indicators to converge into a cell score for the item, as well as to reveal the contribution of each independent indicator to a cell with stand-alone scores per indicator (see Appendix B).

One student explained how this type of disaggregation helped them make sense of their teaching approach:

The [POES] gives you more classifications. You weren't bunched together [one stem item linked to a single score]. In addition, you had more control of the survey. You were able to rate yourself, and you knew where the classifications came from. I was able to see all of my scores in each row to see which areas are strongest in me. It gave me more options to consider. (student in course, Professor C).

D. Are preservice teachers attracted to the objective, linear nature of an approach?

Preservice teachers find objective, linear teaching procedures efficacious (e.g., Wactler, 1990), particularly when encouraged by mentors during the field-experience (Pryor & Kuhn, 2004). It also might be natural for preservice teachers to value the linear nature of an approach which they believe will allow for a strong level of classroom control and demonstration of teaching competence (Enz, Freeman, & Wallin, 1996; Veenman, 1984). In fact, Wilkins-Canter (1996) reported that the most requested information preservice teachers hoped to receive from mentors are strategies for "discipline." However, students do indicate that they are eager to learn how to implement "hands on inquiry" and "exploratory projects," the capstone activities of a humanist approach to teaching (Guyton, Rainer, & Wright, 1997). For students to develop a belief in the importance of a non-linear philosophical approach to teaching, they must also believe that they are capable of using a classroom management plan in which they will not struggle with the use of open-ended inquiry approaches to teaching.

E. Implications for teacher education.

The professor-researchers in this study identified the following three enhancement areas they planned to add to their courses. These enhancements reflected individual purposes, (a) Professor A, unveiling philosophical assumptions of practice (Feinberg, 2004); (b) Professor B, developmentally appropriate practice (DAP, Bredenkamp, 1997 and others) and (c) Professor C, ontological synthesis (Bredo, 2002). To focus attention on the personal nature of the integration of these enhancements rather than suggest replication, these enhancements are discussed below in first person narratives.

Professor A. I focused my first class session on an introduction of the assumptions of each philosophical approach on the POES, followed by a session in which students discussed how each of these assumptions might be linked to beliefs about the role of the teacher and sample classroom activities. I hoped students would notice that the POES indicators represented personal meanings, rather than feel compelled to use the indicator/prompt as the *only* frame for their response. However, at this early point in the course students had little field experience from

which to frame their POES ratings and discussion, and many simply replicated the language used in the prompts.

I realized I needed strategies to foster students' unveiling/demythologizing of beliefs, and I identified the following course goals and used three teaching strategies to achieve these :

Goal 1. Enhance Student Engagement

Students will develop a rationale to foster their engagement of particular classroom practices (Wactler, 1990).

Teaching Strategy: Lengthen the autobiography section in philosophy statement.

Goal 2. Understand Assumptions

Students will be able to describe philosophical assumptions underlying goals of education (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004).

Teaching Strategy: Add philosophical content focus during classroom reflection discussion on students' observations in the schools .

Goal 3. Describe Belief Coherence-dissonance

Students will describe the coherence-dissonance of their beliefs (Korotokov, 1998).

Teaching Strategy: Class discussion using POES results with students identifying where coherence-dissonance exists in their teaching observation reflections using personal rationale.

By the end of the course, evidence of students' understanding of their beliefs about teaching began to emerge in their responses during course discussions (e.g., "Now that I understand my mentor teacher's approach, I think my mentor teacher should...") and some (but not all) responses *grew* into insightful analysis statements (e.g., "Lesson plans that are objective [executive] focused are not always considerate of students' needs. If I were the real teacher, I would change that part of the lesson plan").

Professor B. Drawing heavily on the guidelines for developmentally appropriate practices (DAP) as defined by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997), the content of my early childhood courses is decidedly constructivist. Through such an orientation, I emphasize the importance of instructional approaches that foster open-ended, child-determined experiences and guided discovery rather than teacher-determined experiences and teacher lecture. Thus, I was surprised to find that most of the students in my course more closely aligned themselves with an executive approach. Throughout the semester, I explicitly challenged tenets more closely associated with the executive approach, in particular the teacher-as-leader role and the limitation of direct instructional approaches in the classroom.

These findings suggested to me that I had not done an adequate enough job of shaking free these preservice teachers from traditional (what I often call "default") modes of teaching whereby the institutional circumstances and traditions of school tend to favor teacher directed, even teacher dominated, approaches. More importantly, however, the findings of the POES demonstrated that I needed to offer the preservice teachers in my class more explicit experiences with instructional approaches in which teachers serve as facilitators of learning rather than directors, even dictators, and that I needed to provide the pre-service teachers with more structured experiences in how to both manage and assess open-ended experiences through which children present multiple interpretations of their understandings. Most of all, the findings of the POES demonstrated to me that it is not enough to talk about constructivist approaches to teaching and learning, but to demonstrate and operationalize such approaches (Burlubes, 2002). To this end, I have begun to use more video vignettes of classroom teachers as a means to not

only understand what a teacher is doing, but also speculate about possible alternatives that would foster child-directed inquiry and discovery.

Professor C. The differences in survey-question construction and procedures notwithstanding used together, both instruments provoked students' reflectivity on their educational beliefs along two important lines. First, students had the opportunity to make meaning on their philosophical orientation separately on each instrument. Second, they had the opportunity to commingle these isolated reflection-responses into an interpretive analysis by responding to both questionnaires. The reflective cogitations that the two instruments sparked in my students' class discussions appear to me to corroborate Dewey's pronouncement that "the formation of purposes [educational philosophy] and the organization of means to execute them are the work of intelligence" (Amobi, 2003, p. 77).⁵

V. Conclusion.

This study investigated three instructors' course methods developed to help pre-service teachers better understand their philosophic foundations of education. The POES used in this study provided coherence information about preservice students approaches to teaching. Professors and student comments suggested that more importance should be placed on developing course strategies that enhance opportunity for preservice teachers to portray emerging beliefs about their early experiences in schools. The data in this study indicated how a tool, such as the POES can be used to unveil non-linear relationships between seven content-pedagogical dimensions of teaching and philosophical teaching approaches. For example, even for those who held strong beliefs in which linearity is common—such as executive (behaviorist) beliefs—coherence is demonstrated contextually (e.g. "I'm ok with it [the Executive approach] in developing activities for the kids, but not in classroom management. Some of these kids really need the teacher to help them."). We learned from both our course discussions, and in our administration of the POES that our preservice students were more likely to describe what they *were not* ("I am *not* an Executive when I grade students") than what they *were* ("I'm *not* always an Executive").

The three professors in this study considered how these results might impact their teaching goals, and suggested three program areas and related activities for possible use in similar courses. The purpose of developing these philosophy *to* practice translations during actual coursework time and before the summative evaluations period occurring in the more intense field experience semester (semester two-student teaching) was twofold: (1) to mediate the potential of "washing out" of the use of theoretical rationale in teaching decisions (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981), and (2) to create a format for long term reflection on practice (Wactler, 1990). However, this study was limited by the following factors: (a) participants represented two research universities in two separate states, (b) preservice teachers were enrolled in different program levels (elementary or secondary), (c) field experience either differed, or was not a part of the course, and (d) structured and non-structured texts were not used in a similar manner.

Several concerns remain regarding how course construct might effectively engage students' knowledge about their beliefs about teaching. In part, little is known about the circumstances that contribute to students' engagement in philosophical discussion—especially as

⁵ However, Huck (2000) suggests that item response on similar topics or multiple instructions should not be interpreted as a main effect. Huck writes that tests (such as a three-way ANOVA) of these effects could be used.

autobiographical-personal beliefs might be consonant or dissonant with the beliefs of others (classmates, mentor teachers, professor). Because of the importance of philosophical beliefs to the decisions teachers make about their teaching, additional research is needed to determine how students' previously held or current beliefs are enhanced, disengaged, or impeded by important others (their mentor teacher, other students, teachers they know), particularly as they progress in their preparation program.

Interaction among faculty outside the domain area of teacher education would enhance this discussion. For example, Hager, Pryor and Bryant (2004), compared approaches to designing a field experience (called an *internship*) across four domain areas: political science, health science, teacher education and construction science education. Although Hager described the programmatic organization of internships in several domains, there was no discussion about the goals students might hold for themselves, their beliefs about how to best implement theories of practice learned in the university program, or their understandings of the implications of use of particular practices.

For example, health sciences faculty might want to evaluate the course activities they use to enhance student belief in holistic diet, or exercise programs when these students are engaged in a parallel experience in a field-based internship. Will their students hold beliefs similar to their professors? Are students' beliefs coherent with their field mentor? As faculties in teacher education (and other applied programs) review the scope and sequence of courses provided in their preparation programs, alternative program design formats such as seminars and blocked sections within courses (Appleton, 1979; Pryor, 2003a) should be evaluated so that implications might be shared among university domains. To advance this discussion, we propose two resources useful for continuing discussions about our course practices: (a) a newly developed URL containing the online version of the POES, (http://texascbt.tamu.edu/survey/Philosophy_of_Education/scale.htm), which includes immediate participant feedback on scoring and SPSS data analysis, and (b) use of interactive media formats to augment development perspectives. These suggestions might lead to similar scale development and investigations helpful in other domain areas. Importantly, scales and other reflective methods might reveal that students' non-coherence portrays an unintended outcome—student independence from the normative saliency of promoted philosophical orientation.

References

Amobi, Funmi (2003). "Reflections on the Transformation in a Teacher Educator's Teaching of Educational Philosophy." *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 30(3) 23-32.

Antonovsky, Aaron. (1987). *Unraveling the Mystery of Health*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Appleton, Nicholas.A. (1979). "A Modular Approach to Foundations." *Journal of Teacher Education*, 25(3) 249-253.

Arnstine, Donald G. (2002). "Why *should* philosophers and educators speak to each other ? There are more serious problems to face and more important jobs to be done." *Educational Theory*, 52(3) 303-313.

Ausubel, David. (1963). *The Psychology of Meaningful Verbal Learning*. New York: Green and Straton.

Berliner, David. C. (1986). "In Pursuit of the Expert Pedagogue." *Educational Researcher*, 15(7) 5-13.

Bredenkamp, Sue, and Copple, Carol. (Eds.). (1997). *Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs* (Rev. Ed.). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Bredo, Eric. (2002). "How can Philosophy of Education be Both Viable and Good?" *Educational Theory*, 52(3) 263-271.

Burbules, Nicholas C.. (2002). "The dilemma of philosophy of education: Relevance or critique." *Educational Theory*, 52(3) 257-261.

Butin, Dan W. (2004). "The foundations of preparing teachers: Are education schools really 'intellectually barren' and ideological?" *Teachers College Record Online*. Retrieved July 29, 2004 from: <http://www.tcrecord.org>

Carbone, Peter. E. Jr. (1991). "The Teacher as Philosopher." *Educational Forum*, 55(4) 319-331.

Coffey, Amanda, and Atkinson, Paul. (1996). *Making Sense of Qualitative Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Connelly, Michael F., and Clandinin, Jean D. (1988). *Teachers as Curriculum Planers: Narratives of Experience*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dewey, John (1933). *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Edel, Abraham. (1972). "Analytic Philosophy of Education." *Educational Theory*, 22(1) 131-152.

Ediger, Marlow. (2003). "Data driven decision-making." *College Student Journal*, 37(1) 1-9.

Enz, Billie J., Freeman, Donald. J., and Wallin, Mark B.(1996). "Roles and responsibilities of the student teacher supervisor: Matches and Mismatches in perception." In *Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers: The Field Experience*, (D.J. McIntyre & D. M. Byrd, Eds.), pp. 131-150.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. (1841/1983). "Self reliance." In *The Essential Writings of R.W. Emerson*. New York: Penguin Putnam.

Feinberg, Walter F., and Soltis, Jonas F. (2004). *School and Society*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fen, Sing-Nan. (1967). "The professional and liberal education of teachers."

Peabody Journal of Education, 45(3)158-16.

Gross, Patrica. (1996). "Grounding theory into practice." *Teaching Education*, 8(1) 37-43.

Gunzenhauser, Michael G. (2003). "High Stakes Testing and the Default Philosophy of Education." *Theory into Practice*, 4(1) 51-58.

Gutmann, Amy. (1987). *Democratic Education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

Guyton, Edith., Rainer, Julie, and Wright, Thomas. (1997). "Developing a Constructivist Teacher Education Program." In David Byrd & John McIntyre, (Eds.), *Research on the Education of Our Nation's Teachers*, pp. 149-171. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hager, Candice, Pryor, Caroline R., and Bryant, John. (2004). "A Comparison of Four Domain Area Standards for Internship and Implications for Utilization in Undergraduate Construction Education Internship Programs." *Journal of Construction Education*, 8(30) 157-179.

Haggerson, Nelson L. (2002). "The Mission of the Mytho-poetic Scholar". In Michael Wolfe and Pryor, Caroline, (Eds.), *The Mission of the Scholar: Research and Practice*, pp. 75-90. New York: Peter Lang.

Henry, Christine M., and Shea, Carol A. (1986). "Who's Teaching the Social Foundations Courses?" *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(2) 10-15.

Hlebowitsh, Peter S. (2005). *Designing the School Curriculum*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Huck, Schuyler W. (2000). *Reading Statistics and Research*. New York: Longman.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (1992). *Model Standards for Teacher Licensing, Assessment, and Development: A Resource for State Dialogue*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Kalimo, R., and Vuori, J. (1990). "Work and sense of coherence: Resources for competence and life satisfaction." *Behavioral Medicine*, 16(1) 76-89.

Kincheloe, Joe. (1999). "Critical Democracy and Education." In James G. Henderson and Kathleen R. Kesson (Eds.), *Understanding Democratic Curriculum Leadership*, pp.70-83. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kohn, Alfie (1986). *No Contest: The Case Against Competition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Korotkov, David. (1998). "The sense of coherence: Making sense out of chaos." In Paul T. P. Wong and Prem. S. Fry (Eds.), *The Human Quest for Meaning: A Handbook of Psychological Research and Clinical Applications*, pp. 51-70. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Korthagen, Fred. A., and Kessels, Jos. P. (1999). "Linking Theory and Practice: Changing the Pedagogy of Teacher Education." *Educational Researcher*, 28(4) 4-17.

Leathy, Robert, and Corcoran, Carol A. (1996). "Encouraging Reflective Practitioners: Connecting Classroom to Fieldwork." *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29(2) 104-114.

Lustig, Daniel C., Rosenthal, David A., Strauser, David R., and Haynes, Kelly. (2000). "The Relationship of Sense of Coherence to Life Satisfaction for Students with Disabilities." *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 43(1) 134-141.

Morey, Ann. (2001). "The Growth of For-profit Higher Education: Implications for Teacher Education." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 52(4) 300-311.

Motzer, Sandra Adams, and Stewart, Barbara J. (1996). "Sense of Coherence as a Predictor of Quality of Life in Persons with Coronary Heart Disease Surviving Cardiac Arrest." *Research in Nursing and Health*, 19(1) 287-298.

Noddings, Nel. (1995). *Philosophy of Education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Nunnally, Jum. C. (1967). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oliva, Peter. F. (2001). *Developing the Curriculum*. New York: Longman.

Petress, Ken C. (2003). "An Educational Philosophy Guides the Pedagogical Process." *College Student Journal*, 37(1) 128-135.

Pinar, William. F., Reynolds, William. M., Slattery, Patrick, and Taubman, Paul M. (2000). *Understanding Curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.

Pinar, William F. and Grumet, Madeline (1976). *Towards a Poor Curriculum*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt.

Pinar, William F. (1974). "Currere: Toward Reconceptualization." In John Jelinke (Ed.), *Basic Problems in Modern Education*, pp.147-171. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University, College of Education.

Preskill, Stephen L.. (1979). "In Search of a Usable Philosophy of Education: The Vision of Glenn Gray." *Journal of Educational Thought*, 31(3) 205-222.

Pryor, Caroline R. (2003a, February). *A Comparison of Preservice and Inservice Teachers' Philosophy of Education: Tests of A Newly Revised Philosophy of Education Scale*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators. Jacksonville, Florida.

Pryor, Caroline R. (2003b). "Teaching for Democratic Practice: Three Strategies for the Social Studies Methods Course." *Teacher Education and Practice*, 10(3) 171-185.

Pryor, Caroline R. (2004a). "Creating a Democratic classroom: Three Themes for *Citizen Teacher* Reflection." *Kappa Delta Pi The Record*, 40(2) 78-82.

Pryor, Caroline R. (2004b). *Writing a Philosophy Statement: An Educator's Workbook*. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Pryor, Caroline R., and Kuhn, Jodi. (2004). "Do You See What I See? Bringing Field Experience Observations into the Methods Course." *The Teacher Educator*, 39(4) 17-29.

Pryor, Caroline R., and Eskirmireh, Zoreh.(2004). "Iranian and U.S. Preservice Teachers' Philosophical Approaches to Teaching: Enhancing Intercultural Understandings." *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 7(1). Retrieved September 16, 2005 from: www.tc.columbia.edu/ice

Rainer, Julie, and Guyton, Edith. (1999). "Democratic Practices in Teacher Education and the Elementary Classroom." *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15(1) 121-132.

Ravitch Diane and Thernstrom, Abigail (1992). *The Democracy Reader*. New York: HarperPerennial.

Schonwetter, Dieter J., Sokal, Laura, Friesen, Marcia, and Taylor, K. Lynn. (2002). "Teaching Philosophies Reconsidered: A Conceptual Model for the Development and Evaluation of Teaching Philosophy Statements." *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 7(1) 83-98.

Shea, Christine., Sola, Peter, and Jones, Alan. (1987). "Examining the Crisis in the Social Foundations." *Educational Foundations*, 2(1), 47-57.

Smith, L. Glenn. (1984). *Lives in Education*. Ames, IA: Educational Studies Press.

Soderberg, Siv, Lundman, Berit, and Norberg, Astrid. (1997). "Living with Fibromyalgia: Sense of Coherence, Perception of Well-being, and Stress in Daily Life." *Research in Nursing And Health*, 20(1), 495-503.

Soltis, Jonas F. (1986). "Perspectives on Philosophy of Education." *Journal of Thought*, 18(2) 14-21.

Steiner, David. (2004). "Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers: An Analysis of Syllabi from a Sample of America's Schools of Education." In Frederick Hess, Andrew Rotherham, and Kate Walsch, (Eds.), *A Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom*, pp. 119-148. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Szymanski, E. M., Hershensen, David. B., Enright, M. S., and Ettinger, J. M. (1996). "Career Development Theories, Constructs and Research: Implications for People with Disabilities." In Edna Mora Szymanski and Randall M. Parker (Eds.), *Work and Disability: Issues and Strategies in Career Development*, pp. 79-126. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.

Tanner, Daniel, and Tanner, Laurel. (1995). *Curriculum Development*. NJ: Prentice-Hall.

The Council of Learned Societies in Education (CLSE) (1996). *Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Author.

The National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2000). *NCATE Unit Standards*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Towers, James M. (1991). "How and Why Social Foundations of Education are Taught at Minnesota's Private Four-year Colleges?" *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 15(1) 30-35.

Veenman, Simon. (1984). "Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers." *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2), 143-178.

Wactler, Carolyn R. (1990). *How Student Teachers Make Sense of Teaching: The Derivations of an Individual's Educational Philosophy*. Arizona State University, Tempe: Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Wilkins-Canter, Elizabeth A. (1996). "Providing Effective Cooperating Teacher Feedback." In D. John. McIntyre & David M. Byrd, (Eds), *Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers: The Field Experience*, pp. 169-177. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Witcher, Ann, and Travers, Paul. (1999). *The Witcher-Travers Survey of Educational Beliefs*. Retrieved September 16, 2005 from: <http://www.abacon.com/witcher-travers>.

Zeichner, Kenneth M. and Tabachnick, B. Robert (1981). Are the Effects of a University Education "washed out" by School Experience? *Journal of Teacher Education* 32(3), 2-6.

Appendix A. Definitions.

The Executive Approach. Efficiency is the focus of this approach, in which example concerns might include: time on task, test attainment, and rules that direct classroom management (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004). It is not unusual for executive teachers to consider student behavior and an organized classroom environment primary to effective teaching. Berliner (1986) wrote that these teachers approach their teaching as managers of a business, a notion grounded in the functionalist concepts underlying a factory model of education (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004).

The Humanist Approach. The humanist approach is primarily concerned with providing an environment in which the interests and abilities of each student can be fully developed (Tanner & Tanner, 1995). This approach suggests formulating pedagogical decisions based on recognizing various levels of student ability, and has historical support from progressivist theorists such as Rousseau, Froebel, Dewey and others (Smith, 1984).

The Subject Specialist Approach. The subject specialist approach is focused on students becoming knowledgeable within a particular domain area (e.g., mathematics) and use of pedagogical practices based on the nature of the subject. Here, a teacher's focus is the breadth and depth of the subject area with student interests and abilities less central. Historically, a hierarchy has existed among the subject areas considered most important to teach (Smith, 1984).

The Citizen Teacher Approach. The goal of the citizen teacher is to prepare students as active and informed participants in a democracy. Three principles of democracy define this approach: liberty-freedom, justice-fairness, and equality-equal opportunity (Pryor, 2003b; Gutmann, 1987). Using this approach, a teacher provides a foundation for analysis of the social, historical and economic roles of citizenry using activities such as discourse and communication.

The Explorer Approach. The explorer approach emphasizes discovery of vast amounts of information, however Information is considered distinctly different from the term knowledge used in the subject specialist approach. In the subject specialist approach, knowledge is valued for its collective potential; the explorer approach seeks instead to understand the rapid change in information. An explorer teacher helps students investigate the changing world through global interaction, often using multi-media as primary tool.

Appendix B. Sample POES Scoring Across One Dimension of Teaching.

The Philosophy of Education Scale is available online at http://texascbt.tamu.edu/survey/Philosophy_of_Education/scale.htm or hard copy (Pryor, 2004a).

This form has seven rows (e.g., “Classroom Environment”) of large boxes. Each large box has a small box and three descriptors of teaching beliefs and practice. First, start with the descriptors. Rate each of the three indicators in each large box in the first row, going from left to right, using the scale below as a guide. *Rating numbers can be repeated.*

Most like me 5 4 3 2 1 least like me

Second, *rank* each of the five large boxes in *across* each row from the one most like you (5), to the one least like you (1) using the scale above. Use each ranking number only once; *place this number in the small box*. Repeat this process for the remaining rows.

Third, add the small boxes (*down*), for each column total.

Sample POES Dimension: Lesson Plans

<i>Rate</i> Indicators	<i>Rate</i> Indicators	<i>Rate</i> indicators	<i>Rate</i> Indicators	<i>Rate</i> Indicators
<i>Rank</i> Approach	<i>Rank</i> Approach	<i>Rank</i> Approach	<i>Rank</i> Approach	<i>Rank</i> Approach
Lesson Plans ▼ <u>4</u> Specific objectives and standards clearly defined <u>4</u> Essential elements of instruction are addressed <u>5</u> Meets district guidelines, scope and sequence	▼ <u>1</u> Long-term, broadly structured outcome <u>1</u> Thematic and integrated curriculum <u>1</u> Student-centered learning	▼ <u>3</u> Emphasis on depth of knowledge <u>3</u> Instruction extends beyond standardized testing <u>2</u> Extensive resources (field trips, guest speakers)	▼ <u>1</u> Open-ended objectives <u>2</u> Inquiry <u>3</u> Emphasize technological skills and information interpreting techniques	▼ <u>2</u> Flexible goals based on community and citizenship needs <u>3</u> Practical knowledge and life skills <u>5</u> Higher-order, critical thinking and problem-solving

Note: To determine *overall* philosophical approach, sum total only the ranked small boxes *down the column*.