Exploring the Moral Dimension of Professors' Folk Pedagogy

Thomas Steven Barrett

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
In
Teaching and Learning

Jim Garrison, Co-chair
Susan G. Magliaro, Co-chair
Bonnie Billingsley
John K. Burton
Rosary Lalik

December 1, 1997

Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: moral education, higher education, moral discourse, narrative analysis

Exploring the Moral Dimension of Professors' Folk Pedagogy

Thomas Barrett

ABSTRACT

This study explores the intersection of two major conceptions in higher education: professors' folk pedagogies and teaching's moral dimension. Folk pedagogy is the accumulated set of beliefs, conceptions and assumptions that professors personally hold about the practice of teaching (Bruner, 1996). When these beliefs and conceptions are enacted as a teaching practice, they are conceivably undertaken on behalf of students as the means to a good end. Professors, in the course of enacting their folk pedagogies, make educational decisions -- value determinations in essence -- about what they believe are in the best interests of their students. In so doing they have entered moral territory. To make these decisions, issues related to moral perception, moral imagination, and moral responsiveness are present. This moral dimension of teaching was found in this study to be an inherent feature of the participants' folk pedagogy.

Pursuing tangible exemplars of these ideas, this study accomplished three key objectives. First, it explored and described some key features of professors' folk pedagogies. Second, it examines the discourse that emerged from the folk pedagogy investigation for its moral expressions and the insights it offered toward understanding how professors conceive of teaching as a moral endeavor. Finally, using narrative analysis as the guiding methodology, it retold professors' personal narratives - their discursive practices - as a unified story of moral agency and moral discourse in university teaching. These objectives were satisfied through case study investigations of three professors, wherein each participant professor was interviewed and observed teaching over the course of nine weeks.

Although this investigation sought to explore moral discourse, four additional discourses were discovered interacting with the moral discourse - the personal discourse, a professional discourse, an academic discourse, and the institutional discourse. It was found that rather than there being one singular moral discourse, each independent discourse possessed its own moral substance. A full view of the moral discourse, therefore, can only be achieved by looking across all of the independent discourses themselves.

Interestingly, the nature of the moral discourse and moral agency varied for each professor depending upon which independent discourse dominated her or his practice. For example, those professors engaged in professional disciplines (i.e., business and engineering) exhibited practices dominated by what is termed here a *professional discourse*.

In contrast, the practice of the philosophy professor was dominated by the *academic discourse.* In each case, however, the moral discourse revealed itself most often when professors' engaged in closer, more personal interactions with students and during their consideration of students in their course planning. Moral discourse and moral agency for the professors in this study played an important role in their overall folk pedagogy and in many instances served as an unintentional pedagogical tool.

This work is lovingly dedicated to my Mother who, regretfully, will never get to share in it; and to Lauren, the price I paid to achieve it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"The moral life is lived only as the individual appreciates for himself the ends for which he is working and does his work in a personal spirit of interest and devotion to these ends." -- John Dewey (1909/1975)

As it has been with many others, so too has it been difficult for me to deny the call to teach. I am not sure from where it comes, but I do know that it is strong, and it reveals some of itself in my deep fascination with the teaching craft. Uncertain of its origin, I have on and off for twelve years now been trying to answer that call through practice, through study, through passionate pursuit. One of my first efforts was my only year of teaching in public schools. It's hard to recall many details, mostly it seems only a blur of dispassionate mechanical mouthing of science under conditions of marginal control and minimal confidence. It was a year during which I battled both my own ignorance of teaching and many of my students' disinterest in learning. Looking back I can hardly call what I did teaching; it was much more like survival. Still the experience was rewarding, the call not muted much at all. However, for reasons not related to teaching, I left education promising that if I ever went back I would understand it better before calling myself a teacher. Now, much time, learning, and growing having passed, I feel ready to again answer that call. This time I answer from a whole different place within me, as a much different person, and with a much richer understanding and appreciation of teaching, studenting, and education.

During my brief, early teaching experience and the pre-service training that preceded it, I failed to comprehend a crucial part of the meaning of education. I did not see teaching as a humanistic endeavor. After six or so courses certifying me as a science teacher, I thought teaching was only "planning-instruction-assessment," a very technical affair. I thought it was about delivering subject matter and certifying by grades the degree to which students understood it. I thought education was about teaching subjects, not about teaching people. After all, this was education as I had experienced it for seventeen or so years; why would I think about it any differently? It didn't occur to me until much later that teaching and education were about something much bigger, something far deeper, and something much more essential than just "delivering" subject matter and hoping it was "received."

What had never occurred to me, or perhaps what was never made clear to me, was that teaching is, fundamentally, a moral endeavor. Because it involves making decisions and taking actions on behalf of others, it is inherently moral. Because it involves helping people to develop a particular view of the world, it is inherently moral. Because teachers are entrusted to promote a world view that is consistent with social tenets of rightness and wrongness, of goodness and badness, and because in so doing teachers must enact those tenets themselves, teaching is inherently moral. I could go on for a long time describing the myriad ways that teaching is more

about moral relationships among people than it is about merely content delivery and hopeful reception. I am now convinced that, fundamentally, teaching is a moral enterprise. It is from this richer understanding that I now "answer" its call differently than I once did.

Up to the point of my preliminary examination for doctoral candidacy, I had only informally engaged in the study of the moral dimension through personal mulling and musings. The subject of that prelim was moral discourse in higher education, and it was really my first formal exploration of education's moral core. One purpose of that activity was to explicate a conception of moral discourse within the context of higher education. A second purpose was to conduct a thorough review of educational scholarship to get a sense of how the concept has been explored by other researchers and to begin to situate myself and my work within it. Prior to investigating education's moral dimension, I really had no idea how vast was the territory, nor did I have any idea of how ambiguous and uncertain would be its claims. However, my understanding was made more solid through that activity, specifically through the works of several researchers.

Simpson and Garrison's (1995) elaboration of moral perception was my first conscious encounter with the moral foundation of teaching. It was through this work, and through Jim Garrison's course on *Analysis of Educational Concepts*, that I first took a hard look at the softer, more humanistic side of education. These authors suggest that through moral perception teachers are able to "comprehend particular contexts and persons", make "sympathetic connections" with students, and see into "the future of their best possibilities" (p. 252). These ideas were either never emphasized in the various "methods" and "foundations" courses I had as a pre-service teacher or I failed completely in comprehending them that way. Then I never really understood that teaching was about students, I always thought it was about subject matter. In fact, reflecting on my experience at the university as an undergraduate reaffirmed for me that education was more about teaching things rather than teaching people. And so, recently, I began to wonder about the moral aspects of "teaching people" in higher education.

Not long after that I discovered Fenstermacher's (1992) ideas of "method" and "manner" as two "critical attributes" (p. 95) of teaching. Manner in the general sense, applies to "human action that exhibits the particular traits or dispositions of a person" (1992, p. 97). When placed in a pedagogical context, it "consists primarily of moral and intellectual virtues pertinent to education" (Fenstermacher, 1986, p. 47). For so long my conceptions of teaching were simply conceptions of methods -- plan-instruct-assess. That teachers possessed a manner seemed obvious, but to view manner as an instrument of teaching - something that contributed significantly to the education that teachers gave - simply had never occurred to me. These ideas proved powerful in helping me to continue to conceptualize this humanistic side of education.

Finally, in their book entitled *The Moral Life of Schools*, Philip Jackson, Robert Boostrom, and David Hansen (1993) revealed the seemingly infinite ways that the moral dimension of education is made manifest in schools. I was particularly struck by two aspects of this research: first, that nearly everything that happened in schools bore some moral content; and second, that teachers, like me, were largely unaware of this phenomenon. Through the combined affect of these three works I began to deeply appreciate the importance of teaching as a moral craft.

Following my preliminary examination I became more intrigued over how university professors understood, taught within, and expressed the moral aspects of teaching. I wanted to know if they expressed through their discourse and practices some "moral awareness" relating to their functions as teachers. Did they understand the role they played in the lives of their students? Did they recognize the tacit moral education they inevitably gave? Was educating students, to them, more like "job training" or more like realizing "best possibilities"? To answer these questions and the many that would follow required designing a study that could illuminate such an awareness, if it existed, while avoiding the trappings of pervasive "right answer giving" that moral conversations induce. While in pursuit of a viable methodology, I discovered a framework that, on the one hand, added a second foci to the study, but on the other hand, opened an ideal space from which moral discourse would likely emerge.

In brief, I have created a framework based on two notions recently elaborated by Jerome Bruner: *folk pedagogy* and *narrative ways of knowing.* Folk pedagogy is a system by which teachers organize their experience in, knowledge about, and transactions with prevailing cultural and professional canons of pedagogy (Bruner, 1996). Thus, investigating professors' folk pedagogies - that is, investigating their personal beliefs and conceptions of teaching and learning - provided an ideal context through which to examine moral expression as a feature of practice. The narrative mode of thought has been articulated by Bruner and others as the storied form through which we make sense of, account for, and communicate our lived experiences. My plan was to engage professors in a naturalistic inquiry of their beliefs and personal theories of teaching and learning as they told me stories of their teaching experiences. I, in turn, would relate their stories and my interpretations of their moral content through a story of my own, one told through this dissertation.

This research plan was, I feel, quite successful. I gathered through interviews and classroom observations a great deal of information relating to the beliefs and personal theories some professors hold about teaching and learning. Moreover, I collected extensive personal stories that related professors' moral agency within their teaching practice. Given the abundance of

these data[1], I have chosen not to present it all in this dissertation. While beliefs and conceptions of reality (including teaching) are inextricably woven throughout life's moral fabric, I will focus this document on the expression of these beliefs and how they influence teaching's moral dimension. Elaboration of what these beliefs constitute in their pedagogical sense will be the subject of a later work. For now, there is story to tell about folk pedagogy, moral discourse, their interrelatedness, and how this all helps me to more fully answer teaching's call.

_____

[1] - While most researchers refer to the information they derive from their studies as "data" - an idea that implies to me something quantifiable, discreet ,or separated out from the contexts from which they came. I personally find it difficult to see the narratives the participants in this study have shared with me as "data." Their narratives are not quantifiable or discreet, rather they are deeply embedded in the contexts of the time and places through which they were revealed. Instead, I find a more suitable concept to be "artifacts" -something characteristic of human activity and bound in the context of a specific time and place. From here on I shall use this term to represent the "data" of my study.

INTRODUCTION

"Teaching well requires as broad and deep an understanding of the learner as
possible, a concern for how what is taught relates to the life experience of the
learner, and a willingness to engage the learner in the context of the learner's own
intentions, interests, and desires." -- Gary Fenstermacher

February in Blacksburg is often overcast and breezy, with a biting chill in the air. But on
this particular winter's day it wasn't the weather that was chilling me. The day before I had
successfully defended my dissertation prospectus and felt warm and comforted by the guidance
and support of my committee. The day after I stood facing the challenge of beginning that research
program with feelings of apprehension and concern. That's what was chilling me.

For about two years I have been a student of teaching's moral dimension. My studies have
taken me deep into the literature on the topic with encounters ranging from the thick, sometimes
dense material of educational philosophers to the often sparse but relevant classroom-based work
of the educational researchers. In practical terms, I have also been a student of the moral
dimension through my own practice as a teacher public school teacher and at the university. In
both arenas of my education it has been both fascinating and frightening to observe and reflect
upon the inevitability of moral encounter in educational settings; encounters with the infinite
combinations of context and characters, with the myriad decisions to be made, and with the
consequence of countless actions necessarily taken. The moral aspect penetrates all dimensions of
teaching. To consider a study of something so large, so complex, and so ubiquitous is
intimidating for it presents a puzzling paradox - moral matters are everywhere and embedded in
everything. How then does one separate out a slice that is manageable for study while maintaining
the essential context of the whole? It's no wonder a chill ran through me that February day.

The challenge of designing my study lay in establishing a methodology that would
maximize teachers' opportunities for moral expression, while avoiding their tendency toward "right
answer giving" based on their intuitive sense of what I was looking for with my questions.
Another concern was to guard against degradation of the richness and embedded meanings of the
"artifacts" by decontextualizing them during analysis. Clearly, the study design needed to be one
sensitive to the vicissitudes of human moral expression, yet capable of extracting moral discourse
without an overt engagement of the topic.

I found useful frameworks for inquiry in two of Jerome Bruner's recent ideas relating to
folk pedagogy and *narrative ways of knowing.* Those ideas are elaborated in detail later, but for
now let me share my objectives for this study and then explain in detail some important
considerations of teaching as a moral enterprise.

1

Study Objective

The overarching objective of this study is to investigate how professors' folk pedagogies influence their moral agency and moral discourse. Also, it is my hope that, by examining the moral discourse of other teachers, this study will also aid me in further understanding my own moral agency as a teacher. Throughout this study I have listened as these three teachers have shown and told me their own stories of folk pedagogy and moral agency. My task as investigator has been to explore these tales and to exercise my perception and imagination to make sense of what has been imparted to me about the moral milieu in which these teachers are immersed. In each case participant teachers appear to share the same struggle as I do: They too are trying to attain good ends for their students. They too desire to improve the lives of their students in their own personally and professionally valued way, a moral mission to be sure. We, as teachers, share at least this one common struggle, though we each perceive it and set about its resolution differently. I view this struggle as a moral one. Thus, my interest here is three-fold: to investigate the elements of professors' folk pedagogies; to explore how their folk pedagogies influence their moral agency and moral discourse and to what degree the participants of this study also embrace this struggle as moral; and to use their narratives to tell a story of moral discourse in higher education. Given these objectives, it seems wise to begin this project with a discussion of the conceptions of morality that will undergird this work.

Framing Morality

Ethics and morality have been prominent topics of serious debate since the ancient Greeks (Garrison, 1997; Noddings, 1995). While there are a plenitude of moral theories, conceptions of morality have concerned themselves traditionally with matters of right conduct vis-à-vis some particular code of rightness and wrongness (Blum, 1994; Noddings, 1995; Strike & Soltis, 1992). Theories based on codes or principles define moral behavior or right conduct in terms of conformance to the respective tenets of the theory. Icons of the principle-based theories of morality include universalism (e.g., Kant, 1959), and utilitarianism (e.g., Mill, 1861). The precepts of universalism ascribe moral codes to ideals of rightness (not necessarily goodness) that derive from a higher order than the human realm (Blum, 1994). According to such theories moral behavior is enacted by personal choice and adheres to absolute principles of rightness (e.g., do not steal), a metaethical view of morality. Utilitarianism, by contrast, insists that a vision of what is good must precede the vision of what is right (Noddings, 1995). For utilitarians, the moral ideal seeks the greatest good for the greatest numbers. Through these theories and their numerous

variants, morality is viewed as a conforming act - behavior enacted in conformance with extant rules and codes.

Alternative views of morality see it as more than just an act of conformance to codes (i.e., more than an ethic of justice). Contemporary thought is increasingly expanding the view that, while morality involves conformance, it also involves non-rational, subjective qualities such as care, empathy, and altruism (Blum, 1994; Garrison, 1997; Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1992; Strike & Soltis, 1992). Rather than solely predicating moral behavior on conformance to rules that supposedly are applicable to all situations, these moral theorists and philosophers believe morality has a interpersonal aspect whereby right behavior is determined by involvement in the lives of others and perception and response to their needs, desires and dispositions. Blum (1994) reminds us that "personal relationships are the principle setting in which this moral endeavor takes place. . . The moral task is not a matter of finding universalizable reasons or principles of action, but of getting oneself to attend to the reality of individual other persons" (p. 12). Conceptions of morality along this theme recognize the cognitive component of moral behavior - that is, determining when one is in a moral situation then deliberating over which rule to apply to ensure moral behavior - but they also recognize and insist on an inherent and complimentary affective component to moral behavior. For as John Dewey insists: "Morality is not a matter of mere behavior; it is a matter of feeling too" (1909/1975, p. x).

The conception of morality underlying this study is that which recognizes that right behavior involves much more than simply mapping codes of conduct onto extant situations and behaving accordingly. This study recognizes the dilemma between the infinitude of moral situations and the relative dearth of moral codes. It takes the view that moral agency involves perceiving the moral aspects of situations, imagining and deliberating over the best moral response, then enacting that response. It shares the views of Blum, Johnson, Garrison, and Noddings who all recognize the rational aspects of morality but who insist that morality arises from altruistic motivation and embodies such characteristics as care, kindness, concern, helpfulness, compassion, and sympathy among many others. Thus, the moral exploration of professors' teaching practices will focus on the participants' moral agency as it relates to this non-rational, affective conception of morality. Specifically, it will examine within their educational discourses instances of moral perception, moral deliberation, and moral response. The concert of these three moral elements constitute moral agency (Blum, 1994), and each is worthy of some simple discussion here to provide the foundation of the more detailed and contextualized discussions in later sections.

Debate abounds on whether every human situation is moral, contains moral elements, or has moral potency at all (Blum, 1994; Darwall, Gibbard, & Railton, 1997; Noddings, 1992). The position taken in this study is that moral situations exist only when moral features of particular situations are perceived or detected by the agents within those particular situations. Not all persons

will find moral relevancy in all of the same situations. Perception of moral situations depends on agents already possessing the psychological moral categories represented by their circumstance and being able to recognize these moral features at the time they are encountered (Blum, 1994). As an example, two persons encounter a child who has established a small enterprise on the neighborhood street corner selling lemonade. The first patron along sees the situation as an opportunity to quench her thirst. The second patron, equally as thirsty as the first but who does not like lemonade, buys a cup simply because he sees the situation as an opportunity to reinforce in the child the values of industry, independence, and fair trade. The second patron has perceived that purchasing the child's lemonade may foster the growth and well-being of the child. The second patron has seen the situation in moral terms whereas the first patron saw it only in terms of her own disposition. Situations have moral potency only to the extent that agents in those situations recognize them as moral.[2]

Accordingly, before a person can behave morally - whether morality is conceived as rule-bound or altruistic - she or he must first recognize a situation as a moral one. Moral perception is the capacity to recognize the moral features situations or to distinguish moral situations from non-moral situations (Blum, 1994; Garrison, 1997; Simpson & Garrison, 1995). The second patron at the lemonade stand perceived the situation as a moral one, where one person can help out another. However, moral perception alone does not necessarily result in moral action (Blum, 1994). Simply because one detects a moral situation in no way guarantees that the person will act morally. Between moral perception and moral action lies the matter of deliberating over appropriate moral responses.

Two conditions must first transpire before a response is made to a moral situation. First, the agent must actively decide to take action in the moral situation. Not all morally perceived situations move us to decide to take moral responses. A telling example of my own experience is when I observe parents smoking in the ill-ventilated space of their automobile with their young children present. I perceive it as a moral situation, a situation where my involvement might lead to some result that may have a positive impact on the health of the child. However, I recognize that my moral stance has no place in this particular situation since it is not my child and there is no immediate threat of danger. Consequently, I decide not to take moral action.

The second condition involves the agent must choosing some appropriate moral response (Blum, 1994; Johnson, 1993). Thus, in moral agency, moral perception is followed by some

---

[2] - There are situations that have been socially identified as moral and that require appropriate moral action from us all. These situations typically have been generalized and are those for which we have developed codes of moral conduct. For instance, we recognize the moral potency of situations involving stealing, lying, bringing physical harm to others. Proper moral responses have been set for these situations: Do not steal, lie, or hurt people.

form of moral deliberation. For the sake of simplifying the complex process of human decision making, I will adopt Johnson's (1993) dichotomy of moral deliberation constituting two facets: moral reasoning and moral imagination. Moral reasoning, he says, involves "discerning the appropriate universal moral principle that tells us the single right thing to do in a given situation" (p. 1). Moral reasoning works well in situations where moral context and the appropriate moral reaction are easily discernible. By contrast, moral imagination is engaged when situations arise for which no clear moral principle exists, where alternatives to conventional rules are sought, or when the agent is motivated toward some moral act when a moral response is not customarily required. Moral imagination, therefore, is "an ability to imaginatively discern various possibilities for acting within a given situation and to envision the potential help and harm that are likely to result from a given action" (Johnson, 1993, p. 202). In the earlier lemonade vignette, moral imagination was exemplified by the second patron who chose to buy the lemonade not because the situation necessarily demanded moral action, the way that witnessing a crime might, but because the patron perceived some moral context (e.g., the opportunity to help another person, care for the success of the child's endeavor, kindly treatment of young people, etc.) and imagined how that moral act might be accomplished (e.g., buying the lemonade, providing verbal encouragement, etc.). An agent's moral deliberation within some morally perceived situation prepares him or her for moral action.

At the risk of oversimplifying an inherently complicated process, moral action typically takes some form of either a reasoned, rational *reaction* that follows some rule or guiding principle, or it is arises from a creative *response* perceived as the right thing to do for that particular situation (Blum, 1994). Rational deliberation is a matter of applying the right rules and enacting the prescribed reaction. Familiar examples of this in education abound: attendance policies, college entrance requirements, honor codes and so forth. Creative moral responses are not nearly so apparent for they are often made to situations for which rules are not available to guide moral action. Moral responsiveness, says Blum (1994), is:

> an action expressive of an altruistic motive toward others. . . . is not to be taken as meaning merely 'reacting to another person'. . . . it involves taking action to address another's condition. . . . Responsiveness involves both cognitive and affective dimensions (pp. 188-189).

Actions that are *responsive* in moral situations require the agent to affectively or empathetically recognize another's situation and to desire to make that situation better in some way. A child

---

Proclaiming such situations as moral through our laws and customs is a social effort to ensure that those situations are properly morally recognized and responded to.

selling lemonade is not an inherently moral situation where some rule indicates that one must react to ensure moral certitude. Contrarily, an individual such as the second patron might recall his own entrepreneurial efforts years ago and feel motivated as an act of kindness or generosity to buy lemonade. In situations of responsiveness, the agent often transcends the egoism of self-concern and "takes in" (Noddings, 1984) the other person, opening oneself to the feelings of the other. Because educational situations inherently present an infinitude of opportunities for moral perception, it is fertile ground for responsive moral action.

So far I have propounded the ideas that morality involves both cognitive and affective considerations, that perception of moral situations is individually regulated, and that moral deliberation over some moral action can involve compliance with rules or imaginative moral responses where rules do not apply. What I have not so far provided is any elaboration of what is a moral act. To do so, I will begin with John Dewey's idea of morality as he explains it in Moral Principles in Education (1909/1975). "Moral ideas," he says, "are ideas of any sort whatsoever which take effect in conduct and improve it, make it better than it otherwise would be" (p. 1). In this way then, morality is the choosing of some means of action that will result in improvement of some condition. Johnson (1993) makes this more explicit: "Morality is not the search for moral laws to guide our lives, but rather the ongoing imaginative exploration of possibilities for dealing with our problems, enhancing the quality of our communal relationships, and forming significant personal attachments that grow" (p. 209). Moral agency therefore constitutes more than just acting in accord with established rules, it involves acting in ways that lead to the growth of others as well as ourselves. Education, thus, is an endeavor to foster the growth of students and so is an endeavor of moral significance.

Exploring the moral dimension of education in this study is an exploration moral action. It is an exploration of morally potent situations - those situations that present opportunities to "make it better [for students] than it otherwise would be." It is an exploration of moral reasoning and moral imagination. And, it is an exploration of moral agency, what Garrison says "directs us toward the best possibilities for expansive growth" (1997, p. 175). This exploration of education's moral dimension becomes more clear when morality is examined in the context of educational settings.

Morality in Education

Upon hearing the terms "moral" and "education" associated together people immediately begin to think about what I call a *moralizing education* - that is an educational endeavor designed and implemented to directly teach, even indoctrinate, some set of moral beliefs. This dissertation is not about moralizing education. Instead it is about those moral aspects that inherently reside within

the usual educational settings, aspects that are typically much more subtle and ever-present than overt moralizing acts. After all, teaching is a matter of instructing and assisting students so that they acquire knowledge, understand how that knowledge bears meaning in their lives, develop traits of character and conduct required for a personally rewarding life, attain productive employment, and contribute to effective citizenship (Fenstermacher, 1990). No doubt, teaching is an enterprise in pursuit of lofty and challenging ends. Thus the moral dimension of education as it is construed in this study is of necessity also quite broad. It, in fact, penetrates every facet of the endeavor from educational objectives, to relationships between people, to decisions made about teaching and learning, to the countless everyday deeds done in the name of education.

Even if direct or didactic instruction of moral lessons is avoided, the inevitable value-ladenness of the educational enterprise persists. As cogently expressed by Oser, Dick, and Patry (1992), teaching is indeed a moral endeavor for it is a "deliberate effort to develop values and sensibilities as well as skills" (p. 6) among students. In public schools we aim to transmit culture, to impart those values and virtues we all hold common and deem essential. Through public education we "seek to ensure that the young will learn whatever values, skills, and modes of behavior are deemed to be in the best interests of the group or the whole" (Goodlad, Soder & Sirotnik, 1990, p. xii). Honesty, respect, fair-mindedness, democratic tradition, tolerance, and enterprise are a few of the many ideals that we would hope to promote and perpetuate through schooling at all levels. Moreover, because teachers are charged with enculturation, the very profession inheres a moral quality.

Even though public schooling maintains a host of accreditation procedures, policies of good conduct, and standards of learning, teachers enjoy reasonable autonomy within the confines of their classrooms (Jackson, Boostrom & Hansen, 1993). No place is this more true than in college classrooms where professors enjoy an "academic freedom" to educate as they see fit. Society entrusts teachers and professors to fulfill the obligations and duties necessary to meet the goals of schooling. In higher education, the professions, in addition to society, also establish expectations of teachers. Whether and how teachers meet these expectations are matters of moral concern. In a sometimes confusing turn of semantics, conformance with such "codes" often refer to the "ethical" aspects of the endeavor.[3] As part of this trust, teachers are empowered to make

---

[3] - Many philosophers and scholars use the terms "moral" and "ethical" interchangeably to describe "right" or "good" behavior, though this is sometimes a confusing practice. I prefer to make a handy distinction between the two. I use moral to refer to personal conduct taken toward "good" ends, where determination of the means follow no fixed or "right" recipe, thus involving moral perception and creative imagination. By contrast, I see "ethical" behavior, though also undertaken toward "good" ends, as that which adheres to some established principles of "right" conduct; in this sense the moral reasoning is rule-bound and conformance based. Professional ethics then are codes of right conduct that teachers follow. Moral behavior is that action that results from a teacher's deliberations where specific

classroom decisions of all sorts; decisions relating to effective instruction, acceptable behavior, fair treatment, and worthy pursuits. For as Fenstermacher (1990) asserts, "The teacher's conduct, at all times and in all ways, is a moral matter" (p. 133).

Quite literally, nearly any activity undertaken by teachers in the name of education can carry moral weight (Fenstermacher, 1990; Jackson, Boostrom & Hansen, 1993; Oser, 1994; Purpel & Ryan, 1983). While every teaching act is not necessarily a moral act, every such act is at least potentially moral depending upon how the situation of the act is perceived by the actor. In universities moral elements involve such broad institutional issues as class size, valuation of teaching excellence, student retention/attrition, and the preparation of faculty for teaching. On a more compassed scale, moral concerns include choice of course curriculum and materials, use of assessment measures, the nature of the relationship between teacher and student, and instructional techniques. On an even finer scale, "every response to a question, every assignment handed out, every discussion on issues, every resolution of a dispute, every grade given to a student carries with it the moral character of the teacher" (Fenstermacher, 1990, p. 134). Regardless of the scope one takes, the moral element is present.

At their most refined level, the character and beliefs of the teacher serve the moral turn. As Jackson and his colleagues (1993) discuss from their research in schools, moral education can result from the expressive morality of the teacher. Many other educational researchers and philosophers propound similar conceptions that go by various names like moral character, moral agency, professional morality, moral intuition, and so on. These concepts can well be amalgamated by Fenstermacher's conception of *manner*. Manner in the general sense, he states, applies to "human action that exhibits the particular traits or dispositions of a person" (1992, p. 97). When placed in a pedagogical context it "consists primarily of moral and intellectual virtues pertinent to education" (1986, p. 47). Moreover, manner:

> refers to disposition and traits of the teacher as he or she undertakes the tasks of teaching. Thus, we speak of a teacher being fair or unfair, considerate or harsh, high-minded or base, while also engaging in explaining, leading a discussion, organizing a study group, or illustrating a difficult concept (1992, p. 99).

Fenstermacher (1992) asserts that because nearly everything a teacher does concerning students carries some moral weight, the teacher's basic behaviors during these actions are the primary conveyors of moral principles. Thus, it is through nearly every act of teaching that the teacher transmits manner and, thereby, conveys morality. Instantiations of manner have been

---

rules do not apply, say in the choice between which of a group of students shall answer a question. This distinction receives further illumination in Chapter Two.

described from actual field study and point to manner's profound role in education (Baxter Magolda, 1987; Elbaz, 1983; Jackson, Boostrom, & Hansen, 1993; Joseph & Efron, 1993).

In their extended study, Jackson, Boostrom, and Hansen (1993) identified, named, and effectively operationalized manner in a concept articulated as *we teach ourselves*. This concept emerged from the teachers' reflections of the moral yet tacit lessons they teach through their classroom conduct and manner. Students learn such lessons as what the furrowed brow means, what the limits of tolerance are (e.g., how loud "quiet" can be), and how fair and kind a teacher will be in the struggle of classroom performance. *We teach ourselves* applies as equally well in colleges and universities as it does in public schools. Professors inevitably teach such lessons, and their students learn them: one need only think about the instructor who habitually starts class late and then wonders why most of her or his students continually arrive late. While there is strong agreement that teaching is, as Alan Tom (1984) says, a "moral craft," one must ask what it is that makes it so? What constitutes moral activity in educational settings?

The Moral Core

At least two moral characteristics that all of these manifestations hold in common are *relationship* and *decision making* (Oser, 1994; Tom, 1984). In fact, these characteristics are inextricably bound in the educational realm. What makes teaching a moral endeavor is that it constitutes human action undertaken in regard to other human beings (Fenstermacher, 1990). Thus there is inevitably a relationship between teacher and student, one that is influenced regularly by decisions made by the former on behalf of the latter. Or, put more succinctly by Clark (1990), "At its core, teaching is a matter of human relationships. Human relationships, whatever else they may be, are moral in character and consequence" (p. 265).

In education, human relationships are epitomized by the relationship between the teacher and the taught. These relationships are inherently moral, for teachers are regularly making decisions and taking actions related to the educational welfare of students. Oser (1994) indicates that the moral core of teaching is ". . . .the decision a teacher makes to help students learn, communicate, share, reflect, evaluate, and so forth" (p. 59). In a very real sense, teachers are asking students to form or change their views of the world in ways and directions chosen by the teacher (Bruner, 1996; Clark, 1990). These ways and directions are the products of decisions made according to the particular beliefs teachers hold relative to the matters of education. Beliefs, as we know, are propositions one accepts as true and that drive one's actions toward some end (LeFrançois, 1997; Richardson, 1996). Beliefs give impetus to and guide the decisions that teachers make. For instance, if a teacher believes learning is a passive activity whereby students need only to hear in order to learn, then she or he may decide that teaching need only involve a

one-way vocal transmission of information, no dialogue or practical aspect is necessary. By contrast, the teacher who believes learning to be a matter of individual knowledge construction based on prior experiences and individual style may thus decide that teaching should create opportunities for students to select personally meaningful tasks toward learning. These decisions and the beliefs that guide them are moral matters for they bear directly, for better or for worse, on the nature of the education received by the learner.

That teachers and students have a particular relationship in schools, and that teachers make decisions in support of those relationships based on beliefs they hold, firmly establishes teachers as moral agents. It is the moral agency of professors that this project seeks to illuminate through an exploration of their moral discourse.

The fact that educational decisions are made on behalf of students, yet are based upon a teacher's beliefs, is an important moral ingredient in education. If decision making is grounded in beliefs that manifest in moral deliberation and moral action, then examining professors' beliefs about their practices ought to provide a view into the moral nature of these practices. This relationship between beliefs, folk pedagogy, and teaching's moral dimension is the key premise underlying this study. The relationship of this premise to the other integral parts of the study are outlined briefly below.

Organization and Overview

Because this dissertation involves narrative analysis and because I cannot separate the artifacts I have collected from the stories I have encountered, I have organized and shall present this study in the same storied form I have experienced it. The chief advantage in using narrative analysis is that it is a method for maintaining unity of experience and meaning, and giving greater insight into the lives of those studied (Polkinghorne, 1995). Consequently, this dissertation is storied through and through. It relates stories of life and teaching experienced by my participants. It too tells some of my history and my story of discovery throughout this experience. The primary story, however, tells of the moral dimension of folk pedagogy among three university professors. It is around this particular theme that I have tried to craft this work as a story - with setting, plot, and characters - and use the other elements of this form such as voice, dénouement, perspective, illustration, and so forth. Regrettably, I am not a story teller, and have had no serious experience writing stories. So, while this project's development as a gripping piece of narration is amateurish, I am satisfied that I have given it my best and have conveyed the essence of my research in a form that, at least, respects good narratology.

To this point, I have tried to establish the setting of the story, namely the moral dimension of education, and I have set the plot into motion. I have given detail to the setting by relating ideas about morality, how it is conceived here and what forms and functions it takes in educational

situations. The plot, in a sense, has begun with the indication that it is within the highly charged moral contexts of classrooms that actors will come to reveal their own narratives of moral discourse and moral agency.

In the next chapter I begin to develop characters by discussing a theoretical framework for understanding how culture and personal histories merge to yield here-and-now representations of teachers. By exploring the ideas of folk pedagogy and narrative thought, my intent is to provide some psychological insight into teachers generally, and these professors particularly. The sections relating to narrative analysis offer an understanding why stories have value as qualitative research and how I have gone about the process of telling this story out of a research project.

Readers more familiar with traditional forms of research will be comforted to find that the artifiacts collected from this study are presented in Chapter Three, though they are presented in a noticeably narrative form. It is here that the characters of the story take the spotlight and begin revealing themselves and their ideologies about university teaching. The larger story discloses five major themes of folk pedagogy that have emerged from the individual narratives. Drawing from these narratives, I highlight the essential elements of moral discourse and moral agency.

The final chapter of this dissertation is an attempt at dénouement. Reflecting on the individual narratives of folk pedagogy, I try to relate the connections between higher education culture and the teaching practices I have encountered; first in general terms, then specifically in regard to the moral discourse and moral agency. This chapter tells of the conclusions I have drawn from the study and synthesizes my major discoveries into what, hopefully, are useful insights into the moral dimension of higher education pedagogy.

In addition to my prospectus, February brought another semester of teaching for me. This semester was different though. Because I was conducting research of other professors' moral agency, I could not help but to also reflect upon my own moral agency. I found that I became quite sensitive to the moral weight that nearly every teaching act invariably involves. I became more focused on how I engaged students, both in groups and individually. I watched how I expressed myself to them in terms of my tone, temperament, and manner. I also became very critical of how I selected, interpreted, and presented material to class. After all, my class was taught not just some sanitized version of *Foundations of Educational Psychology*, but the highly personalized Tome Barrett version. What my students now understand as "ed psych" is, to an extent, my view of what is valuable in educational psychology; a moral matter to be sure. So my research began to synergize with my teaching. By watching myself as moral agent, my perceptions became much more attuned to the moral agency and moral discourses of other teachers. It was as if I became the fourth member of my study.

Before long my research program, including my teaching, was moving along vigorously. After nearly nine weeks, the field work was mostly complete. It rushed by so quickly that I hardly had time to consider the concern and apprehension I possessed in the beginning. But with the end of artifiact collection came the beginning of making sense of all the stories I had collected. In doing so, I realized how the design of my study - no, it was more like its emphasis - had become different from what I originally intended to do. I guess I got so wrapped up in the theory behind my prospectus that I lost sight of my real objective. What follows is the plan I devised to straighten myself out.

MORAL DISCOURSE, FOLK PEDAGOGY, AND NARRATIVE THOUGHT

"Teaching is inevitably based on notions about the nature of the learner's mind.
Beliefs and assumptions about teaching. . . are a direct reflection of the beliefs and
assumptions the teacher holds about the learner." -- Jerome Bruner

Creating the research prospectus was quite a challenge for me. What I found most difficult
was understanding how one's own perspective and the theoretical standpoint guiding the nature
and orientation of the proposed research required certain research strategies and methodologies. I
had to come to grips with such elements as ontological, epistemological, and methodological
assumptions (e.g., Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), with competing research paradigms such as
positivistic and constructivistic views (e.g., Schwandt, 1994), and with research strategies like
case study (e.g., Stake, 1994; Yin, 1984), ethnography (e.g., Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995),
and grounded theory (e.g., Strauss & Corbin, 1994). These were all very foreign concepts,
necessitating a great deal of study and countless conversations with knowledgeable others. In the
end, however, I was able to make some sense of it and design a study that would allow me access
to the information I sought.

This study design is rooted in Jerome Bruner's (1996) conceptions of *folk pedagogy* and
narrative thought. In fact, through my intrigue with these two ideas, my initial research design
ended up so heavily emphasizing a study of folk pedagogy and its relationship to culture that the
emphasis of moral discourse was seemingly consigned to a secondary role. Fortunately, my
rationale proved correct and the study produced not only a bounty of information relating to
professors' folk pedagogies, but also a wealth of insights into the moral dimension of higher
education. Despite my genuine interest in folk pedagogy and the valuable practical artifacts I have
gathered related to it, in this dissertation I relegate it to a supporting role in service of my prime
interests, moral agency and moral discourse. What immediately follows here is a detailed
discussion of the folk pedagogy concept and how it has been used to create the framework for the
study of moral agency and moral discourse. I also provide some discussion of narrative thought
and narrative analysis as the means by which I interpret and present the findings of this study.
While I define moral discourse and moral agency and explain them somewhat, I do not explore
their true depth and complexity here. Instead, I will weave those ideas among the artifacts I have
collected as I tell the story that later follows.

Recall that two main features of teaching as a moral enterprise are its relational nature and
its decision-making processes. At the university professors engage in a pedagogical relationship
with students, whereby they make decisions and take actions on the students' behalf. These

decisions are based on the beliefs held by professors about what is in the best educational interest of the students. Described in simple terms for now, a professor's set of beliefs and ideas about education - what it means and how it happens, for example - constitute a personalized set of pedagogical tenets, a folk pedagogy. When a teacher enacts their folk pedagogy in the course of educating students they inevitably engage in forming relationships and making decisions for students. This is what I refer to as moral agency, for professors are deciding what is presumably right and good for students and taking action to actualize those beliefs. I will explain this idea more later on. But this moral model raises many important questions, including: From where do these beliefs come? How might they be formed? What is their role in the moral agency of the professor? A close inspection of Bruner's (1996) notion of folk pedagogy, derived from folk psychology theory, helps to answer these questions and establish a frame for inquiry into teaching's moral dimension.

Folk Pedagogy as Moral Agency

Folk psychology relates the lay theories people hold about the workings of their mind and the minds of others, and how this is expressed in public discourse (Bruner, 1996). Folk psychologies reflect certain 'wired-in' human tendencies that allow our minds to meet, to establish connection, with the minds of others. For an example, one need only think about the task of explaining. It is almost an intuitive action that when attempting to explain something to another person, we imagine or speculate on what prior knowledge that person might have that will assist our explanatory efforts. Of course we do not always consciously select this strategy, but it seems a natural response to explanatory situations to find some reference point upon which to begin the explanation. Teaching in many ways represents the same psychological problem as explanation. Accordingly, "folk pedagogy" indicates the common, everyday meanings that teachers might formulate about the craft of teaching and its relationship to learning (Bruner, 1996). Such ideas and conceptions are products of professors' beliefs and suppositions about the minds of their students. Folk pedagogy is also influenced by the meanings assigned by the prevailing educational culture, in this case the university. For professors of higher education these ideas are conceived not through formal encounter as in an education degree program, but rather through tacit means and praxis (Bruner, 1996). Inevitably, though, what is implicitly defined, projected, and rewarded by the local educational culture will be what is foundational in personal folk pedagogies. In this way, university faculty possess a shared public knowledge of teaching that influences individual folk pedagogies.

While college teachers possess a folk pedagogy, in most cases they are not required to formally study pedagogy before practicing it, as do their teacher colleagues in public schools.

Thus their theories and beliefs, catalysts of educational possibility, most often do not reflect structured experience with formal pedagogical tenets. Instead they have more "home-made" ideas formed through tacit second-hand encounters with teaching (Richardson, 1996). This situation suggests practical implications. Among others, Zeichner and Gore (1990) have illustrated how "folk" theories influence the way individuals approach teaching. Explaining this "folk" conception in more certain terms, Bruner (1996) indicates that "beliefs and assumptions about teaching ... are a direct reflection of the beliefs and assumptions the teacher holds about the learner" (pp. 46-47) and that "a teacher's conception of a learner shapes the instruction he or she employs" (p. 48). Familiar metaphors of teaching and learning abound: "students as empty containers awaiting their fill," "teachers as executives, therapists, or liberators," "students as gardens to be nurtured and cultivated," or even teachers as trainers and students as a "workforce" to be trained and employed (Fenstermacher & Soltis, 1986; LeFrançois, 1997). These ideas are not offered here for judgment, but posed rather to begin illustrating how folk beliefs and educational culture guide educational decisions, thus impinging on the moral dimension of teaching and learning.

Of course professors' pedagogical knowledge is not a steady-state phenomenon. Over time, professors learn about teaching and learning either by brute trial and error, informal collaboration with colleagues, encounters with the plenitude of guide books offering "teaching tips," and/or through participation in formalized professional development activities (e.g., McKeachie, 1990, 1994). Still, it is reasonable speculation that what professors ultimately develop as pedagogical knowledge are likely only familiar lay theories and comfortable instructional techniques. Moreover, because of the high status of research in the universities and the emphasis on professionalism, a concern is that many professors may not recognize teaching's somewhat more subtle moral dimension (Boyer, 1990; Wilshire, 1990). Therefore, this study explores both the pedagogical and moral realms, with an interest in the degree to which and in what form professors might develop an understanding of teaching as a moral enterprise. Because the impetus and direction of professors' evolution toward effective teaching is likely to resemble the meanings of teaching and learning established by the educational culture within which they teach, I expect that their moral discourse will in some way reflect these exogenous influences. For while meanings reside in the mind, they have their origins in culture (Bruner, 1996). Professors' folk pedagogies, including their perception of the moral dimension, are syntheses of personal beliefs and cultural meanings.

Referring to folk psychology, Bruner (1996) discusses this synthesis as the place where culture shapes our agentive selves, giving rise to a "personhood" construed for public meaning and understanding. Related to folk pedagogy and college teaching, this space is the intersection of faculty folk theories regarding teaching and learning and the established meanings of the university as culture. This is where "possible-professor" meets "teaching effectiveness" as it is culturally

defined; the place where *professorhood* is synthesized (Bruner, 1996).[4] Professorhood is the public demonstration of what has been transacted between individual professor and educational contexts. And so, a teaching practice is the actualization of this transaction.

Professorhood, no doubt, has a moral dimension that can aptly be termed the moral agency of the professor (Long, 1992; Wilshire, 1990). Moral agency is how a person comes to act or respond in a given situation with respect to their own moral virtues or imagination (Blum, 1990; Sockett, 1990) . Moral agency concerns itself with how a person sees or perceives the morally salient features of some situation, how she or he deliberates (reasons or imagines) over the matter, and how the agent responds or acts as a result (Blum, 1990; Johnson, 1993). Moral agency can often be seen in the words and the deeds of professors as they go about delivering their respective courses. Thus, if one wants to better understand professors' conceptions of teaching as a moral endeavor, she or he can look at moral agency as one feature of professors' teaching practices.

If *professorhood* is professors' acts of teaching and the cultural meanings and conceptions that inform those acts, then examination of their discourse and practice should begin to tell about the meanings professors ascribe to teaching and the beliefs that guide decisions made about their practice (Johnson, 1993). The practice of teaching comprises many acts, practically all of which have some moral potency. There are the acts of instruction, acts of evaluation, acts of communication, acts of relationship, problem-solving, planning, and so on. Of these, acts of instruction - or methods and manner of instruction - are morally most obvious, pervasive, and telling (Fenstermacher, 1990; Jackson, Boostrom, & Hansen, 1993; Purpel & Ryan, 1983). Choice of instructional method communicates something about a conception of the learning process. Bruner (1996) provides explanation:

> [T]he emerging thesis is that educational practices in classrooms are premised on a set of folk beliefs about learners' minds, some of which may have worked advertantly toward or inadvertently against the child's own welfare. They [folk beliefs] need to be made explicit and to be reexamined. Different approaches to learning and different forms of instruction - from imitation, to instruction, to discovery, to collaboration - reflect differing beliefs and assumptions about the learner - from actor, to knower, to private experiencer, to collaborative thinker. (p. 49-50)

---

[4] - Practically speaking, professorhood constitutes more than just teaching; there are also the broader aspects of research and service. For this study, I am content to engage in the more literal definition of one who teaches or professes special knowledge.

Developing that line of thinking further, Bruner identifies four major models of learner's minds that have dominated the research scholarship. In describing each model he makes explicit the assumptions about functions of the learner made by each paradigm. For example, in the model "Seeing children as learning from didactic exposure: The acquisition of propositional knowledge" some key underlying assumptions include: In didactic teaching the premise is that learners should be presented with facts, figures, principles, and rules of action; procedural knowledge is assumed to simply and naturally follow from the propositional. Likewise, in the "Seeing children as thinkers" model, learners are regarded as capable of constructing their own conceptions of the world with the teacher's role being to guide them within the tenets of the subject (Bruner, 1996).

Though Bruner (1996) refers to teachers of children, the discourse and practices of college teachers can be examined in this same way. Observing the models of teaching employed in university classrooms can provide insight into professors' beliefs and theories about learning and teaching and, hence, their moral agency. A professor whose practice is limited to lectures, where information is, in effect, handed over and whose assignments only involve mining facts from books and articles, may conceive of learning as the product of some didactic delivery process. Likewise, the professor who engages students in various activities that promote personal discovery of course content and opportunities for integrating new material with prior experiences might possess a folk theory about pedagogy that suggests education is less about memorizing inert subject matter and more about mastering of one's own mind. In actuality, such instances will rarely be so clearly defined and certainly will not tell the whole story, they do provide snap-shots and directional signs useful for interpretation.

Although models of instruction are most expressive of beliefs and theories, other aspects of practice are revealing too. The tenor and tone of conversations between student and teacher give indication of relationship, personability, and invitedness. The demeanor, as mentioned, tells of regard for students and hints at how their role is defined by the professors. Organization of class, use of materials, availability for personal assistance, and so on all combine to "unconceal" teachers' knowledge of pedagogy and their relationship with students.

When a professors' educational discourse is examined for her or his beliefs and values about teaching and learning, a moral side is revealed (Bruner, 1990, 1996; Fenstermacher, 1986). For when professors' beliefs and values are inspected with a focus on how they shape and control the acts of teaching and learning within the classroom, these beliefs and the decisions they yield establish the direct moral relationship between the teacher and the taught. These educational decisions are made by professors' because it is believed that they will enhance the educational welfare of the student. Acts such as these are moral acts. Indeed, teachers' decisions form part of education's moral core, yet the decision making process itself is morally complex and is constituted by several important phenomenon. Thus, an inquiry into teachers' beliefs, if properly designed

and executed, will bring the investigator into moral territory. Once within this territory, however, the moral landscape is by no means an easy read (Jackson, Boostrom, & Hansen, 1993).

Jackson, Boostrom, and Hansen (1993) undertook an intensive two-year qualitative study of the moral aspects of eighteen classrooms. The intention of their work was to discover how to go about discerning those moral properties of teachers engaged in their practice. An early realization for the authors was that the expressive dimensions of what teachers do and say were replete with moral significance; all expressed in inconsistent and varied ways. Distinguishing the moral from the rest of the classroom milieu was an inevitably biased process that required developing the skill of "expressive awareness;" an ability referred to in similar terms below as moral perception. University classrooms are not nearly so fraught with moral activity as are the public schools - mostly because school teachers must exercise greater control over their students - but the university classrooms are not devoid of moral significance either (Wilshire, 1990). Still it is important to acknowledge that investigating the moral element, even in college settings, requires an awareness or an ability to "find the moral significance of matters that are commonly overlooked" (p. 120). Folk pedagogy is the construct I have used to bring to the surface the moral matters of university teaching. A discussion of what constitutes moral discourse in this study will help to make more explicit the source of professors' moral agency.

Moral Discourse

Relationships and decision-making are the two focal constituents of teaching's moral core and provide the impetus for moral agency for this study, and they both manifest and operate in innumerable ways. I refer to these myriad manifestations collectively as moral discourse. In this section my aim is to identify exemplary instantiations of moral discourse so that they are more recognizable in the reading ahead. It is also my intention to begin to show the relationship between moral agency and its actualization as moral discourse. The underlying moral theory behind these ideas have been explained in an earlier section and will be given more contextual discussion through the narratives that follow later. For now, an elaboration of discourse as a vehicle for moral expression is needed.

Discourse and Practice as Expression[5]

So far I have used the ideas of *discourse* and *practice* as if they were separate phenomena. Discourse, broadly speaking, comprises what is <u>said</u> and <u>written</u> about some matter, while practice is the <u>doing</u> of that matter (Fenstermacher, 1994). Citing elements of speech act theory (that spoken words constitute action), Cherryholmes (1988) claims that what people say predicts what they will do. This relationship is one where "no firm, stable, clear, unequivocal distinction can be drawn between discourse and practice .... Discourse, a more or less orderly exchange of ideas, is a particular kind of practice, and practice, at least in part, is discursive" (p. 8). Saying and doing are one phenomenon, speech is a form of action. Rather than using the unwieldy conjunct "discourse-practice," I use only the single term "discourse" to denote the unity of saying and doing; in this way I conceive of discourse as expressivity writ large. Viewing discourse and practice together as one construct provides a handy lens by which to inspect professors' acts of teaching for moral expression.

A moral discourse in pedagogy is founded on the premise that education is about more than merely presenting curriculum and testing for learning. It is about acknowledging and facilitating students' development of healthy and informed conceptions of self. For as Noddings (1992) says, "... we cannot separate education from personal experience. Who we are, to whom we are related, how we are situated all matter in what we learn, what we value, and how we approach intellectual and moral life" (p. xiii). In this way, a moral discourse is about relationships of all kinds, including those between professor and student, student and learning outcomes, and professor and the aims of education. One considerable challenge to the hope of finding moral discourse at the university is that there are few templates or exemplars for how it is achieved or applied within the varied contexts in which it occurs. There are no evaluative instruments for moral agency as there are for assessing teacher effectiveness. Precisely how professors might demonstrate such a discourse cannot be conclusively defined because of the particularity and contextuality involved both from the perspective of professor moral perception and from the multivariate moral contexts themselves. However, certain instantiations of moral discourse can be described.

One obvious instantiation is simply a discourse that explicitly engages moralistic language or some similar vocabulary denoting altruistic regard for others. That language might engage concepts like individuality, choice, caring, dialogue, compassion and empathy (Blum, 1994; Noddings, 1992; Purpel & Ryan, 1983; Simpson & Garrison, 1995). For instance, professors who learn and use their students' names acknowledge student individuality and affirm student

---

[5] - There are some scholars who view moral discourse as a method of moral education, a strategy for teaching morality (see Oser, 1986; Darwall, Gibbard, & Railton, 1997). Moral discourse as it is used here does not refer to moralizing methods, but rather to the collective means of moral expression engaged by professors.

identity. Similarly, when these students are invited into conversations with professors and classmates, that dialogue can convey sensitivity to viewpoint, care for participation, or a concern for creating intellectual community. Such moral practice indicates a regard for students not as objects upon whom information is heaped but as autonomous, sensitive self-constructing agents with particular interests, histories, abilities, desires, and needs. Accordingly, teachers are not described or regarded strictly as experts or keepers of sacred knowledge or beings higher on some evolutionary plane than are the students they teach. Instead, teachers who use a moral vocabulary describe themselves in partnerships with students, as more knowledgeable peers, as guides or coaches who are sensitive to and accommodating of students' individualities.

Another instantiation of moral discourse relates to how it is derived from and employed in given situations, or what is commonly called moral agency. Blum (1994) suggests that moral agency begins first with moral perception, or being able to discern the morally salient features of the situation at hand. Earlier I used the example where a parent was smoking a cigarette in the ill-ventilated space of a car with a child present. My perception of the situation was a moral one because I feel that parents ought to be more responsible for the health of their children. Most likely, few other folks would similarly perceive the situation as a moral one. Simpson and Garrison (1995) conceive a more elaborate view of moral perception, one that involves sympathetic connection with people, recognizing and responding thoughtfully to them, and imagining their best possibilities. After moral perception, follows the natural course of moral deliberation (i.e., moral imagination and reasoning) over the matter at hand, and then taking moral action toward the desired end. All of these together constitute moral agency enacted as a moral discourse.

Finally, drawing together the aspects of moral language and moral agency, moral discourse it seems to me, represents an overt demeanor, a moral attitude or frame of mind. A moral demeanor in this sense is an expression of a caring interest in students as people; it is a seeing beyond the barrier implicit in teacher-student relationships and believing that one is educating people not objects. So often higher education is accused of being impersonal, especially by students (Astin, 1993; Walsh & Maffei, 1994), relegating them to student numbers, majors, and class distinctions. Regrettably, higher education's bureaucratic nature is a rationalistic, utilitarian morality; that is, bureaucracies want to see and treat all constituents as the same, strive for impartiality achieved through rules that are blind to the particularity of individual situations. An imaginative moral attitude instead allows teachers to transcend the limitations of bureaucratic rationalistic deliberation - where normalization and efficiency supplant educational goals - and to regard and respond to students humanely (Garrison, 1997). A moral demeanor creates dialogue and connections among students and teachers, or rather between people, that places education in a personal space where individual interests, desires, and intentions reside. A moral frame of mind recognizes that education is much more than curriculum and testing, that students are more than

recipients of subject matter, and that teachers themselves are more than purveyors of specialized knowledge (Fenstermacher, 1990, 1992; Garrison, 1997).

A moral discourse, when present, is rooted in the language, agency, and demeanor of professors. It transforms them from simply trainers of the technical to pedagogues of the possible. Through a moral discourse, teachers can offer students an education on both subject matter and on self-discovery. But whether professors possess, develop, or use moral discourse will be to some degree a function of how they have transacted their personal educational beliefs with the prevailing cultural tenets of education - that is, how they have developed their folk pedagogies.

Narrative Thought and Moral Discourse

Folk pedagogy, as with folk psychology, is the means by which the members (e.g., professors) of a culture (e.g., teaching) organize their experience in, their knowledge about, and their transactions with the social world (e.g., university). Moreover, folk pedagogy expresses meanings made about teaching and learning and it can reveal moral discourse and represent professors' roles as moral agents. This is significant, for the cognitive organizing principle of folk psychology and folk pedagogy is *narrative* rather than conceptual (Bruner, 1990). That is, when professors tell of their theories and beliefs about teaching and learning, that knowledge will be presented in story form. Similarly, meanings that emerge through moral agency and expressed as moral discourse will also be organized and maintained as narrative knowledge, a knowledge retained and re-presented in storied form (Bruner, 1990; Johnson, 1993). Therefore, for researchers to understand the meanings of folk pedagogy, they must interpret professors' own stories about their teaching. Likewise, through the telling of these stories professors will relate some contextual influences and some personal beliefs that guide their thinking as moral agents.

Bruner (1990) says that "stories have to do with how protagonists interpret things, what things mean to them" (p. 51). In a like way, professors' stories have to do with how they interpret teaching and learning, what pedagogical things mean to them. Their stories are narratives, and Bruner (1986) asserts narratives are one mode the human mind uses for creating meaning and organizing knowledge. More specifically, "Narrative can illuminate purposes, plans, and goals which are the forms by which our lives have some direction, motivation, and significance for us" (Johnson, 1993, pp. 170-171). Thus narrative serves two crucial functions in this study: as a cognitive organizer of professors' experience and as a medium for expressing that experience as storied representation. This dissertation makes use of these phenomena by engaging professors' beliefs through their stories about their teaching practices and, by extension, creating entree to their moral discourse and moral agency; in effect, engaging them in their own expression of teaching's moral dimension.

In a sense, moral discourse can be conceived of as a *story in action*. An investigation of professors' moral discourse is a witnessing of stories from the past brought to present practice; thus creating the *story in action* we now see. An investigation into such stories utilizes the principles and methods of narrative inquiry, a subject now deserving detailed discussion.

Narrative Analysis: Situating and Making Sense of Moral Discourse

One way professors share their beliefs and conceptions of teaching and learning, and thus share their moral discourse, is through the stories they enact and tell. This research explores the stories of three university professors through an active investigation of their teaching practice; by talking with them about their thoughts and actions, through observations of their classroom teaching and interactions, and by examining aspects of their practice through course-related materials. Exactly how these stories become research interpretations is best explained by starting with a very brief discussion of narrative ways of knowing.

Narrative as Mode of Thought

Earlier I alluded to Bruner's (1986) conception of narrative as "one mode" our minds use to organize knowledge. He calls the "other mode" *paradigmatic* thought. Bruner explains the two:

> [paradigmatic thought] deals in general causes, and in their establishment, and makes use of procedures to assure verifiable reference and to test for empirical truth.... the narrative mode leads instead to good stories, gripping drama, believable (though not necessarily 'true') historical accounts. It deals in human or human-like intention and action and the vicissitudes and consequences that mark their course. It strives to ... locate the experience in time and place. (p. 13)

It is, however, the narrative mode which is important to this study. Narrative serves both as mode of thought and expression of cultural views. Therefore, it is through personal narratives that we construct ourselves in the world, and it is through narrative that culture establishes paradigms of identity for its members (Bruner, 1996). Folk pedagogies then are schemes of thought organized as narratives. Professors structure their conceptions of teaching and learning in a personally storied form, and if not limited in response by a narrowly worded questions, they will recount their experiences in storied form (Polkinghorne, 1995). It stands to reason, therefore, that examination of professors' narrative thoughts and beliefs related to teaching will reveal or provide access to how they see (or fail to see) and engage the moral dimension.

Narrative in Qualitative Research

Narrative inquiry as a research method employs stories to tell about human experiences and give meaning to human action. It is an effective means of research utilized across many domains of social science, including education (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994, 1996; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Johnson, 1993; Nespor & Barber, 1995; Polkinghorne, 1995). If a research enterprise seeks to understand the meanings and motivations behind specific human experiences - for example, college teachers' interactions with the moral dimension - then it seems fitting for the researcher to use a method that effectively reveals the ways teachers' give meanings to experience (Oliver, 1996). Bruner supports this assertion:

> Narrative is such a natural vehicle for folk psychology [folk pedagogy and moral discourse]. It deals . . . with the stuff of human action and human intentionality. It mediates between the canonical world of culture and the more idiosyncratic world of beliefs, desires, and hopes. (1990, p. 52)

It is probably useful at this point to make the distinction between stories and narrative. It is now widely-held convention in qualitative research that the phenomenon of experience is expressed as stories (Polkinghorne, 1995). Consequently, one method for studying those stories is commonly referred to as narrative inquiry (Bruner, 1990, 1996; Clandinin & Connelly, 1996; Polkinghorne, 1995). The power of this method lies in its ability to capture the contextual, emotional, and moral significance of particular persons engaged in particular situations. Narrative inquiry allows an investigator to collect what Garrison (1997) refers to as "sympathetic data" - data derived from the recognition and perception of the unique desires, dispositions, dreams, and hopes of others. When using such a mode of inquiry there are multiple methods for collecting narratives that can, singularly or in combination, yield insights into participants' experience (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994). This study will use several such methods to collect professors' stories and re-present them in textual form.

Narrative as Text

Discourse, as related earlier by Cherryholmes (1988), constitutes things said and done; narrative evolves naturally there from. It is inevitable that in the conduct of thorough research "things said and done" must be transformed into "things written" to better preserve memory. In most all cases, texts must be created to retain the potentially vast information that is conveyed through spoken words and observed actions. These texts typically take their first iteration from transcripted audio tapes that have captured things said, or from hand-written notes scribbled to record things heard, seen, thought, or felt. Clandinin and Connelly (1994) refer to these data

sources as *field texts*, the term I shall adopt here. Field texts can be developed from various information collection methods including oral histories, journals, observations, work products, letters, interviews and conversations, and so forth. In this study, field texts were generated from professor discourse, primarily through interviews and classroom observations.

Narrative Analysis of Moral Discourse

Polkinghorne (1995) distinguishes between two different ways of analyzing narratives: paradigmatic analysis of narrative and narrative analysis. In the case of paradigmatic analysis of narrative, stories are collected as artifacts and then <u>deconstructed</u> into "themes that hold across the stories or in taxonomies of types of stories, characters, or settings" (p. 12). As the name of the process implies, paradigmatic analysis of narrative engages Bruner's paradigmatic reasoning to discover, separate, classify, and summarize story data. Narrative analysis, on the other hand, utilizes events and happenings as artifactual sources that are then constructed into a story. The distinguishing feature of this method is use of plot, around which artifacts are configured. A more detailed discussion of narrative configuration can be found in Appendix A - Methodology. The present study utilizes narrative analysis to construct a story of moral agency and moral discourse as it is revealed by the three participant teachers.

Narrative Analysis

A narrative analysis is more than a mere amalgamation of events into linear sequence, rather it requires the researcher to discover or develop a plot by situating and finding relationships between events or happenings and actions (Oliver, 1996). In a seemingly strange procedure, narrative analysis begins with the story's ending (Polkinghorne, 1995). The university professors participating in this study reveal folk pedagogy and moral discourse well before I, as investigator, come to the scene. What is witnessed through discourse is the product of transaction between personal and cultural pedagogies. The "end" of the moral discourse story, as I find it, is then analyzed to derive clues to its earlier parts. "From its conclusion, the researcher retrospectively views the data elements in order to link them into a series of happenings that led to the outcome" (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 18).

Field texts serve to uncover the "events or happenings" that constitute this story. As these texts are collected, they are analyzed for their "temporal" station within the story's plot. Once so arranged, contributing pieces to the story's outcome are identified. According to Bruner (1990), narratives arise naturally out of the dialectic between culture and personal beliefs and theories; indeed, the relation among the two conditions is an explanation given as story.

Stories seem to be designed to give the exceptional behavior meaning in a manner that implicates both an intentional state in the protagonist (a belief or desire) and some canonical element in the culture. . . . *The function of the story is to find an intentional state that mitigates or at least makes comprehensible a deviation from a canonical cultural pattern.* It is this achievement that gives a story verisimilitude [emphasis in original]. (Bruner, 1990, p. 49-50)

By examining the language of field texts and its situation within the story's context, some inference can be made about the role and nature of the moral discourse encountered.

Having arranged field texts into their temporal spaces, the investigator can begin the process of identifying emergent themes that shape the story. Polkinghorne (1995) discusses seven guidelines for establishing adequacy in narrative analysis. These follow the elements of story - plot, characters, and setting - and range from considerations of culture context to dispositions of actors and to issues of plausibility and understandability. Additional criteria for ensuring the quality of interpretive research, such as narrative analysis, is offered by Lincoln (1996). Each of her criteria is "relational - that is, they recognize and validate relationships between the inquirer and those who participate in the inquiry" (p. 8). Of particular significance to this study are "positionality, " "voice," "critical subjectivity," and "caring." These criteria work to ensure that data derived from an investigation are, as Garrison (1997) advises, sympathetic. Guidelines such as these are followed in this study to ensure that descriptions and interpretations fairly represent the moral discourse encountered, and to ensure proper configuration of the moral discourse story.

This study endeavors to tell a coherent and plausible story of moral discourse among three university professors. Meanings disclosed from field texts are related across the story's characters to establish the major themes that drive the plot. The intent is for this story to reveal through professors' narratives and teaching practices some understanding of their moral agency and moral discourse as demonstrated through their folk pedagogies. Construction of both field texts that inform this story and the story itself are co-constructed narratives. These constructions always bear some difference from actual happenstance as a function of researcher interpretation and retelling. The research program has been designed and executed in a way that attempts to ensure that interpretations give the fairest representation of the people, conditions, and events encountered. To ensure that my interpretations were fair and accurate, this dissertation received in-depth confirmational review by each of the three study participants. The specific details of methodology and verification are elaborated more fully in Appendix A - Methodology.

Interview and observation transcripts became like added appendages on my body. Seems everywhere I went I had a bundle of papers, colored markers, and the glazed-over, maniacal look

of a man coding artifacts. For those who have not had the experience of their very being having been bound to hundreds of pages of artifacts, where each page presents interpretive possibility, it is a lonesome and lost period of existence. What made this study difficult was not just its bi-planar nature where on one axis I was trying to make sense of the folk pedagogies I encountered through teacher narratives, and on the other axis I was also trying to identify moral significance within what was presented. Instead what became most difficult was looking at these two planes of information not as separate and distinct, but looking at them together. I had to view these three folk pedagogies as moral discourses.

It sounds like a fairly simple task as I casually mention it here. But this is not the case at all. For in order to view some other person's situation - in this cases their situations as teachers at a university - the investigator must be able to imagine themselves in that situation. It is not enough to view casually from a distance because so much meaning is embedded within the context of the happenings. In the moral realm, the investigator needs to not only observe the goings on, but also must imagine the feelings and thoughts of the person in the situation. To make as honest an interpretation as possible of some other person's situation is to employ moral imagination, where the sympathetic imaginer tries as best as possible to be in that situation him or herself. To make an interpretation of what one participant felt and thought about while regularly teaching hundreds of students at once, I tried to imagine myself, with as much authenticity as I could muster, in that position. Imagining the nervousness, frustration, exhilaration, complexity, challenge and all else that seemed fitting for the situation gave me a much deeper appreciation of the meanings that teacher created for him or herself in that situation.

So it turns out that I actually practiced moral imagination in order to try to best appreciate the moral situations of my participants. Granted, I could never know the true meanings each them found for themselves, but I felt I was closer to them than if I merely reported objectified artifacts. To encourage my moral imagination I returned to a class project I once prepared where I explored my own thoughts and feelings about my own teaching. This work gave me a sense of the same sort of moral portrait that I hoped to create here about moral agency and discourse in higher education.

EXPLORING MORAL DISCOURSE AMONG THE PROFESSORATE

"The ethical self does not live partitioned off from the rest of the person."

-- Nel Noddings

A couple of years ago I wrote a paper that revealed some of my own folk pedagogy and exemplified my own moral discourse. At the time, of course, I didn't know that's what I was doing. My objective was simply to reflect on my own beliefs and visions of teaching and learning, to try to articulate for myself what I valued most in my teaching practice. This exercise was significant because it was my first major step toward resolving the tensions I felt from previous teaching experiences. Writing that paper initiated an endeavor to discover that which I felt was missing in my practice of teaching, for I knew deep down that there was more to it than simply to plan-instruct-assess. The paper was unimaginatively entitled "A 'Self' Analysis of Educational Concepts." I only recently recognized it as my own personal disquisition on moral discourse.

My conception of good teaching was recast after that introspective activity. Good teaching to me, I discovered, involves more than effective guidance toward the successful mastery of subject matter content. Good teaching, to me, is understanding that the truly important lessons are not always about course content and are rather often about personal content - that is, creating our own personal understandings of ourselves and attempting to facilitate individual sense-making of our encounters with the world. I see education less as a means to learn inert, subject-bound facts and more as the means to learn our "self." That is not to say subject matter is unimportant. In this scheme, the subject matter is the medium through which "self" learning takes place, one without the other is difficult and boring. But, to me, good teachers use their subjects as the fulcrum by which students are "levered" toward learning the concepts of the course on their way to learning a little bit more about themselves. Good teachers create learning environments in which students are assisted in learning along these two dimensions of subject and self.

What became apparent through that exercise was a clear recognition that my teaching is a moral action; its moral nature cannot be escaped, especially if one assigns themselves the pedagogical task of helping others to learn about themselves. Given this realization, I recognized how important are my perceptions of morally potent situations and how important is my imagination in pursuit of desirable educational ends. My struggle as a teacher thus engenders exercising moral perception, moral imagination, and moral action within my teaching practice. Like most all teachers, I desire good ends for my students; and like me, I suspect, other teachers may not always be cognizant of the moral agency involved in actualizing those things truly desirable. This seems a struggle shared among all teachers, including those who join me in this narrative.

Since that writing I have continued to be reflective about my teaching, slowly discovering my own folk pedagogy. Through an evolving understanding of the moral complexity of classrooms and the moral essence of teaching, I have been able to better grasp my own moral agency and moral discourse. My personal moral perceptions - that is my habit of detecting from given contexts those things deemed morally salient - became more carefully cultivated through this process. So too did my moral imagination - I now feel better able to appreciate the plights and pleasures of others through active empathetic imaginings. No doubt, these reflective habits have also aided me in my study of the moral dimensions of other teacher's practices.

The story of moral agency and moral discourse that follows has not been related to me directly, and what you will read is not an account of some singular foregone experience. Instead, this story has emerged on its own through my observations of and conversations with the teachers in this study participants. I have made every effort to be as faithful as possible to those original narratives and their contextual meanings. My specific efforts to preserve the intended meanings presented to me through professors' narratives are discussed in the latter part of the previous chapter and also in Appendix A. What needs to be made clear at this point is how these narratives have been presented here; how, through the process of narrative analysis, they have come to tell one story of the moral dimension of professors' folk pedagogies.

Discourse Dynamics

The story told here of the moral dimension of folk pedagogy in higher education is a complex one. In pursuing the moral element of these teachers' narratives, it became apparent that the larger educational discourse of these professors - the amalgamation of their words, ideas, and actions into their teaching practices - was composed of several distinct discourses commingled together. Although my search was focused on only moral discourse, I, in fact, found four additional discourses, described below, that were common among each of the participants. Taken together these five discourses weave the overall educational discourse which tells a story of higher education writ large: professors are experts in their respective fields; they teach their special knowledge to young adults; these students at some point choose to major in a particular field of study; classes are commonly referred to as lectures denoting the traditional instructional mode; and so goes the story. When the level of examination moves from the larger educational discourse to its individual constituent discourses, however, a completely different story emerges.

A closer look at the words, ideas, and actions that constitute each discourse discloses particular subtle mindsets or mentalities that provide the impetus of the respective discourse. For example, in the first discourse explored, what I call the *personal discourse*, the participant professors give narrative accounts of experiences that possess a distinctive personal quality; that is,

stories that are rarely told publicly and reflect meanings made at a more intimate and personal levels. Personal discourses relate participants' experiences as students themselves, they reveal accounts of family, and they illuminate personal interests and desires. Despite its personal nature, this discourse finds its way into the professors' teaching practices - reveals a little about folk pedagogies - and it also demonstrates what I will explain later as a discursive kinship to the moral discourse. Similarly, the *professional discourse* exhibits particular conceptions of education that are remarkably oriented toward specific professional fields, notably business and engineering in this study. The other two discourses beyond the moral discourse relate to institutional influences on professors' pedagogies - what I term the *institutional discourse* - and the *academic discourse*, through which they articulate particular ideas and beliefs about teaching, learning, and the relationship between the teacher and the taught.

Although in my examination I appear to separate out these discourses, in reality they are intricately woven together and must be understood as integrated pieces of the whole educational discourse. This means that they all work together in mutual reinforcement, each helping to form and inform the other. As an example, framed within the personal discourse are brief stories of what these professors individually recall as features of good teaching from their experiences as students. It turns out that through the academic discourse these professors relate many of those same features as constituents of their own practices. Despite their knitted relationship, the discourses are individually identifiable primarily by their particular effect on how each professor conceptualizes her or his practice. For example, the engineering curriculum is designed to ensure that students pass the professional engineering examination after they graduate. This profession-based influence affects both what engineering professors teach and how they go about it. Professors of engineering might limit their ideas about teaching engineering to those that make obvious and direct contributions to passing the professional examination, a convergent conception of education. By contrast, the field of philosophy is not constrained by such profession-related demands and so is more accommodating to innovative techniques and topics. Philosophy professors might have more divergent and expansive ideas about teaching their subjects.

No one discourse tells the whole story of a particular professor. To gain some idea of an individual's overall folk pedagogy, all the discourses must be examined and considered together. Moreover, while I relate the narratives of each discourse here, my story is limited to only those words, ideas, and actions I encountered through my study. My story here does not tell the whole story of each professor. It is a story that is limited by time, place, and context. To be sure, the participants in this study are intelligent, experienced and complex individuals. There is much more to each of them than this circumscribed study can possibly uncover. The reader should not assume that the tale told here is some final analysis of these participants. My discussions reflect only what I observed and interpreted over nine weeks, no one should think that this study represents fully the

teaching practices of the professors studied. Indeed, I acknowledge that the tales I tell say as much about me as about those whose stories I relate.

It is from the starting point of the personal discourse that I will begin the story of moral discourse and moral agency. The story will continue through the subsequent narratives of the other influential discourses. Following each discourse narrative, I provide an analysis of the folk pedagogy encountered and highlight within it elements of moral agency. The larger story concludes with specific narratives of moral discourse.

Narratives of Personal Experience

Dr. Mike Monroe has been teaching twenty-two years. "I always wanted to be a teacher," he says, "I wanted to be a high school teacher originally, but uh, you know, I just kept on going to school." When he had his first business class, he "just absolutely loved it." Finally, after finishing all of his schooling he became a teacher, not at a high school, but in a university. In his long college teaching career he has taught nearly every business course offered by the college. "I love doing what I do. . . . I just love teaching. I love being with the kids. . ." he professes.

What Mike Monroe is doing this semester is teaching an introductory business course, the same one he has been teaching for the last seven years. The class is the first real business course that most of these students have had, since they satisfy most of their non-major course requirements in their first two years. Even though this spring semester Mike's class is half the size of his fall enrollment, he still has nearly 350 students. Of course with this many students class is held in a large cavernous lecture hall where his enthusiastic voice is amplified through a sound system and reverberates off stone walls.

This first night of class Mike arrives right on time. He is professionally dressed, in a casual sort of way, khaki slacks, maroon tie, and a grayish tweed blazer. He appears as a small well-dressed figure down front in the auditorium. Introducing the course, Dr. Monroe immediately reveals a sense of humor that hints at a congenial and entertaining semester in business class. His first antic could well be a paid advertisement. As he pops open a soft-drink can into his microphone, it echoes through the room. He exclaims: "God, I love Dr. Pepper!" Dr. Monroe and Dr. Pepper would regularly team up to put a smile on students' faces.

Immediately Monroe's appreciation and sensitivity for students reveals themselves through his understanding of the restrictive elements of the given learning environment. Recognizing that the class occurs late in the day, that it is quite large and in an inhospitable room, and that it is the first exposure to topics of business for most students, he insists on a simplified approach that involves conveying only course essentials. Mercifully, he relates those principles in entertaining and relevant ways and adjusts assessments to account for the depression of night classes. Despite

being the author of the textbook used in the course, Monroe distills the subject of business down into ten essential principles, or what he refers to as axioms. As he explains it: ". . . if you can somehow bring it down to them, it clicks in a lot more - it's a lot easier to understand something if you have a reference point. You know, that's part of the purpose of the axioms. The axioms kind of provide a reference point. They aren't anything that's too difficult to learn if you don't know the subject matter, and then you have that to kind of rely back on. . . ." In addition to simplification, he relates these axioms through entertaining and illustrative stories ranging from tales of his son's lemonade stand and the local video movie rental market to international business decisions for such disparate commodities as diamonds and baby food.

It is through his stories as a student that the portrait of Mike Monroe as teacher begins to take shape; that his folk pedagogy starts to become clear. As a graduate teaching assistant he was responsible mostly for leading small discussion groups and had little experience in classroom instruction. As with many professors, he has never had any formal training in pedagogy. What can be seen in his practice now is a personally constructed version of experiences he had as a student; that is, what he experienced about teaching while himself a student. "I don't know diddly-squat about teaching, or theories about it, or whatever," he confesses, "So, you know, what I've done is just plodded through things, just kinda made up ways: what works, you keep doing; what doesn't, you bag." Not surprisingly, when asked about a metaphor for teaching, he described it as Ted Williams once described hitting a baseball: "I just get up there and do what comes natural. If I thought about it, I'd never hit it." The natural thing seems to have worked for Mike Monroe as he has received several university awards for teaching excellence.

Monroe faces a challenge however. He must teach an extraordinarily large class in the most inhospitable of classrooms all the while not knowing, as he claims, "diddly-squat about

being the author of the textbook used in the course, Monroe distills the subject of business down into ten essential principles, or what he refers to as axioms. As he explains it: ". . . if you can somehow bring it down to them, it clicks in a lot more - it's a lot easier to understand something if you have a reference point. You know, that's part of the purpose of the axioms. The axioms kind of provide a reference point. They aren't anything that's too difficult to learn if you don't know the subject matter, and then you have that to kind of rely back on. . . ." In addition to simplification, he relates these axioms through entertaining and illustrative stories ranging from tales of his son's lemonade stand and the local video movie rental market to international business decisions for such disparate commodities as diamonds and baby food.

This simplified approach to teaching has its roots in Mike's own experiences as a student. As an undergraduate he attended a small liberal arts school where he found the social lessons of early adulthood, especially those learned at the fraternity, to be more meaningful than many of those lessons in the classroom. Years later after graduate school, he remembers the teachers he considered best and what made them so: "They enjoyed what they did and conveyed that excitement in the classroom." More importantly, good teachers to him did not get overly intellectual and kept the material "accessible." Mike himself preferred those classes where teachers did not question students: "It always seemed like stupid banter back and forth between a professor and a kid," he asserts, ". . . I never enjoyed it as a student, I never thought that any of the questions were particularly interesting - why not say what the heck the person is trying to say? [It] never got me to think a whole lot more that way. So I don't do that at all. Now, I will, you know, have conversations with students in class where I will say things, but it will usually be pretty darn irrelevant, and it's usually used as a technique to try and, you know, re-alert people."

It is through his stories as a student that the portrait of Mike Monroe as teacher begins to take shape; that his folk pedagogy starts to become clear. As a graduate teaching assistant he was responsible mostly for leading small discussion groups and had little experience in classroom instruction. As with many professors, he has never had any formal training in pedagogy. What can be seen in his practice now is a personally constructed version of experiences he had as a student; that is, what he experienced about teaching while himself a student. "I don't know diddly-squat about teaching, or theories about it, or whatever," he confesses, "So, you know, what I've done is just plodded through things, just kinda made up ways: what works, you keep doing; what doesn't, you bag." Not surprisingly, when asked about a metaphor for teaching, he described it as Ted Williams once described hitting a baseball: "I just get up there and do what comes natural. If I thought about it, I'd never hit it." The natural thing seems to have worked for Mike Monroe as he has received several university awards for teaching excellence.

Monroe faces a challenge however. He must teach an extraordinarily large class in the most inhospitable of classrooms all the while not knowing, as he claims, "diddly-squat about

teaching." The fact is that he does know something about teaching, and that something is his folk pedagogy. This pedagogy is a crochet of his personal history with teaching - learned while a student and over the years as a teacher - and of the cultural customs of teaching that surround him at the university. In narratives related later on, Monroe will reveal his strategies and beliefs about teaching as he attempts to convey his subject matter to such large numbers of students. More importantly, we will see that Mike's teaching situation is a morally potent one and requires that he make some careful moral decisions along the way.

The College of Business is one of the largest colleges at the university and makes a sizable contribution to the university's reputation as a leading technical research institution. Likewise, the College of Engineering, regularly ranks as one of the top undergraduate schools in the nation, and also supports the research ethos. Dr. Jill Andersen is a professor of engineering and has been teaching at the university for nearly five years. She came to this university after completing her doctoral program in engineering. Initially, she pursued a doctoral degree in agricultural engineering and then later followed her interests into her current engineering specialty. Given such a breadth of engineering knowledge and her experiences as a woman in a male dominated professional field, Dr. Andersen's narratives offer exceptionally rich insights into the folk pedagogy of higher educators.

Jill Andersen is a tall, lean woman whose appearance bespeaks her past as a college swimmer and her present enthusiasm for lunch-time work-outs. Reflecting back on her days as an undergraduate student, Jill says that collegiate sports was her most meaningful experience. From it she feels she gained a strong sense of commitment, an ethic of hard work, and skill at planning her time. These experiences also serve as reference points for setting expectations of her students. "I guess I know what students are capable of doing. . . I see they have a tendency to, you know, get by on less and less. [But] they're not going to benefit if you lower their standards . . . . I mean that's just saying that they can't do this. And that's just an injustice to them." In addition to maintaining standards for her students, she also feels like her broad engineering background is an asset to her practice in "that I'm able to explain things on a basis that maybe most people can understand." I observed her doing just this in class as she related the engineering principles to commonly recognized devices such as refrigerators and steam boilers. She also attributes her success as a teacher to "having a family of teachers . . . I think the value of education was always very strong in our family. My father was a shop teacher, and my mother a social worker. I have a very strong sense of the value of education."

When asked about what she felt made a good teacher when she was a student, Jill gives a rather elaborate response. "They were very knowledgeable, of course, about the subject. They presented things very clearly. They had a more informal [rapport] with the students. They were not *formal* formal, but they were, there's still a distinction between them . . . and they were rather

rigorous. But they were very fair as far as grading goes. . . . and they were definitely concerned about students. You know, they were punctual." Despite her apparently clear vision of education, when asked to give a metaphor for teaching she responded: "I can't really come up with something. I guess what I envision is something that's, uh, has . . . a lot of interactions and is changing all the time." A good teacher to Jill Andersen - the attributes she might have fashioned into her own folk pedagogy - involves knowing one's subject and being able to present it clearly, keeping a distinction between teachers and students, grading fairly, and being concerned about students.

Dr. Andersen has been teaching this same engineering course for the past five years. This semester she teaches two morning sections of the course, with about eighteen students in the section I observed. As with Mike Monroe, Andersen has not had any formal training in pedagogy, though she did teach several courses as a graduate student. "I think it's ironic that for . . . grade school you have to have all this education background, but to be a university professor you just take a lot of classes and figure it out!" Watching her in front of the class, she demonstrates a routine that appears to be organized, fluid, and well-practiced. It is interesting to observe what she has "figured out."

Jill Andersen's engineering class is a structured affair. As one would guess, it involves a great deal of complex mathematics and applying natural laws to specific problem sets, and classroom routines that focus on "re-producing" course content. This is in contrast to the two classes that Susan Keller teaches. Susan is an Assistant Professor of Philosophy and is teaching two courses involving the philosophies of mind, knowledge, and reality. Rather than practicing and applying rules as engineers do, students in Dr. Keller's classes are encouraged to take critical views of the subject matter and formulate their own conceptions and opinions of what they find. While Keller's classes may sound every bit as logically-oriented as Jill Andersen's, she takes a much more imaginative approach toward instruction.

Susan has been teaching at the university for five years now, and nearly every semester she teaches a large introductory philosophy course and a smaller upper level course. This semester her larger class is comprised about 250 students, and like Mike Monroe's it meets in a large, crowded lecture auditorium. Her smaller class boasts a mere fifteen students and meets in a much more comfortable traditional classroom. While Susan is more satisfied with the education she provides her smaller groups, she sees being effective with larger groups as a professional challenge:

"I mean, here is something I thought was absolutely impossible to do - teach a large class successfully. Well, damn it, I'm going to make it work."

And make it work, she does. Her large class meets as a whole group only once each week. The balance of their time is spent in smaller discussion groups or workshops, or working individually on assignments gathered from the course's website. Keller's classes are successful

because she is without question a teacher driven to create positive learning experiences for her students. Her demeanor seems to shift regularly from intense and focused to light and playful. In either case, she is, as we will see later, inviting and certainly projects concern and caring about her students. Susan Keller takes education seriously, is openly enthusiastic about her subject and her teaching, and has designed courses in ways that are innovative, pedagogically sound, and thus, effective.

Dr. Keller came to the university five years ago. As a doctoral student, she worked as a teaching assistant most of the time. She did have one occasion where she had some formal training in pedagogy, though it was specific to a particular program. Overall though Dr. Keller, like Drs. Monroe and Andersen, has had to invent her craft as she has gone about practicing it. Also like her counterparts in this study, Susan has fashioned her practice after her experiences as a student herself, and after teachers she found enjoyable or effective.

Keller started her collegiate career at a private university, but it didn't last long as she moved to a state supported school. "I didn't fit into that scene anyway, because I'm not a private school kid . . . . I was young and hostile and I was perfectly happy being anonymous in my university education, but looking back I think in many ways the university did not serve me as well as it could have by not taking an interest in me. And there are things that I can point to now that really bug me, that I work very hard to make sure doesn't happen with my students; I mean, I do what I can to rectify that scene."

Susan goes to great lengths in her own teaching practice to amend some of her unsatisfying college experiences. In each of her classes students are intellectually provoked and have the opportunity to respond straight to the teacher. Obviously in the smaller class a discussion format is a simple achievement, and she is, as a philosopher might be expected, effective at creating and maintaining the class dialogue. Also in this class students engage in electronic chats among themselves, and so the conversation is promoted through a second, less threatening medium. In her larger class, classroom dialogue is somewhat limited, by no means non-existent. As part of the "out-of-lecture" activities, students participate in smaller face-to-face discussion groups and they too utilize electronic conversation.

Watching Susan leading her class, it is difficult to ignore her enthusiasm for what she does. Though but an unimposing woman somewhat on the petite side, both her physical stature and her demeanor belie her ability to generate energy in the classroom that at once seems contagious among the students. It is obvious to me as an on-looker that this woman has a real passion for this subject and is likewise driven to share it with her class. She seems to charge the class with her fervency, speaking emphatically, pausing here and there while pondering this idea or that, writing with rapid strokes acrss the board showing how her thoughts all connect up. Remarkably, the students

resonate with her momentum and themselves become engaged in the subject and the classroom exchanges.

Such an effect is what Keller hopes for from her teaching. "The most important thing that I can bring to my students is an example of intellectual curiosity . . . . I think I can show them how to be an intellectually interested person . . . . And I think most students really don't get a good model of that." She actually takes this concept one step farther as she explains her metaphor for teaching: "I think . . . in some ways, the relationship between a student and teacher is very much like parent and child. Yeah, parenting, I think. Intellectual parenting."

In revealing her idea of teaching and learning, indeed in revealing all of the personal story she has chosen to share, Susan Keller has shared with me part of her personal life narrative. Jill Andersen and Mike Monroe have done the same. In each case, the personal narrative gives insight into those past life experiences that are currently shaping their teaching practices. More importantly for this study, these personal stories - these personal discourses - resonate with and promote the moral discourse. What makes these two discursive practices so compatible is their common engendering of interpersonal relationship and its characteristic language of personal connectivity.

The Moral Nature of Personal Discourse

Earlier it was explained that narrative is one way we organize and make sense of our life's experiences. Narrative is also the form through which we relate those experiences to others (Bruner, 1986, 1990, 1996; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Johnson, 1993). When we do attempt to share our experiences, however, we do not recount our entire life's narrative. Instead we retell some small portion of it that relates to the exigencies we perceive in the present situation. We, in effect, tell situationally related short stories (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988). The stories just related about Mike, Jill, and Susan were retold from the individual short stories those characters shared with me. But these individual short stories were contrived to fit the context and boundaries created by particular situations. In this immediate case, my main objective was to collect clues about the participants in order to describe the characters used to portray the larger story of moral agency and discourse. What I received through my efforts were the short stories that were drawn forth from the larger individual life narratives based on participants' perceptions of the parameters established by the context of my study. Had the parameters been different, or had the professors interpreted them differently, then I would have ended up with somewhat different stories.

In the context of this part of the research study, however, the teacher-characters are telling stories of their pasts as students and relating what some of those experiences bring to the present as they are now teachers themselves. This process of selecting particular past experiences to bring forth into some present situation is what Connelly and Clandinin (1988) refer to as personal

practical knowledge. For not only do we <u>retell</u> past experiences, but we apply the knowledge embedded in them toward achieving our future goals. We use personal practical knowledge, they claim, to engage the world at the practical level of everyday events - that is, how formal knowledge, personal aspirations and goals, and accumulated experience are integrated into an understanding of immediate, local situations. Personal practical knowledge is demonstrated on countless occasions in the study, but is particularly well exhibited here by reference to what these teachers bring from their past to most benefit their students now.

Mike Monroe, as a student, found classroom questioning of students more like "stupid banter ... So I don't do that at all." His classes, by his own admission and confirmed by my observations, are "monologues" where he "lays things on the table" so students can learn them. Thus, in his classes neither teacher or students raise many questions, there is little if any conversation; it is virtually one-way flow of his special knowledge to the students. Also from Mike Monroe's past emerges his preference for teachers who did not try to impress students by overcomplicating lessons and so he aims to simplify his instruction. His class lectures are indeed simplified and efficient: He provides short reviews of the previous class, he distills business principles down to essential ideas, and he illustrates these ideas with real-word examples in the form of actual business stories. More will be said later about how Monroe's current teaching practice is also shaped by teachers he liked and respected as a student himself (this feature of folk pedagogy will later be elaborated for each of these professors).

Like Dr. Monroe, Jill Andersen's personal practical knowledge guides her present teaching practice. In her earlier story Jill told how she brings an ethic of hard work as a student herself into her present life as teacher. The effect of this experience in her life is that she maintains high standards of achievement for her students. She sees it as an "injustice" to let them "get by on less." Jill explains her rationale for this feature of her pedagogy: "In the future on you're not saying, 'Oh, I can't do this.' Well, you know you can do it . . . I think we've sort of, as a society, gotten away of the benefits of, you know, putting yourself to the test. I think it's a good thing to do." And do it she does. As I look at Jill's syllabus for the coming semester I see that it is indeed challenging with lots of homework, library projects, regular quizzes, and major exams. Her class will surely learn as much about testing their own limits this spring as they will about engineering.

Susan Keller felt unserved and unacknowledged as a student. She is now determined to "rectify that scene" as a teacher. One look at the courses she designs bespeaks her ambitions. Both of the courses I am involved with are very elaborate affairs. Each involves traditional classroom meetings, but also includes discussion sections, workshops, and computer chatroom sessions. Both of these courses have world wide web-based components that allow students to choose from a smorgasbord of course activities, to work on class activities asynchronously, and to

communicate with classmates electronically. Susan Keller also tries to she bring "an example of intellectual curiosity" into the "local situation" of her classroom. Her elaborate course designs are offered to give students choice in how and what they learn about philosophy. She hopes that if students have choices in their learning they may be more inclined to intellectual curiosity themselves. As we shall see in her stories later, much of Susan's efforts in the classroom today seem stem from her experiences as a student.

This study is rife with instances of the characters demonstrating personal practical knowledge. These experiences have coalesced to form the folk pedagogies that currently guide these teachers. But the study is not about explicating these particular knowledge structures exclusively. It also seeks to illuminate their understanding of the moral dimension of teaching. To make a better connection between Connelly and Clandinin's notion of *personal practical knowledge* and the exploration of discourse practices, I have adopted slightly different terminology. In this study I use *personal discourse* to represent the expression of experiences that are personal in nature (not to be confused with "private" in nature) and that relate stories whose meanings and language are typically reserved for more intimate dialogue. Narratives of personal discourse tell about an individual in terms that are not measured for public consumption. They convey a non-public essence that suggests these are stories of some personal value that are not readily exposed, that are carefully shared in circumstances where their value can be maintained.

Personal discourse inevitably demonstrates moral elements. Because we know ourselves through our stories, our stories are laden with feelings and emotions and thus have an affective base. All stories have emotional, moral, and aesthetic content (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988). Our experiences are moral because we value them to a greater or lesser extent. These experiences may or may not be ontologically moral - like when one knowingly follows rules toward ethical behavior - but when they are related as stories they are told because they hold personal value in a given context and so have moral potency.

But, personal discourse also maintains moral significance because of the choice that is made in terms of how and to whom we express it. As I conceive it here, our personal discourse is reserved for expressing some of our experiences to trusted, familiar audiences whom we believe will share our value of and appreciation for those experiences. In this way, the personal discourse is a sympathetic discourse, for it is sympathy that motivates us to extend our "selves" to others (Garrison, 1997). It is sympathy that buttresses interpersonal understanding within the personal discourse.

What turns out to be another intriguing moral characteristic of these personal discourses, especially as they relate to teaching, is the nature of the language that is used and the types of experiences that language brings to the surface. The majority of the language employed in personal discourse is very warm, sensitive, familiar, and sympathetic. It is not technical, impersonal,

reductionistic, or jargon-laden as are many of the other discourses. The language is used to bring people together, to communicate emotion and a sense of personal value; it creates connections. It is not a language that objectifies people or events, or tries to abstract facts and content for sanitized presentation. Mike Monroe proclaims his "love" for teaching. Jill Andersen relates memories of home, of a father who was a teacher, and of the personal value of education. Susan Keller's metaphor for teaching is that of parenting, implying virtues of care, connection, nurture, and love. Each of the professors relate stories of their families, relate patently personal information, convey emotion, and engage a dialogue that seems to speak on a humanistic level - there is no jargon, no manufacturing for effect, just people telling their stories to someone listening. In this way, personal discourse reveals the essence of personal narrative and reflects peoples' views of themselves as human beings, as persons in the world with others; it teams-up with moral discourse to convey valued experience.

While expressing personal discourse, professors usually relate their experiences in a particular way using a particular language. Stories that relate experience are told in response to particular contexts. Thus, what occurs in this study is that the stories drawn out by particular contexts engage particular and distinct discourses. While the stories just related exhibit a personal discourse, the stories that follow, because of the different contexts from which they emerge, exhibit very different discursive practices. Moreover, although the personal discourse contains a moral vocabulary and results from moral choice and valuation, the moral element of other discourses is more constrained by context, sometimes seemingly excluded altogether. The discourses examined next derive from situations and contexts that tend to avoid personal revelation and offer more sterile, objectified insights.

Narratives of Professional Experience

"Business is a trade school, at least that's the way I view it" explains Mike Monroe. ". . . they've had two years of course work before they enter the College of Business, it's supposed to round them out a bit, teach them a little bit more about life . . . all during this process hopefully they're maturing and there's a lot of interaction. . . . Then they take two years' worth of pretty much concentrated course work in the College of Business, and the purpose there is so that at the end of it, uh, they're attractive employment prospects to business people. You know, you want them to have the opportunity to get a good job, the opportunity to succeed, the opportunity to do whatever it takes to achieve whatever goals they have. And the College of Business students are a bit different because they're focused on getting a job. Because, that's really what, you know, business is."

No one is likely to argue that one important mission of a college education is to prepare young adults for eventual success in some occupation. Dr. Monroe articulates this idea very clearly as it relates to students pursuing careers in business. What is most intriguing about his description is that there are apparently two separate domains of college education: that domain designed to "round them out a bit . . . teach them a little bit more about life" and that domain "that at the end of it, they're attractive employment prospects to, uh, business people." According to this scheme, Dr. Monroe operates within the domain of educating about business, about getting students prepared for employment. As for that other part of education - the rounding out part - he reports: "Well, we don't do that in, you know, the College of Business."

This isolating of the "professional" aspects of education from the "other" aspects seems very traditional in the College of Business and manifests itself in a variety of ways. One manifestation in Dr. Monroe's folk pedagogy involves formality: "I cringe when I see people that don't have something in the way of a formal relationship. . . . There's a number of the faculty members that allow kids to call them by their first name. You know, I'll let them call me 'Dr. M,' but, first name - God, I'd cringe. I'm too old to have anybody call me by the first name. You know, so . . . it's somewhat formal, but that isn't, I don't think, that unusual being in the College of Business." There are, no doubt, particular codes and customs that are necessary for success in the various professions, and formality seems to be a standout example in business. Formality is also exhibited by Dr. Monroe's fashion choice when he teaches his classes. "I wear a tie and a jacket every time," he reports. "I'm the professor, and uh, I want them to realize they're getting information from somebody that they should be respecting, and as in the College, and in business, you know, I want them to realize that dressing up is appropriate."

To Dr. Monroe this formality has a pedagogical application related to students respecting professors. Referring to the affect of formal dress in class he explains: "I think there's some respect you get in the classroom, and you certainly need it in that large a class, because you don't want kids talking, you want them to be paying attention. You know, and you can lose a class that size awfully easy if you don't have their respect. So, that's what you need. You know, you don't have to say a whole lot about yourself, they'll, you know, they know who you are." He goes on to say, "When I interact with students, I'm always dressed up. You know, the way you ought to be. Period. I don't know why. It just seems, you know, I like there being a big dividing line between me and the students."

Perhaps one pedagogical inference that can be drawn here is that formality helps to create the necessary conditions for respect. In turn, respect establishes the "big dividing line" between professor and student and that dividing line helps create those conditions necessary for class control. This scheme was elaborated further when Dr. Monroe was asked what is the most important aspect of the relationship between teacher and student.

"Uh, probably respect. You know, you respect someone, you want to do well in the class. You respect someone, you want to listen to what they're saying. You respect someone, you realize that they're probably giving you some valuable information. Uh, [pause] you know, if you don't think it's worth anything, you aren't going to do anything about it. You need the respect of the, uh, professor. You know, it's one of the valuable things about, you know, editing a journal, and writing books and those kinds of things. They're something that the students can, you know, identify with. They kind of see that there's something out there that you're doing that, that has some meaning perhaps, . . . some substance or some value where you know what you're talking about."

As with the folk pedagogies of any teacher, there is a natural instructional affect that is demonstrated in Dr. Monroe's class. There is indeed a "big dividing line" between professor and student in class, in part supported by his monologue approach to instruction. I found his class to be quite "teacher-centered", demonstrating that he alone possesses important information and the duty of students is to receive it through his words, both spoken and written in his textbook. Students were not encouraged to contribute to the educational endeavor from their own relevant experiences. Opportunities for students to make their own fresh interpretations about business was, in effect, discouraged. It seemed that the only form of knowledge that was important in this class was Dr. Monroe's form as it alone was exhibited in class. That students had valuable experiences or insights or that students might organize and make sense of course content in different but equally meaningful ways than the professor was not included into the instruction in any apparent practical way. Instruction that features monologue lecture, no choice of work assignments, and multiple choice examinations reflects a teacher-centric pedagogy and emphasizes control while effectively minimizing student participation and investment in their own education. However, we must remember that Dr. Monroe must teach under course conditions that are particularly inhospitable to many more student-centered methods of instruction. But, by his own declaration, he takes nearly the same approach to his much smaller upper-level courses, though he tries make it more personable by "teasing 'em and proddin' 'em." Still, as demonstrated by Susan Keller, class size does not absolutely necessitate teacher-centrism and Monroe's pedagogy merely reflects a larger, widely held premise that college classes featuring unidirectional information delivery is acceptable education, especially in large classes.

Professional discourse is also demonstrated by what Dr. Monroe hopes will be the outcomes of learning in his classes. He indicates, "I'm willing to, uh, teach 'em as much as I can, make sure that they're ready for their jobs when they get outta here." The profession itself, acording to Dr. Monroe, values specific knowledge. The profession rewards those students who best know its principles and how to apply them. Apparently, "rounding out" is not a critical curricular feature for professional training. But business is not the only profession that has

influence over how education is conducted, over what is important to know. For Dr. Jill Andersen, professor of engineering, her profession too holds sway over her folk pedagogy and over the education she provides to her students. She notes its role in her teaching as "huge, huge!"

"Engineering is a very traditional field," claims Dr. Andersen, "[a] very conservative field and they'll [students] probably see more of that [tradition] in this discipline than you might in more of an "arts" type of class by far, I'm sure." The tradition of this field, as Dr. Andersen sees it, touches many areas but most notably gender issues, the relationship between professor and students, and curricular and instructional matters. Regarding the latter, she remarks "Engineering is a profession and we are an accredited institution . . . so we have an obligation to meet those criteria, and so it's uh, what we go through in class and how we do things is somewhat set by the profession itself, and one of the things that I think you'll find . . . well, with a lot of teachers here is that they feel very much like they have an obligation to have the students at the end of their educational experience be competent engineers."

This tradition shows up in the classroom as well. The fact that engineering is essentially a problem-solving endeavor appears to lead Dr. Andersen toward a predominant pedagogy that regularly and repetitiously involves drill and practice on various engineering problems. During the class sessions I attended, activities centered mostly on lectures of engineering principles and subsequent application of those principles to various hypothetical problem situations. "One of the things we want to do is to teach them how to solve problems - that's what engineers do," says Andersen. Indeed, the engineering curriculum itself seems oriented toward preparing students for taking and passing the professional licensure examination they encounter after their graduation. Dr. Andersen explains: "I think probably we're a little bit more constrained because our curriculum is rather rigid as far as what the students need to know. . . . because that's their degree. I mean, that's analogous to an MD [medical doctor] - then you've gotta take the boards at the end .... So it's really not a degree so much that's important for them as much as it is being able to pass this exam." Perhaps it is for this reason that she sees the most important aspect of the teacher-student relationship as the necessity for the teacher to convey that it is not the grades that should be important to students, but learning the material. To be sure, the material is important to engineers.

In fact, it seems the material is so important to engineering education that broader conceptions of education beyond learning the trade might be at risk. "You know, that's just sort of the nature of our profession. Um, I think probably as engineers, we probably are more inbred, as far as our teaching methods, than it might be in other disciplines, because we, um, have little exposure outside of engineering; because the curriculum is very rigid, all of us who have gone through it - I think I got something like 8 quarter credits [as an engineering student herself] of things other than math, science, and engineering - So, I mean, we don't get a lot [laughs] of exposure to what the rest of the world is doing." If Dr. Andersen's perceptions are accurate, then

41

her department is highly concerned with making competent engineers. Indeed, she reports that her department is conducting an extensive survey of student graduates to assess the engineering curriculum. Jill reports that most responses indicate the curriculum has well-prepared them for their profession.

When speaking about the purpose of education, Dr. Andersen makes the distinction that there are two aspects: "One view is, I'd say, more on the enlightenment side of things, and that's probably uh, traditionally the liberal arts viewpoint. You know, to create thinkers, I guess in a sense. The other side is more . . . specific, you know. Engineering is more, um, to learn how to do specific things . . . . We learn to be problem-solvers, I think we do it in a way that they can apply it to other . . . disciplines. You'll find a lot of managers in engineers, you know, just . . . sort of a critical way of thinking, and we do quite well on that. Um, I think their education would be, oh, improved . . . if they had more of the other side [i.e., liberal arts side], you know, because pretty much their schedule is very rigid in there. So one [aspect of education] is more geared to how to do a specific task and hopefully they have enough general information. The other objective would be very broad, and just learning how to be, uh, intellectual, you know, or no other word for it." Dr. Andersen, like Dr. Monroe, sees her role as teacher to convey to her students some specific knowledge, expecting that her students will get the "intellectual" aspect - the "rounding out" part - from another arena of their education.

Dr. Andersen points out an intriguing paradox in engineering education. "Professor Engineers are notoriously theory-based and, . . . I'm probably one of those, but the way a typical professor <u>learns</u> is the exact opposite of the way we <u>do</u> things. And that's always an issue, so the students always like to see more examples, and that's something I always try to put in, and they never think it's enough, and I think it's way too much." It seems that professors have a bank of experience, an expertise, that allows them to see how the theory applies to the tangible world. So, it seems natural that they might emphasize theory - the bedrock of the subject - to the exclusion of its application since they see the applications so clearly. The students on the other hand may not be making suitable connections between the two arenas and so desire more tangible representations of theory.

This traditional framework of engineering education also involves a sensitive social situation for Dr. Andersen. As a woman in a traditionally male-dominated profession, she has adopted certain strategies into her folk pedagogy to ensure her professional success and personal satisfaction. After a half dozen observations of Dr. Andersen dressed very professionally in class, I decided to ask about her choice of fashion. "I don't wear jeans," she answers. "I've never worn jeans. I've never even worn pants to class. A lot of that comes from being a woman . . . I think you have to sort of go the extra mile in terms of [pause] that." She adds that "because I'm a woman I've had . . . when I first started I was young, and ended up with guys in the class that

would try to discredit me . . . and I've found that because of that aspect, that it's even more important that I have this [professional dress] distinction."

"Distinction" is another ingredient of Dr. Andersen's folk pedagogy. Like her colleague Dr. Monroe in business, she feels that it is necessary for educational success that there be, to borrow Dr. Monroe's terms, a "dividing line" between students and teachers. Likewise, Dr. Andersen's prefers that her students address her as either "Doctor" or "Professor."

"If a student calls you Jill," I ask her, "would you correct them?"

"Uh . . . I don't think I'd have a situation where they'd call me Jill. They've called me Ms. Andersen - I get that quite a bit, and I do correct them on that, because they don't call their male professors 'Mr. So-and-so,' it's always 'Doctor' . . . You need some bit of authority in that classroom, and that has to be there . . . . It's just a matter of respect of the position. I think it's important to do. I certainly did. I'd never, ever think of going into my classes and calling them, 'Hey, bud' [laughs]." But the formality of title is not just employed by her: "Yeah, definitely in engineering you'll find that that is more of a norm than the exception. Graduate students . . . sometimes they call me Professor Andersen, but they say Jill and I don't care, because that's more of a colleague, you're working together in a one-on-one type of thing."

While business and engineering are professions where formality, tradition, and custom oftentimes infiltrate the folk pedagogies of professors, philosophy is a non-professional field. "There's no formal professional body that would come down hard on me if I taught a lousy class or something like that," Susan Keller explains. But there is an indirect relationship to the professions: "Most of our majors here are double majors in something like engineering or business, and they just wanted to have a humanistic side to their education. Um, a lot of our majors go on to things like law school or business school, something professional . . . . I mean, we teach you how to think, so you end up being very well-prepared to do just about anything."

In an interesting contrast with her profession-oriented colleagues, Susan takes a different view of what is the most important aspect of the teacher-student relationship: "Mentoring. I think mentoring probably is, which is something we don't get to do very much of, just given the number of our students that pass through here. But I think the most important thing is, is a personal touch." She goes on to explain her idea of *personal touch*: "Well, I mean . . . [pause] it goes back to what I was saying before, that, that each student comes here with different intellectual needs, and they're going to end up going someplace different. And if I could personalize the education to each of my students, I would, because they all have different intellectual needs, and they all have different deficits that need to be rounded out. And to the extent that I can do that, that I can um, mentor the students individually, and say: 'Yeah, I understand you as an individual, and I can help you - YOU - in this particular part of your life, and this is where it's going to lead YOU', then I think that's most important thing. Unfortunately, that part of education doesn't fit well with, uh,

education for the masses situation that we have." Susan finds it difficult to mentor the 250-some students she, though she does make a variety of pedagogical adaptations to accommodate such inhospitable conditions.

Throughout our conversations and my observations of her teaching, there was little evidence of "professional discourse" in the sense of supplying some specific knowledge toward a future trade. But, it seems fair to infer that, as she suggests above, she might be a "rounding out" professional, at least in undergraduate education. She sees herself as a mentor tending to different intellectual needs of her students and their "deficits that need rounding out." She sees philosophy as a field where students learn a "humanistic side to their education." Dr. Andersen calls this task the "liberal arts view," and indicates that young engineers get it from other aspects of their education outside the engineering curriculum, acknowledging that they could use more of it. Dr. Monroe, likewise, refers to non-business education as "rounding-out" and hopes that students learn this through the broader university experience.

Perhaps the case for Susan Keller being a "rounding-out" professional for undergraduate students is best supported by her goals as a teacher: "My theory of education . . . is to give people the skills to be, um, a participating citizen in a democratic society. And that's sort of the typical answer that you'll get from all educators - but it's something I actually believe. And, I say that in contrast to what many students think they're doing when they get here, which is getting the knowledge they need to get a good job. Um, because whatever knowledge they get is going to be either forgotten, or immediately obsolete, given this rapidly changing society. So what I can give them are the tools of critical reflection and analysis so they can go out and learn what they need to learn. I can also give them a sense of where we've been intellectually, and where we're going intellectually, so that they can have some idea of how they see themselves fitting into the world. Okay, so my job, then, as a teacher to these 18 to 22 year olds, is to try to give them the skills of critical analysis, such that no matter where they go, they're gonna be able to [pause] compete successfully. And also, um, so that they'll have a deeper appreciation of who they are in a very broad sense. I mean, what it means to be human."

This philosophy is actualized by her instructional approach. The leading feature of her folk pedagogy related to students is being approachable. Susan Keller does not seek to create a dividing line between her student colleagues and herself. Approachability is conveyed in her classroom through her classroom attire - usually casual, more like how parents dress around their children - and she prefers her students call her Susan because, she says, "Dr. Keller" sounds like some television character. This informality should not be misconstrued as lacking seriousness or not establishing respect, for Susan's classes are designed for serious learning of philosophy and, accordingly, respect is earned by demonstrated care for student learning.

Although one of her classes enrolls approximately 250 students, she still manages to involve a "personal touch." As a single large group, her class meets for lecture only one hour a week. But during this period she presents subject matter and invites students into a dialogue about the meanings they make from it. In addition to the whole-group segment, the balance of the course involves two other innovative components. The first is an asynchronous aspect accessed through the course website on the internet. Tasks and assignments for this part of the course are accessed and accomplished at the students' convenience. It involves student choices of supplemental reading assignments, on-line discussions, and reflective writing opportunities. Keller monitors and participates in the electronic discussions herself and has seen that this forum draws many more people, especially women, into meaningful conversations than what ordinarily occurs in class. Students engage each other in intellectual exchange and debate about class material and share their own meanings made from it. The second aspect provides students with choices of special topic "mini-courses" which they select from among a handful of options. These mini-courses are offered at various times to accommodate students' preferred learning times. Assessment of student performance in the course involves mostly written assignments such as essays and research papers, for Keller does not see much value in objective testing.

Susan's course provides opportunities for students to "discover" knowledge rather than have it "delivered" to them. The lecture-discussion sections serve to provide basic concepts and set the course's structure. However, the variety of activities that exist outside that structural component encourage student reflectivity, critical and creative thinking, expression and debate, give students choice in their learning, and engage them through multiple learning modalities such as written assignments, video reviews, oral and electronic dialogue, and presentations. In addition to these activities, there are also regular help sessions each week and extra-curricular workshops through which students can get assistance with writing skill development.

I must mention that there is an alternative view of philosophy as a profession beyond my contrived idea of its "rounding out" role in the university scheme. Susan explains: "Certainly it's [professional philosophy] different in a lot of ways between engineering and business . . . in that if you graduate with an advanced degree in engineering or business, you can go into industry, and most of 'em do. If you graduate with an advanced degree in philosophy, you're gonna go to academia, or flip burgers. So, there is, I think, a bigger interest in education per se, maybe, in professional philosophers than there are in professional engineers or people in business. Because all of our [graduate] students are going to end up being teachers if they stay in the profession. And that's all we do. So, no one is in this except because they want to at least in part be an instructor." Thus part of the specialized philosophy knowledge that is conveyed, at least to graduate students, is a knowledge of instruction. This proposition is expanded more thoroughly in the discussion of institutional influences that follow.

Professional discourse is an essential part of higher education to be sure, for it comprises much of the language and customs that students must learn to negotiate their way through the careers that follow college education. But in thinking about the professional influence on folk pedagogies, there are questions that surface in my mind with respect to my own teaching practice. What affect does it have on how education is conceived? In what ways might it influence how teachers create opportunities for learning? What role does "professional pedagogy" offer students in the educational enterprise? These, of course, are not questions asked for the first time in educational inquiry. However, they are questions of a moral nature and suggest some intriguing propositions for understanding folk pedagogy.

A Moral View of Professional Influences on Folk Pedagogy

Professional and disciplinary fields, as constituents of educational culture, influence the folk pedagogies of the professors in this study. These influences manifest in several consistent ways: 1) what the professors value as primary outcomes of the education they provide; 2) the instructional methods and manners employed toward the educational endeavor; and 3) how they perceive some of the necessary elements in classroom relationships with students. An examination of each of these areas of influence reveals, to a limited extent, some of the formulated beliefs these teachers hold about how teaching and learning are accomplished. Moreover, each of these influences have particular moral potency which, when examined within the context of folk pedagogy, highlights some of education's moral foundation.

Both Drs. Monroe and Andersen appear to see their roles as educators primarily in terms of possessing and delivering specialized knowledge. This seems a natural vision since they both teach at a prominent research university where specialized technological knowledge is seemingly cherished above all else. Consistent with the university mission, its professors are charged with creating and disseminating that knowledge. But, as demonstrated in numerous instances elsewhere in this study, both Drs. Monroe and Andersen understand that a college education is about more than just the parceling out of professional tenets and customs. Strikingly, though, they see the other non-professional part of education, the "rounding out" part, as the responsibility of others; presumably others with their own specialized "rounding out" kind of knowledge, like Dr. Keller.

One apparent effect of professionalization on folk pedagogy, at least as revealed from these cases, is that it leads to compartmentalized thinking about educational responsibility. Compartmentalized education reflects a presumption that each class exists alone in the world, that courses and disciplines do not share common ideas or applications. For example, it is commonplace to teach mathematics as a subject isolated from its practical applications or its relationships with other subjects. That mathematics comes alive in physics, chemistry, biology, or

music is, it seems, rarely an instructional objective of math teachers. While compartmentalizing seems an efficient division of labor toward educating students, what seems to be missing is the realization that, while specialized knowledge is easily contained in the classrooms of specialized professors, "rounding out" knowledge occurs everywhere, <u>even</u> in the classrooms of specialized professors (Fenstermacher, 1990; Jackson, Boostrom, & Hansen, 1993). "Rounding out" as it has so far been discussed here means college education beyond the major field of study, implying the liberal arts aspects of university education. But is there not more to "rounding out" than knowledge of the arts and humanities? Do we still not expect students to learn honesty, community, tolerance, compassion, and a host of other moral virtues that do not register in any curricula? If so, then to whom is this task left? Into which compartment of education does it fit? Of course, the answer is that it is left to all university teachers, it fits into all compartments. It is an unavoidable task of the college teacher to engage moral virtues and to "round out" students on moral matters. Recall Fenstermacher's (1990) assertion that "the teacher's conduct, at all times and in all ways, is a moral matter" (p.133). He or she may not teach moral lessons directly, may not even intend to, but by manner of action, by rendering of decision, by creating relationships, all professors teach these subtle, tacit moral lessons (Clark, 1990; Fenstermacher, 1990; Jackson, Boostrom, & Hansen, 1993). Fenstermacher makes this very important point:

> Just as teachers possess a manner that defines the moral character of their teaching, so learners possess a manner that identifies their moral development... Teaching is a moral activity not simply because teachers exercise authority and control over those in their care.... it is a moral activity because teachers have a specific responsibility for the proper and appropriate moral development of their students. (1990, p.135)

Another insight related to professional influence on folk pedagogy seems to involve its effect on instructional style and expected learning outcomes. Professors who might view themselves as experts in possession of special knowledge risk also seeing education as merely delivering that knowledge to students. In such a scenario, it is possible, maybe even likely, that students memorize the course material but learn very little in terms of how to critically assess it, how to relate it to prior experiences, or how to recall it in any form other than that in which it was delivered. Barr and Tagg (1995), providing a useful rubric for analyzing teaching models, refer to this delivery effect as the "instructional paradigm," where the teacher's purpose is to instruct students to learn material. This method is adequate indeed if the goal of the educational experience is to "re-produce" the teacher's knowledge within the student. Successful learning in this paradigm involves only the student "re-producing" knowledge for the professor in nearly the same form it was received. Such a concept of teaching and learning is contrasted by what Barr and Tagg

refer to as the "learning paradigm," where the teacher's purpose is to produce learning, where knowledge is regarded as co-constructed by teacher and student, and where students are enabled to apply it to future endeavors. Wilshire (1990) affirms this dichotomy through etymological reasoning:

> There is genius in the Latin word *educere* - to lead out, or draw out. It contrasts richly with *instruere* - to build in. The educator leads students out to confront basic questions, while the instructor merely builds in information and techniques, answers to questions that each person need not ask anew.... We are talking about *education*, to lead out or draw out by exciting students so that they freely initiate the learning process and bring to bear their own energies and responsibilities: 'This is what it means to others- what might it mean to me?'" (p. 22)

The moral element of such educational paradigms - to continue with Barr and Tagg's (1995) conceptions - relates to consideration of the student's role in learning. Earlier it was asserted that the moral core of teaching, at least as it is viewed in this study, involved decisions made by one person on behalf of another. In selecting a particular paradigm, be it an "instructional" one or a "learning" one, a teacher has decided one mode to be in the better interest of the student than the other. If that teacher's goals of education are merely to impart specialized knowledge, then an instructional paradigm may suffice. However, if the teacher hopes to impart specialized knowledge in a way that enables the student to benefit beyond just memorizing inert content, then a more effective pedagogical strategy would be to involve the student in her or his own mental construction of content matter instead of simply adopting the professor's conception.

It is interesting to consider the difference between how professors learn and test their own knowledge and how they require the same of their students. Professors take a very public approach to their learning. They expose their knowledge in public forums, submitting it to the scrutiny of their peers. Their knowledge is discovered, discussed, debated, and generally formulated through these public exchanges. However, some often tend to arrange learning experiences for their students that are mostly passive and devoid of dialogue, where the knowledge is always accepted as true with little debate to test and share differing views.

One last professional influence on folk pedagogy as seen here suggests that the relationship between professor and student is of necessity hierarchical, where the professor occupies some exalted position which students must respect. The concepts encountered in the earlier stories were "dividing line" and "distinction" and "authority," and they function to ensure this understanding of who is exalted and empowered and who is not. Not surprisingly, the "dividing line" is also a feature of hierarchical management systems present in professional organizations of all kinds. At their essence, hierarchies are nothing more than power structures. Hierarchies in classrooms

simply denote who is "power-full" and who is "power-less" (Wilshire, 1990). In pedagogical terms, power is a relationship (Cherryholmes, 1988); it establishes those in control of learning and those controlled for it. This relationship potentially places students in passive receivership roles where they simply accept the knowledge that is promulgated without questioning, debating, or discovering anything about it. These arrangements were clearly operating in Dr. Monroe's class where opportunities for questions were effectively discouraged and an image of professor as authority persisted. In a similar way, this same condition existed in Dr. Andersen's class where professional formality and her dominant role in class left students relatively unempowered in the day-to-day activities of the class. Power, when it is used to control and divide, inevitably results in *instruere*, in the instructional paradigm, and effectively blunts *educere*, or education (Wilshire, 1990).

The "dividing line" also establishes what Fenstermacher (1990) refers to as the social distance between teachers and their "clients." Medical doctors are nearly always referred to as "Dr. So-and-So" and they tend to confine their relationship with their clients to the particular ailment in question. Attorney's too tend not to engage clients beyond the facts specifically related to the case. Such cool detachment among teachers fails to see students as individuals with their own unique perceptions, interests, and skills for making meaning out of their encounters with the world. Such distance and division between the teacher and the taught risks over extending the sympathetic connection that is necessary to "draw out by exciting students so that they freely initiate the learning process and bring to bear their own energies and responsibilities" (Wilshire, 1990, p. 22). To draw students out by exciting them necessitates knowing them, having some idea of what it is that excites them, or at least being sensitive and responsive when students communicate such things. Education, as Wilshire terms it, requires connection between teachers and students.

Sympathetic connection transcends the "dividing line." It renders power distinctions unnecessary, and it promotes a paradigm of learning rather than one of mere instruction. Sympathetic connection involves self-transcendence and allows teachers to see others like ourselves, having unique interests, desires, and needs (Simpson & Garrison, 1995). Seeing others as unique, as like ourselves, involves moral perception, the capacity to identify morally salient features of particular persons and situations. Moral perception in classrooms requires teachers to view things from the perspective of the students. Moral perception can lead to educational decisions that are underwritten by care, compassion, and empathy rather than impersonal information delivery and reductionistic educational cost-benefit analysis. Garrison (1997) contends that "moral perception provides insight into the needs of students that is very different from cognitive critical judgments or mere calculations alone" (p. 177), and that moral perception is essential if the educative endeavor is to be learning centered.

Although I have propounded the powerful sway of the professional discourse here in this section, there are four other discourses that also operate in this study. While the professional discourse appears to be devoid of moral perception, each professor here demonstrates the capacity for moral perception as a feature of their practice through at least three of the other discourses. Susan Keller illustrates this idea as she remarks "that each student comes here with different intellectual needs, and they're going to end up going someplace different. And if I could personalize the education to each of my students, I would, because they all have different intellectual needs, and they all have different deficits that need to be rounded out." Recognizing differences, seeing students as individuals with unique futures, and creating classroom opportunities for individual exploration all demonstrate moral perception. We will see rather profound instances of moral perception by both Jill Andersen and Mike Monroe as the additional discourses are examined.

Few are likely to question the necessity of specialized knowledge purveyors, but all teachers must recognize the importance of their role in the inherent "rounding out" of our students. To impart only the essential tenets of a trade or profession is to merely provide professional training, and to believe that one's teaching only involves conveying specialized knowledge is to ignore the unavoidable intrinsic moral "curricula" of education. Kerr (1987) explains the idea like this:

> In educating, the teacher is carrying out the moral responsibility of teaching. That is, in attending to the student's development as an autonomous, critical agent, the teacher is helping develop a requisite of moral agency. The understanding that beliefs and values can and should emerge from disciplined thought and not "mere opinions" liberates a person from the grip of prejudice and bias. It is, then, teachers' moral responsibility not just to introduce students to the forms of knowledge as the disciplined ways with which others inquire and structure experience [e.g., specialized knowledge] but also to help all students understand the importance of making their own choices as well on the basis of disciplined beliefs and values. That is, to act as a moral agent is to assume oneself the role of critical inquirer. Hence, the teacher is responsible not only for introducing students to the forms of critical inquiry but also for inviting and encouraging students to demand such disciplined thought of themselves. (pp. 35-36)

A case was made earlier that nearly everything a teacher does related to their practice carries moral weight. The teachers that recognize and respond to accordingly are able to simultaneously convey both specialized knowledge and the rounding-out knowledge of "disciplined thought." Professors

who perceive education as a moral endeavor, recognize its morally salient features, have opened themselves to make decisions and take actions as cognizant moral agents.

Professional influences on folk pedagogy are akin to another set of influences discovered through these professors' stories. An earlier discussion related how Bruner (1996) conceived of folk pedagogies arising in part from the prevailing educational culture. It is thus a natural expectation to find that the extant institutional culture would yield some influence over the teaching practices of its professors. In the next narrative, Jill Andersen, Susan Keller, and Mike Monroe lead this study into an examination of institutional influence on folk pedagogy as they relate their unique perceptions and experiences from teaching in their respective departments and within the university.

Narratives of Institutional Experience

It is never easy to clearly define the boundaries of an institution in the largest sense of the term. What are the boundaries of the institution of education, or of economics, or justice? Here I will refer to two levels of institutional influences on folk pedagogy: the department and the university. Each of these constitutes a separate yet related culture and therefore inevitably works to shape teachers' conceptions of their craft.

The top priorities of the Philosophy Department, says Dr. Keller, are "aiming for better Masters programs . . . there's interest in developing people's research programs, supporting that in every way they can. And then, there's also a high priority placed on good teaching in our department." By contrast Dr. Monroe reports that in his department "they're always striving to be ranked, uh, you know, that's always on top, and provide quality education and those kinds of things, pretty nebulous everybody likes 'em." Not surprisingly, Dr. Andersen reports that the engineering department also identifies "the education of students" as a top priority. These responses become interesting in view of what is reported as these departments' actual contributions to the teaching practices of the three professors as they seek to attain departmental goals.

Mike Monroe describes the business department's role in teaching as one in which "we have a big department that, uh, that isn't real active in the teaching area. You know, all that's demanded or all that they ask are our teaching evaluations or any peer evaluations [are positive], or you know, there isn't any kind of developmental thing that we do with people, you're just kinda on your own. If courses are screwed, if there's complaints by students, you know, they try and do something. . . . The undergraduate curriculum committee always, you know, tries to tinker around with what's required of students and those kinds of things so that the students end up with jobs on the other end. . . . Other than that the department really doesn't do diddly."

When queried about how his department supports his teaching, he replies "Um, they don't hassle me about, uh, making copies of things, and there's no problem with transparencies or those kinds of things. Oh, I get a total of 20 hours GTA help. So I get an extra ten hours for handling, you know, the number of kids I handle."

In what ways could the department better support your teaching?" I asked. "They could convert something to more GTAs or somehow rustle up more GTAs so that we could break into lab sections or discussion sessions; do mass lectures and then have 'em augmented by getting with a grad student or they go over things in a small group. That kind of thing."

Curious about departmental priorities, I inquired: "What are the other things that are consuming your resources that you would like to have?"

"I think a lot of the resources end up aiming towards research," he explains. "If you look at our department and you see what they think about things, most of the resources are allocated based upon research. Uh, you know, that's the only thing that counts. I think that's what drives people. . . . It basically works that, you know, research is the hurdle you have to make, and in terms of teaching you just have to NOT be unbelievably atrocious. . . . And I understand that, you know, you have your different value systems; it's just that you value things differently." Mike explains that if he were the one in charge he would at least provide more GTA support for the larger classes. However, with regard to current conditions he has "made legitimate arguments for it and they've rejected them." He is frustrated by the situation to be sure, but still he is not willing to risk the political disturbance to pursue the matter any farther.

As told, it seems a curious arrangement of priorities in the business department. Given the reported objective to "provide quality education," the department apparently strives toward this end, in Mike Monroe's view, by not doing "diddly" and establishing pedagogical standards whereby "you just have to NOT be unbelievably atrocious." Fortunately for Jill Andersen, the engineering department employs a different strategy toward their priority of educating students.

The engineering department apparently supports Jill's teaching through a variety of initiatives. There is an assistant department head who facilitates matters relating to undergraduate studies. The department itself arranges informal faculty development meetings that occasionally involve topics on teaching. Beyond the department, the college offers a variety of special programs that include teaching seminars, new faculty programs, and developmental opportunities for faculty who need assistance with their teaching.

In terms of direct support, Jill expresses some concerns: "I think that resources is a big problem . . . and that's more from the state. I think the department does a fairly good job. I mean, it would be nice that everybody had a TA. We don't have the resources to do that, but that's not a function of the department, that's a function of the state support. I think the department is very . . . willing to work with you to try to get you teaching what you want to teach, and arrange the

schedule so that you have it." However, she feels the department could better support her with graduate student assistants. "That's really is a big factor because a TA can do things like, just simple things like recording grades, takes forever, and so that's time that I could be spending . . . doing other things that might be a little bit more constructive." But, Jill remarks that most of the graduate assistance in the department is directed toward the research laboratories. With nearly 60 students this semester, and an average of about 120 during fall semesters, she finds it an extraordinary challenge to keep up all of the responsibilities of teaching this course, especially because it involves copious problem solving assignments that require her direct involvement.

Although her instructional approach most often involves lecture and routine problem solving tasks, Dr. Andersen is reform-minded. She discusses using more demonstrations and practical activities as part of class, but indicates that the necessary resources of classroom space and preparation time are not available. Moreover, she and her colleagues have determined that "it's not worth the [pause] return on investments because the time commitment is so much." So while Andersen would like to make changes in her instruction, she feels it to be an effort that is not consistent with the prevailing institutional scheme. "Most of the time I like teaching," she says reflectively, "but um, it would be a lot more fun if we had adequate support. I feel like I get weighted down here because in this university we don't have basically adequate support, so it makes it harder to be better in the classroom."

Resource allocation to support teaching in the philosophy department appears to take a higher priority than in the two departments so far discussed. I have elaborated already the complex design that Dr. Keller uses for her large Philosophy class. She is able to create a range of discussion group sessions, a menu of workshops, and an elaborate internet component as a result of the support she receives from her department. In fact, the department provides her with three full-time graduate students to assist with her classes. In keeping with her own beliefs, Susan relates that the Philosophy department prides itself on a personal touch with students. She even brags that "most of our majors here are double-majors and they don't go on into Philosophy. They go into Chemical Engineering or whatever. But most of them will take Philosophy to be their primary major, not because they want to pursue philosophy, but because we serve them better than they're served in other colleges."

Although Keller's teaching is generally positively influenced by her department, she feels a different relationship with the university. When I asked what the university did to ensure quality teaching, she reported that the university leaves that matter up to the departments. But overall, as a university "we want to be a research institution. We do not want to be a teaching college." But she, like many others recognizes a tension: "on the one hand there's a recognition that we need to reward good teaching. . . . That means we'll be rewarding research less." This dilemma, she points out, creates an inconsistency with the university's emphasized mission of research.

She feels like a more positive influence on her teaching would be if the university could "get over this idea that there is research, teaching, and service, and that these are three different things that we do. [They need to] recognize that they're all connected so that my research can inform my teaching, but teaching is a way of passing on research; without research your teaching suffers, without teaching your research suffers . . . and service is just like, it's another way of teaching . . . . And that would give professors greater flexibility in how they approach their academic lives." Under current university conditions, says Keller, "there is still this attitude that teaching is something you sneak out the back door to do in your spare time."

Aside from the practical university influences, there are also several others Keller feels impinge on her teaching practice. First she notes that the university operates a "business model" of education "and that's not what we do; that's not what we're about." In this regard she cites class sizes as a profit driven-venture, and one with unfortunate pedagogical consequences. "To me it's the worst travesty of higher education. It's horrible" she says about the fact that she usually only makes contact with a small portion of her students because of extremely large classes. Mike Monroe agrees and provides a more revealing explanation. Retelling a conversation he once had with the university provost about class sizes, Monroe says it was all explained to him like this: "Look, at any university you gotta have a cash cow. We have some art courses that by definition are going to have no more than ten kids in it. If we're going to keep that running with what the state gives us, there have to be some big courses. And you're it."

A related feature of the institution that plays an unfavorable role in shaping Dr. Keller's pedagogy is the bureaucratic management which takes a reductivistic view of education. Specifically she feels that "there's this pernicious overemphasis on formal assessment in higher education." She feels that the bureaucracy focuses too much on quantifying an enterprise that is not always fairly quantifiable. "Grades," she says, "are used to sort students for all sorts of things - for who's appropriate for what job, for who should go to which professional school or graduate school, and that's an important sorting mechanism. . . . I just don't think that students should be sorted. . . . I'm just not sure it's the best way." Keller recognizes that there needs to be performance distinctions but she feels like accurate and fair performance measures are not feasible given the business model of education. Reducing education to quantifiable outcomes means that teaching too must be quantified to be assessed. She explains that "it is institutionally-driven, because there's this, you get these stupid surveys you have to give out assessing your class, and seven fill-in-the-blank questions that the students always answer. . . . And so there's an institutional assumption that that is somehow giving you important information about your class, and it's the basis of promotion and tenure and so forth."

The university and its departmental units constitute institutional cultures, each of which differentially influence the way teaching is practiced. These stories, as varied as they are, vividly

illustrate how decisions made from within the bureaucratic organization impinge on the manner in which teachers view, pursue, and enact the craft of teaching. The role of the institution along the moral dimension of education is enormous, both for its intentions and its consequences. Inevitably, the morality of the institution has the power to sway the morality of folk pedagogies, a curious phenomenon to be sure.

Institutional Discourse and Moral Imagination

The institutional discourse manifests as the customs and conditions prevalent within the university and its academic departments and affect the teaching carried out there. The university and the departments comprise particular cultural spaces wherein specific conceptions of teaching distill directly from established values. It was explained in the last chapter that culture shapes our agentive selves (Bruner, 1996) giving rise to a personhood, or professorhood in this case, that understands and employs the tenets and customs of the prevailing culture. For instance, the tenets and customs regarding what constitutes effective and successful teaching are likely to be quite different between the cultures of a large research university and a smaller liberal arts college. Accordingly, conditions and support for effective teaching in liberal arts schools is likely to be different than in research universities where effective teaching must compete for resources with other priorities such as research. Consequently, a smaller liberal arts colleges can boast of the effective teaching because they direct resources to keep teacher-pupil ratios as low as possible. In a similar way, what constitutes acceptable support and conditions for teaching and learning might also differ between departments within the same university.

To continue this review, if the cultures of the university and department together compose one half of the pedagogical equation, the personal experiences of the teacher compose the other half. The sum of the interactions between the various cultural influences and personal experiences that professors bring to their current teaching practice constitutes their folk pedagogy. Noddings (1992) explains this by insisting that "attitudes and 'mentalities' are shaped, at least in part, by experiences. . . . All disciplines and institutional organizations . . . 'shape minds,' that is, to induce certain attitudes and ways of looking at the world" (p. 23). The university and departmental cultures in which Drs. Andersen, Keller, and Monroe teach are influential constituents on their folk pedagogies, and thus on their teaching mentalities.

The most obvious influence on the teaching practices of each of these three professors is that they all teach within a large Research I-rated university that has historically concerned itself with research as a main priority. Indeed, it is this characteristic that has attracted each of these three professors to this particular university; this is to say that, while each enjoys her or his teaching, they also enjoy the research opportunities they find here. To these professors, teaching -

providing a meaningful education to the students in their classes – is at least equally as important to them as the pursuit of their research programs. However, there is an apparent tension between these two arenas of academic pursuit; a tension that appears to frustrate professors' intent on providing what they conceive of as effective education.

The institutional discourse possesses both physical and philosophical dimensions. The physical aspects relate to time, space, and the ordering of people within them. Philosophically, institutional discourse is the tenets and strategies adopted toward managing the physical dimension. A common example of the philosophical aspect is the bureaucratic nature of the university organization. As an institution organized bureaucratically, there are several inherent characteristics that subtly influence the methods and manners of teaching within it. According to Stroup (1966), a bureaucracy is defined as

> ... a large-scale organization with a complex but definite social function. It consists
> ... of specialized personnel and is guided by a system of rules and procedures. In
> addition, a carefully contrived hierarchy of authority exists by which the social
> function of the bureaucracy is carried out impersonally (p.14).

Contained within this definition are the major characteristics of the bureaucratic organization, two of which – impersonal relationships and rule-driven procedures - are exposed through the teaching

---

narratives related here.[6]   Stroup (1966) identifies the main purposes of bureaucratic rules as providing consistency, rationality, and defensibility to the operations of the organization. Established rules and procedures force the organization to treat all its constituents the same. In this way, "bureaucracy behaves like justice itself - blind to individuality. Bureaucracy seeks the achievement of a certain kind of justice, one which eliminates arbitrariness and individualization" (Stroup, 1966, p. 20). The institutional discourse then by its very nature is rule-bound and impersonal. It thus dictates educational conditions that likewise instill these characteristics.

In effect, bureaucratic organization and its institutional discourse shapes education. Anderson (1968) relays some thoughts by Robert Presthus who suggests ". . . the accepted values of the organization shape the individual's personality and influence his behavior . . . . Big organizations therefore become instruments of socialization, providing physical and moral sustenance for their members and shaping their thought and behavior in countless ways" (p. vii). Anderson himself further explains that, "These [bureaucratic] systems create a distinctive social structure and psychological climate conducive to highly predictable behavior by individuals who constitute the administrative staff" (p. viii). What Anderson and Presthus both suggest here is that the bureaucratic organization is, in fact, a culture. To the extent that culture consists of shared concepts and shared meanings and depends upon shared modes of expression among people, the bureaucracy is indeed a cultural influence. The institutional discourse encountered in these narratives tells a story of university and departmental views and rewards for teaching and research that, while consistent with bureaucratic principles, are seemingly incommensurate with the folk pedagogies of these professors. Several examples will make this clear.

The goal of the business department is to be nationally "ranked" and to provide "quality education." But the department sends a distinctly different signal to Mike Monroe. Primarily through the dearth of resources and the acceptance of meager standards for quality teaching (e.g., "NOT be unbelievably atrocious"), the message that is sent to Monroe, via his large business course, is that compromised education is acceptable. Consequently, the department and the university inform Monroe's folk pedagogy in several significant ways: by size alone they assure him that connections with students are not important; that exclusive use of objective machine-graded examinations are adequate appraisals of learning; that a large cavernous lecture hall is an effective learning environment; and that simplifying course curriculum is a sound strategy for off-setting the educational challenges imposed by extraordinarily large classes operated with inadequate support.

---

[6] - Although the characteristics of bureaucracy influence teaching at the university in widely ranging ways, I am mostly concerned here with its specific influences as demonstrated by the participants of the study. A more detailed discussion of bureaucratic principles and their general influence on college teaching is presented in Appendix D.

Fortunately Mike fully understands the limits of education that are imposed on him as he tries to teach and foster the growth of hundreds of students at a time. He knows his situation is an extraordinary educational challenge pleading for extraordinary support in order to make for meaningful student experiences. He fully comprehends that his pedagogical hands are tied by teaching in an environment that is at once impersonal and inhospitable to most any type of instruction beyond lecture. He is cognizant of the fact that his course, by institutional design, and perhaps even by necessity, is a "cash cow." Monroe recognizes the difference between the rhetoric and reality. But still the institution speaks, it imposes its priorities, and these constrain and form what Mike is able to actualize into folk pedagogy. So, the education Monroe provides is compromised, he describes the situation: "Give me twenty-five kids, and they'll learn an unbelievable amount. Give me five hundred, and you know, you just can't control it as well. . . . You know, it's relatively impersonal. . . . I could keep on going, you know, about problems with class size."

One of the many practical problems I observed in Dr. Monroe's large class involved distributing handouts. On the several occasions that he provided handouts, he was required to actually stop class to distribute them. Even though he enlisted my services and had students assist, it took every bit of five minutes to distribute and re-engage the class. During these times the flow and continuity of class were completely disrupted. With the break in the action student conversation exploded, attentions wandered, focus was broken. Amidst the controlled chaos, more than a handful of students quietly packed book bags and slipped out the auditorium doors. Having handed in their work and now briefed on the evening's topics, they take advantage of the impersonal relationship the institution extends to them to make better use of their time elsewhere. While this might not seem like unusual behavior among students, it does have pedagogical significance.

One of Dr. Monroe's beliefs and chief concerns for his students is that they attend class; that they are there to hear the stories which are his currency of communicating the course's subject matter in relevant and understandable terms. He explains that "another thing that screws up learning, well the biggest one, is not coming to class. You know, you don't come to class, the game is over. I can guarantee the grade will go down many, many notches if you don't show up. And you got to show up every time." Here illustrates a situation where the teacher holds a particular belief about learning, one that is a cornerstone to his pedagogy, one around which his instruction is designed, and the institution forces upon him contra-pedagogical conditions within which he is responsible for educating students.

Institutional influence on teaching also influences Jill Andersen. It seems a travesty that a professor, a teacher of young people, a teacher otherwise inclined to ensure that her students learn well, feels that following her innovative spirit might not be "worth the return on investment." Jill

thus finds herself locked into a slower evolution away from traditional ways of teaching engineering than she cares to be. Although much of her course traditionally operates on problem solving, number crunching, and formula manipulation, she does include a small library investigation that offers students some choice and variety in their pursuit of engineering. Also, this semester she is trying to include more of a project-based activity. "We're doing a project at the end of the term. And that's new for the ['Engineering'] class. . . . I'll do teams and get into the design aspect of engineering." Dr. Andersen recognizes that basic engineering courses can have creative and imaginative elements like some of the advanced courses and she tries to incorporate some of these ideas; however, she laments that her progress toward this end and that of her department is so slow. At the same time, the institutional discourse continues to influence her pedagogy.

Institutional discourse narrows learning opportunities in Jill's class by establishing constraints on classroom space and location, and subtly shaping conceptions of how these can be used for teaching. The classes I observed were offered in the typical university classroom; one which accommodates nearly thirty students, has desks all arranged in rows (though mercifully not bolted to the floor), cinder block walls, and no windows. Despite these features, the room is otherwise accommodating to instructional variety. However, Jill, in nearly all of my observations, had her students seated in desks arranged in rows. I never saw students working at the boards or leaving their seats in any way to make contributions to the learning activities. Jill spent nearly all of her time at the front of the class, the blackboards were her domain. Very infrequently did she allow herself venture beyond the teacher's desk and into the rows of desks to be among the students. It seems the institution, through its customary arrangement of classrooms into rows and blackboards at the front of the class, in some sense shapes the type of instruction that goes on in those spaces.

While this arrangement likely has no bearing on students' success in solving problems and reporting numeric answers, it does mute education along the dimensions of community and interpersonal classroom interactions. Occasionally the class broke into work groups; the first time with Jill's casual suggestion that "if you don't know your classmates, here's your chance." However, there was little chance to meet classmates because Jill gave the assignment immediately, leaving no time for introductions among group members. Neither were there any directions given on how the groups should function as learning units. Thus, students, now with seats clustered together, simply put their heads down and solved the problems on their own. There was very little conversation among groups and no larger class discussion; no questions of how, why, or what if, no divergent thinking beyond the singular solution. In the end, the group experience involved only rearranging desks and checking solutions with a workmate. In later conversations with Dr. Andersen, she reports that once the semester progressed into more long-term group-related work, that the group dynamics and social learning aspects "worked very well."

Another feature of the institutional paradigm of education relates to having accommodating classrooms for instruction. Jill reports that she rarely gets to teach in classrooms which are convenient for her use of demonstrations or applied activites. By having classes in rooms designed primarily for lecture, she does not have the luxury of laboratories or suitably equiped space to conveniently allow students to "see" or "touch" important engineering principles. And yet, her fundamental engineering course is supremely conducive to practical demonstrations of course principles, though the materials for such are not easily carried across campus. "The problem is that everything we have is really big, and I used to bring some model stuff when it was in [the engineering building], I could bring it upstairs, but I can't bring 'em over to [other buildings]." Demonstrations are obvious supplements to lectures and meaningful compliments to learning, ideas the institution seems to forget. Instructional innovation requires resources, it takes time, energy, and imagination to work beyond such institutional limitations. But even before this, professors need to feel that their efforts are "worth the return on investment," that there will be adequate reward for their efforts.

The philosophy department has contributed enough resources to facilitate Susan Keller's imagination to work beyond the many university constraints. In effect, her department says "go innovate" and it communicates this message with appropriate resources and, more importantly, an ethos that students matter, that personal connection is important. But still Susan feels challenged, and these challenges shape her pedagogy. She is challenged by class size, by the "pernicious overemphasis on assessment," and by a system that she perceives cannot recognize the interrelationship between the major thrusts of her academic endeavors. In some ways, there seems a conflict, for on one hand Susan's department endorses her commitment to teaching while on the other hand the university seems to set competing challenges (i.e., teaching-research-service) that are differentially rewarded. Nevertheless, she is able to rise to the challenge, to extend effective education and some sense of choice and personalization to her students. She is, to a remarkable extent, able to overcome the institution's insistence on impersonality. Keller resists the institution's penchant for assessing and sorting students by devoting the time and energy necessary to develop and engage alternative instructional and evaluational methods. But in so doing, she risks the institution's misperception of her commitments to research and service. By promoting possibility through choice and personalization in her courses, she risks being perceived as less productive along the dimensions of research and service. The university accounts for only those things measurable like research and service projects, promoting possibility for students is not quantifiable and, therefore, not well recognized by the university ledger. The institutional discourse "assumes that everything important. . . can be reduced to something measurable" (McKinney & Garrison, 1994, p.82). The institutional discourse conceives of education only in

measurable terms, regards it as a rational endeavor, believes that blindness to individuality is fair education.

The problem is that effective education is not always measurable, it is not always rational, and it is not always fostered by impersonality (Garrison, 1997). In fact, institutional discourse hyperationalizes conceptions of education. Hyperrationalization occurs when the purposes of a bureaucratic organization are not being achieved under some given set of rules, thus requiring more rules to "ensure" that the organization's purposes are accomplished. In effect, the true purposes of the organization - education in this case - are lost from sight, obscured by a preoccupation with conformance to the myriad rules (Wise, 1979). At least two effects on teaching are apparent from hyperrationalized institutional discourse. The intent to "normalize" operations and behaviors through extensive rules is a technique for classifying and controlling people. Likewise rule-bound mentalities stifle the discourse of possibility, mute moral imagination, and create educational tension by trying to rationalize a non-rational enterprise. Taken together, teaching loses sight of its true mission in favor of compliance and accounting mentalities - education becomes a matter of "return on investment."

By hyperrationalizing education, by silencing the voice of possibility, the institutional discourse constrains moral imagination in the teaching endeavor. Whereas the institutional discourse strives to see all students as the same, to treat them all the same - an idea we accept as justice - moral imagination instead sees both the similarities and differences among students, and seeks to treat them as the individuals that they are. Justice, it seems, is good for control but does little for possibility. Moral imagination opens the door to possibility, to individuality, to *educere*. In an earlier section I spoke about morality as not just conformance to some code of rightness and wrongness, but also as a matter of attending to the realities of individual other persons. I also explained some about moral perception as the ability to detect the morally salient features of situations and people, as a capacity motivated by care and altruism (Blum, 1996). Although moral perception allows one to see that situations require moral action of some kind, it does not necessarily indicate what that moral action might be. Identification of the alternatives for moral action, however, is initiated by moral imagination.

Moral imagination rises from the desire to undertake beneficent action (Blum, 1996; Garrison, 1997; Johnson, 1993). I have argued throughout this dissertation that education is a moral endeavor, precisely because it is ideally a beneficent action taken on behalf of other persons. Susan Keller morally perceives as she sees individuality and morally imagines as she sees possibility in her class room, as she strives to provide a personal touch. Mike Monroe too morally imagines despite his circumstances. His attempts to see his business course from the perspective of his students leads him to tell stories about business, stories he believes are relevant and interesting to students while simultaneously educational. He tries to imagine himself as one of his

own students. And Jill Andersen morally imagines too. Her efforts to learn student names and relate to them personally shows regard for individuality in the face of institutional discourse. She recognizes students as individuals with particular needs and histories. To the extent that she conceives it, Jill tries to make her students feel appreciated. Each of these teachers often sees through the institutional discourse, empathically imagines around it, but are also constrained by its rule-mongering. Johnson (1993) describes the conflict between institutional discourse and moral imagination:

> It is not sufficient to manipulate a cool, detached "objective" reason toward the situation of others [i.e., institutional view]. We must, instead, go out toward people to inhabit their worlds, not just by rational calculations, but also in imagination, feeling, and expression. Reflecting in this way involves an *imaginative rationality* through which we can participate empathetically in another's experience. . . . It takes us beyond fixed character, social roles, and institutional arrangements. (p. 200) [emphasis in original]

Conceptually, education is an endeavor morally imagined, its purpose clearly a moral pursuit. However, realistically education is an agent of bureaucracy and its moral mission has been hyperrationalized. Nel Nodding's (1992) illustrates this with one of my favorite examples. She tells the story of public schools feeding children, a program rationalized by the claim that "hungry children cannot learn" (p.13). No doubt hungry children do not learn as well as when they are fed. But this educational rationale misses the larger humanistic point: "that loving people compassionately feed hungry children" (p.13) whether learning or schooling is involved or not. Sometimes our institutions make us forget to be human, and make us forget to think humanely. The university too, it appears to me, often misses this larger picture. Regrettably, moral perception and imagination is rarely exhibited by the institution, meaning that neither is it likely taught by it.

What rings remarkable among each of these teachers, though, is their lasting enthusiasm for teaching despite the limited conceptions of education held by the institution in which they work. In the institutional narratives presented above, an array of departmental and university values toward teaching are portrayed. However, while the institutional discourse unwittingly attempts to thwart moral imagination, these professors are motivated by bigger visions of education and attempt to realize them as best they can given the constraints. Nevertheless, the institution as culture makes subtle truck with personal experiences, thus shaping folk pedagogies in subtle ways. The portrait of folk pedagogies conveys its essence not through institutional discourse, but rather through the academic discourse. The academic discourse reveals how the professors themselves approach teaching and take moral action in the classroom. Whereas the institution stymies moral

discourse and moral agency, the academic discourse of my participants invites moral action and truly engenders education as a moral enterprise.

Narratives of Academic Experience

In this section the academic discourse comprises the words and actions teachers employ that relate directly to fundamental features of the educational endeavor. For convenience of discussion, these features are broadly organized around three major foci: the teacher-student relationship, conceptions of learning, and ideas about teaching. The narratives that follow illuminate some of each professors' folk pedagogy along these three themes. The academic discourse is that segment of the larger educational discourse - that larger discourse that is the unity of the personal, profession, and institution segments so far discussed - that relates directly to the practical part of the educational enterprise. It is the academic discourse that discloses what teachers think about and do to effect learning, how they envision learning happening, what they believe are critical elements of the craft of teaching. Narratives of academic discourse give us the most direct insight into the participants folk pedagogies and give a vivid view of teaching as moral agency.

I spent my time in Jill Andersen's smaller engineering class. It had about 18 or so students, most all young men, except for two young women. The class met in the morning, not early by my standards, but the torpidity of the students seemed to tell a different tale. Jill regularly started class by making general announcements, forecasting the morning's activities, and handing back homework. Logistics behind her, she would take the class off into the day's tasks of exploring natural laws and applying them to unnatural phenomenon. Having once been impressed by a professor who could know each student by name, she attempts to learn the names of her students to help them feel some sense of identity in class. This semester, howver, Jill was disadvantaged in learning student names because she had her two classes back-to-back. Ordinarily, she takes advantage of time at the beginning of class to return students' work and to use the process to learn their names along the way. This semester, though, she was rushed between classes and did not have free time at the beginning of the second class for learning names that way. However, because of the pace of the class and the nature of the instruction, Dr. Andersen took few opportunities to practice names once class was underway. Commenting on her exprerience addressing students by name in class, she remarks that "they always panic when I do that. . . . I find they get sort of embarrassed if you use their names."

Dr. Andersen describes the relationship between herself and her students as something of a "joint effort" toward education. She indicates that she as teacher has a responsibility to teach as best as she can and her students have a responsibility to learn that which she teaches. In terms of her responsibility as teacher she explains "Well, I do. . . basic lecture, that portion of it is, in my

mind a chance to explain concepts, to lay down the fundamentals of why things happen the way they happen. The homeworks that they're assigned are to give them an opportunity to use these concepts in applications. . . . And then, also I think it's important more and more to provide more sort of open-ended type situations for the students where they can be challenged beyond sort of a confined level, so that they have the opportunity to do a lot more if they wish. . . . "   More "open-ended" projects refers to library investigation assignments where students chose from one of four topics to examine, and three quasi-design projects – one individual assignment and two team assignments. "I always find that's where they put in the most effort. . . . What I interpreted from that is that they were generally interested in what they were looking up and reading and . . . they were learning from that experience." These "open ended" projects provide a nice instructional contrast to the heavy number crunching activities observed in class.

While Andersen reports learning as a "joint effort," she relates that, as a process, learning is largely individually dependent, though she could not clearly explain how it might be that learning happens. "Uh, the factors that go into it, I think it is . . . oh, crimeny - trying to define specific, even general things, I think it is the ability to be able to, in our field, to apply basic concepts, [long pause] I think that the interaction with the material on a number of different levels is what I think is important. So they see it, they read it, they work with it, they talk to each other about it. . . . for example, on the sensory side, you can look at it, read it, you can read a textbook. You can listen to it, listen to it in lecture. Um, more on the interactive side, the simplest thing is in lecture is just writing lecture notes. There's learning processes that go on there." Learning is not an easy concept for many teachers to explain but it seems apparent that Dr. Andersen's folk pedagogy in part involves a conception of learning that has two sides: the sensory side and the interactive side. She does, however, articulate more handily what she hopes is the product of the learning venture in her classes: "Out of this particular class . . . that they understand the concepts . . . to be able to tie them in to different scenarios. I would hope also in there that they learn how to approach problems and how to, you know, be problem-solvers throughout the process. . . . As far as, you know, gross material learning, I hope that they come out with the basic concepts that they can apply to applications, which is what engineers are about."

In order to ensure these learning outcomes, Jill employs "basic lecture" as her primary instructional mode. This method is consistent with how she views teaching as a communicative process. "I think it's basically, sort of an information transfer, you know, in the rote sense type-of-a-process: information and hopefully the ability to think for oneself . . . sort of as a transfer process from one to the other." After a short pause, she explains that a subsequent component to *transfer* is getting to "more of the *why* question, more of, why are the facts the way they are. . . so you understand principles and those sorts of things." Finally, she submits that "another aspect would be. . . problem-solving, trying to go about addressing the problems sort of the, um,

hopefully teaching them to figure out things on their own." Consequently, classroom activities involve a unidirectional delivery or transfer of concepts through lecture, reinforcing those facts and principles by relating the "why" of the matter, and applying concepts to problem sets via home work and class practices.

An additional feature of Jill's class is regular problem solving sessions that she holds to give students the opportunity to work with her more closely. With a grin on her face she says that she likes the problem sessions best because "it's more one-on-one. . . there are fewer people there, and they're there for a reason, because they know they don't understand something so they have specific questions. . . . The motivation is a little bit different there." This preference is based on what she feels are her best pedagogical attributes and is reflected in what she relates as the most important things to her about the practice of teaching: providing students an opportunity to learn, interacting with students, and generally being organized.

Teaching engineering, with all its complexities and wide ranging applications, is no doubt a sizable challenge. Any teacher would be tested to their pedagogical limit trying to create learning activities that ensured the rigor required of the discipline and the profession. Philosophy, like engineering, requires considerable cognitive processing making it a subject matter quite challenging to teach. Susan Keller realizes this and makes it her mission to create a menu of learning activities through which students can access her subject. In creating such a menu, she also creates an environment that allows her to relate in very special ways to her students.

In an earlier narrative, Keller explained how she felt the most important part of the teacher-student relationship was "mentoring" and "giving a personal touch." While this could easily be interpreted as rhetoric, the depth of her view of students exposes a genuine interest in and concern for educating students. Keller tries "to see the students as individuals, because everybody is coming in with this individual life history, and it really does affect what they can get out of my class, and it's very important for me, the instructor, to remember that." When asked how she manages a personal touch with 250 students she remarks: "Yeah, well, [laughs] that's a tough one, because in some ways I can't. The class is too big. What I can try to do is provide as much freedom as I can in the course for students to pick their own path. So students can choose, for example, what workshop they want to attend. . . . Each covers a different topic, or the same topic in a different way. Um, so the students can pick and choose according to his or her needs." The bottom line for Susan is that she tries ". . . to be aware of them as people. So, I care whether they don't do their homework and why they don't do it. And I care that they're late to class. And, um, I care about them as individuals, and I hope that I can in some way communicate that caring to them." A clear pedagogical tenet for Keller is that caring about students is one thing while communicating that caring is an altogether separate pursuit. Susan is not satisfied to simply care "about" students, she must actively care "for" them.

Caring and the more technical dimensions of education intersect for Keller in her ideas about the learning process. She sees three primary factors catalyzing successful learning: the capacity for intelligence, a desire to learn, and the psychological situation of the student. She explains that psychological situation involves "just a whole bunch of contingent, environmental variables" which meld into those individual life histories. These factors are noteworthy because they emphasize student-related influences. Keller believes learning is a shared endeavor between student and teacher, she explains: "The answer I think that people want to give in my position is it's the student's responsibility to learn. And that, like, that's the buzz phrase now. You want *student-centered learning*, you want students to be responsible for their own learning. You don't want passive learning, you want active learning where it's up to the student. But in many ways, I think that absolutely mischaracterizes even what student-centered learning is all about. Because we don't want the students just [alone] to be responsible for their learning, because, on the one hand, most of them don't know how to learn. They're only seventeen years old, and you know, I've spent a lot of time learning and studying learning, and I'm now just sort of coming to terms with it. So, I don't want to leave to them a task that they're supposed to be responsible for and they don't even know how to do it. And secondly, they don't have a good sense. . . of <u>what</u> it is they're supposed to be learning; if they knew that, then heck, they'd just go to the library. So, I see the responsibility as really being divided. I mean, the students do have a responsibility to try to be active citizens in my class and to do the best they can with the tasks that I set before them. I have a responsibility to design the tasks such that it enhances their learning and allows them to learn as much as they possibly can. I have a great responsibility for their learning, I think." At the end of the learning process, Keller wants to impart the tools of critical reflection and analysis "so that they'll have a deeper appreciation of who they are in a very broad sense. I mean, what it means to be human."

To impart such tools, to illuminate such ends of education, requires more than a simple approach to teaching. Susan recognizes that these ends would be a simple matter if she could individualize her teaching for every student, but this is, of course, a very difficult proposition. Instead she satisfies herself by creating as much freedom and choice in the learning endeavor as possible. In addition to the variety of learning modalities and the buffet of topics to choose from, she strives to integrate four elements into her teaching. First, she tries to model the skills or capacities that she wants students to themselves have. "You know, teaching my children how to be productive citizens, and teaching my students how to think about philosophy. . . that's all part of the same ball of wax, here. So I think modeling is very important, because, I think people learn by <u>watching</u> others do . . . probably more than they learn about hearing from someone else <u>how</u> to do." Secondly, she creates different modes of practice for those things to be learned. These modes are complex, as she says, they are more than "just recursive, because that to me conjures

going back through it in more or less the same way. I want them to go back through it in a different way, from a different angle, in a different context, in a different setting, something like that. Because if you can do that, then to me you start learning the material." The third element of her teaching scheme involves feedback: "I need some sort of feedback from a student about what they have and what they don't have, what they're missing" in their understanding of her class. Finally, Dr. Keller re-emphasizes the necessity of individualizing the experience to the extent that she can.

As I reflect over my experiences in Keller's class, I recall instances where each of her four elements of teaching were on exhibition. Through her enthusiastic teaching, her intellectual engagement of subject and students, and the breadth of her course design she modeled her zeal for intellectual awareness - that students should learn what it means to be intellectually stimulated, of "what it means to be human." Likewise, she effectively incorporates a variety of learning modalities into her course - different avenues toward learning philosophy - and through such offerings creates opportunities for students to individualize their experience in her class. Feedback was received regularly by Dr. Keller for she seemed to be in regular communication with her students. Her classes engaged vigorous conversations - both oral and electronic - through which she was able to take the pulse of her students' experiences. She also received (and provided) feedback through the various divergent writing assignments that were the mainstay of her course activities.

Susan Keller and Mike Monroe share the common challenge of having to teach very large classes. Keller is somewhat more fortunate than Monroe given the support that she receives from her department. Few of us will argue that the graduate student assistance she receives make many things possible in her class - and Monroe too recognized this when he identified such support as his preferred resource - but still it has taken Keller's moral perception and her moral imagination to create the educational opportunities that offer freedom and choice, that promote possibility and thereby enliven the spirit. Mike Monroe, by contrast, has accepted his situation and tries to make the best of what his folk pedagogy and departmental culture allows.

Monroe's course epitomizes the classic university lecture practice. Casual yet careful, he wanders the front half of the auditorium professing subject matter to students. It is a completely unidirectional engagement guided and highlighted by a cascade of overhead transparencies. In fact, he confesses his penchant for monologue and his phobia for engaging students in class discussion. Consequently, students during my visits rarely contributed their insights to class, nor did they raise many questions themselves. Like Dr. Andersen's engineering class, there was a notable absence of dialogue. An intriguing relationship appears to be established under these conditions. On the one hand, Dr. Monroe seems a very approachable person; he is friendly, humorous, and inviting. Yet, on the other hand, he creates dividing lines and projects a sense that

classroom dialogue is not welcomed. The fact that he holds minimal office hours and prefers students to just call him at home when assistance is needed certainly sends mixed signals about teacher-student relationships as a feature of his pedagogy.

While the relational signals sent in class seem mixed, Monroe is very clear about his feelings for students throughout our discussion. Mike ardently expresses his love of teaching, and one of the primary reasons is because of his deep interest in working with students. Because of the extraordinary size of his classes and the department's minimized assistance, he sees interacting with students in ways that are truly productive as a potentially enormous debit on his time. So Mike prefers to work at home and have students contact him there. He reports that some nights he is on the telephone for hours at a time, and he feels that students are more efficient with time (theirs and his) when they call. There are occasions when he takes a more personal approach: "If someone has problems, or is in trouble, or there's something going on, for whatever reason, I'll try and go well beyond being a teacher and I'll try and, you know, befriend 'em and help 'em with this or that or the other. Because there are some kids that need a little bit, something a little bit different. Uh, I find that having as many students as I have, it's hard to, you know, you just don't have to befriend everybody. You have to pick and choose on who really needs it, and who really doesn't." Mike is a bottom-line kind of teacher and his folk pedagogical bottom line on relating to students "is, you know, that could be my kid out there. So, uh, you want to make sure that if they need it, you help them."

Like all university professors Dr. Monroe is concerned with student learning. He speculates on how students themselves approach learning. "I understand probably how 95% of the kids study. Uh, they cram. You know, around like 20% probably keep up with everything, but most kids when it gets to studying they wait 'til the last, and they go for it." Armed with this conception of students, Monroe says he has little role in student learning. "I aim 'em. I take 'em to the trough," he says. Mike describes his teaching strategy to encourage students' to "drink" from his trough: "I think you have to make it to a certain extent enjoyable. They have to wanna come to class. They have to wanna please me, even though it's in a big group, you know. . . . You have to make sure they understand why it's important, that they can identify with the examples, they see how this is going to be used, and that you make it as intuitive as possible." Mike adds that it is also important that students be kept awake during class and that material be maintained at an accessible level, not over-complicating it.

To ensure that his students learn, Monroe follows a handful of personal principles of pedagogy. First, he organizes his course material as a collection of ten or so axioms of business that "kind of provide a reference point. They aren't anything that's too difficult to learn if you don't know the subject matter, and then you have that to kind of rely back on. . . . if you can somehow bring it down to them, it clicks in a lot more - it's a lot easier to understand something if

you have a reference point. You know, that's part of the purpose of the axioms." In conjunction with the axioms, he employs recursive activities such as lecture reviews, homework problems, and case studies that he feels will aid student memorization and association of course ideas. Perhaps one of his pet conceptions of teaching and learning involves relating information in ways that students can in some way identify with. "I try and make it intuitive and use some examples that they can touch, that they understand. Uh, but being as intuitive as possible is real important. You know, giving them an example here or there. . . . a strange story, and I'll have some later on, that are a little on the bizarre side, but they're great stories because you'll remember forever." Learning, Monroe feels, can be achieved through storied associations, the more "bizarre" the better. Keeping students alert and engaged, being an enthusiastic teacher, setting a comfortable pace each also figure in his pedagogical plan.

Aside from these more technical aspects of his practice Dr. Monroe recognizes the value of the personal element in the educational endeavor. Although he does not get to encounter it in his larger classes, he has experienced it in his smaller ones. "On the more personal level you can get to know the kids, you can tease them, you can talk to them about what they're up to before class and after class, and as a result they have a real, you know, at least I've seen, an incredible desire to please. . . . they just have this personal thing in there, they not only have to learn because they're trying to get a good grade, but also there's this person [the professor] that they kind of like, or that's taken an interest in 'em, and he or she's going to be disappointed if you don't do what they want. Kids like to please. And when you have a small class, you can make sure you know what they're doing and when they don't please, you know, you can needle 'em. You can get on 'em. You . . . can watch them as they slip and catch 'em real early as it's going on." While he does not articulate it as succinctly as his colleague Susan Keller, what Mike suggests here as possibility is what Keller has turned into reality: Personal connections can stimulate students to engage course work in ways that institutionally imposed, anonymous conditions cannot. With this understanding, Monroe now needs only to understand, as does Keller, that it is possible, if not easy, to create opportunities for connection even in large classes.

Finally, in discussing Mike Monroe's folk pedagogy it bears remembering an earlier discussion related to special knowledge. It appears that Monroe's paradigm for teaching is one of *instuere*. Accordingly, his academic discourse is one that reflects the belief that the best way to learn fundamental business principles in extraordinarily large classes is for he himself to "build in" that knowledge in the minds of his students. Under these conditions, few examples were found to indicate that his pedagogy accommodates a premise that students themselves might actually know something about business or have personal experiences that might help them to better understand his course if only they were encouraged to explore them. In this situation, Mike's academic discourse bears little reflection to *educere*. Learning in this particular class constitutes mastering

special knowledge delivered by the professor in one form and returned by the students in precisely the same form - no personal customizing of knowledge for personal meaning.

These narratives of academic discourse reveal how the participant professors conceive of some aspects of education. A broad view is given here about what these teachers have fixed into folk pedagogy about how students learn, about what they as teachers believe best facilitates student learning, and how teachers and students are related together in the educational endeavor. These narratives have been examined above with a focus on their practical and technical features, but there is also a moral dimension to this discourse that further illuminates these folk pedagogies.

Academic Discourse: Teaching as Moral Responsiveness

In earlier sections of this dissertation I highlighted two key precursors of moral agency and attempted to give them relevance within the context of specific education-related discourses. Through those discussions I tried to share how moral perception allows us to detect and understand some educational situations as moral and how moral deliberation, especially its creative and affective components, moral imagination, leads us to identify appropriate responses to those moral situations. The final aspect of this moral agency model is performing the chosen moral action; that is, making the *moral response*. In the context of folk pedagogy, teaching in its broadest interpretation serves as a conduit for moral responses. This section identifies moral situations from within the academic discourse and relates them to the characteristics of altruistic moral response.

It has been my assertion throughout this work that teaching is a moral craft. In support of this idea I identified decision-making and relationships between teachers and students as elements of teaching's moral core. The academic discourse just related is the segment of the larger, composite educational discourse that most embodies both of these core elements; for the academic discourse, its decisions and relationships, is what eventually becomes educational reality in educational settings. The academic discourse is the enactment of professors' conceptions about teaching and learning. It is the actualization of those decisions made by teachers to ensure the educational well-being of students. The academic discourse is the game plan for how professors negotiate their relationships with their students so that in the end educational goals are met. In this study, academic discourse functions as the medium through which moral actions are made in higher education.

In a past section, I referred to two generic types of moral action, rule following reactions and altruistically motivated responsiveness (Blum, 1994; Johnson, 1993). The former group is relatively easy to detect and has been given attention in discussions of other education-related discourses. Through the academic discourse we can glimpse professors' undertaking responsive

action. Although much of the academic discourse tends to offer few instances of responsiveness, situations were found where caring, kindness, empathetic connection, and other attributes of moral response were eagerly pursued.

In these narratives of academic discourse, each professor conceives differently what is involved in teaching and learning. Consequently, each professor decides differently upon the instructional methods, interpersonal relationships, topics of study and so on that their courses will follow. Dr. Monroe sees teaching as a sort of translation process whereby the teacher "simplifies" the material and makes it as "intuitive as possible." He thus decides on an instructional style that is based on recursive encounters with material, encounters mostly in the form of teacher-told stories, teacher-authored textbook readings, and teacher-generated class notes and home work sets. He has decided that the teacher ought to be the focal point of the educational experience, the place where students get their organization for constructing business knowledge.

The moral significance of Monroe's pedagogy lies in the decisions he makes. This is not to say that his decisions on instructional style are either moral or not, but simply to indicate that because he makes decisions on behalf of his students he undertakes moral action. In his academic discourse, it appears that in choosing his particular response to the moral situation of how to best teach his class, Monroe's moral deliberation reflects moral rationality more than it does moral imagination, which seems understandable given the highly structured character of his discipline. Moral rationality involves a compliance mentality, conforming to established rules and standards. Monroe, it seems, has decided to conform to traditional conceptions of college teaching. He has chosen an academic discourse that values an instructional style steeped in the tradition of teacher-centered education; education where the professor alone possesses special knowledge and whose task it is to pass it on to students, to hand it over, to profess it. Learning business, in Monroe's pedagogy, is not conceived of as a co-construction of knowledge between teacher and student; rather it is a re-construction of the teacher's knowledge within the mind of the student.

This approach to teaching cannot be judged moral or not, as in the right or wrong way of acting; it is just the way Mike Monroe has decided to respond to the particular moral situation of teaching business. In strict terms it is indeed a moral response requiring moral perception and moral imagination, for Monroe genuinely seeks to make the situation of student learning "better than it otherwise would be" without his involvement (Dewey, 1909/1975, p. 1). Monroe's approach bears every bit as much moral potency and moral validity as any other approach; his simply reflects more rational moral deliberation rather than imaginative moral deliberation. His moral mind-set leads him to a pedagogy of *instruere*, where knowledge is built in, rather than that of imagining the possibilities of students' self-directed learning, of a pedagogy of *educere*.

Jill Andersen conceives of teaching as "transferring knowledge." Like Dr. Monroe, she too conceives of learning as a building-in process. To be sure, there is a need to build-in key

engineering concepts like the Ideal Gas Law, fluid dynamics, and what constitutes a simple compressible closed system. But again, the moral issue relates to the choice of method in which that "building-in" occurs, a choice limited only by one's conceptions of how learning can be achieved. Dr. Andersen chooses "basic lecture" as her primary means of instruction because she feels this mode of presentation is a personal strength of hers. Her students listen to her lectures, work as large and small groups solving teacher-defined problem sets, and, hopefully, successfully apply the taught principles on teacher-made examinations. Contrary to this teacher centrism, Jill offers a library research project where students have some element of choice in what and how they learn. Jill reports that students really enjoy this particular task and learn very well from it even though it is not heavily laden with engineering principles. She hopes to expand the project in the future, for she understands and appreciates the students' interest in it, and she recognizes that giving students choice in their learning empowers and liberates them to learn in ways they desire.

Dr. Andersen's pedagogy reveals her moral perceptions and her subsequent moral responses. Her teaching practice cannot be assessed as any more or less moral than Mike Monroe's, or any other professor at her university. What must be acknowledged is that her moral responsiveness is a function of what she is able to detect as moral situations. She does try to exercise moral imagination by looking at learning in her class from the perspective of her students' needs and interests. She recognizes that they enjoy more "open-ended" class activities. She currently is trying to include these in her teaching on their behalf, though she struggles with it for it requires resources that are not fully available to her. It requires Andersen's moral imagination and personal determination to meet what she perceives are her students needs and desires.

Involving students in their learning beyond passive recipient roles is a morally imaginative view of education. It requires that the teacher let go of time-honored beliefs that learning is "re-construction" of special knowledge and relinquish the idea that the professor has to be at the center of the learning process for students to attain that special knowledge. Morally imaginative teachers see beyond the actual limitations of institution, tradition, and custom so as to see hidden possibilities. Indeed, the morally imaginative teacher recognizes and embraces the idea that students can, with support and guidance, take command of their own learning endeavors.

Teaching as moral imagination is exemplified by Susan Keller's courses and her overall perspective on education. One need only look at her words and deeds as they are presented throughout this chapter. She sees teaching as a parental task; she strives for a personal touch; she tries to understand students as individuals with "different intellectual needs"; and she creates an array of learning opportunities such that students are empowered to educate themselves. Susan's focus is not on "building-in" her special knowledge but rather on creating the means through which students can access her special knowledge and then themselves build it into their own knowledge schemes. Susan sees education as the pursuit of possibility, as the opportunity to assist her

students in the self-discovery and self-construction of special knowledge. What sets Keller's moral perception and imagination apart from Monroe's and Andersen's is that hers is pervasive. It underlies her folk pedagogy. It reveals itself in her vocabulary, her metaphors, her educational goals, and her teaching practice. This seems such a sharp contrast from Drs. Andersen and Monroe, but we must remember that they teach in very different situations (e.g., departmental support and professional disciplines) than Susan's.

Although Monroe and Andersen make moral responses in the strict sense that it has been defined for this project, the effect of their moral actions are blunted by bureaucratic and departmental discourses that compete with and confine their moral agency. The professional discourse showed itself to all but preclude moral perception. It sets a view of students as future professionals not as developing young people. It encouraged distance between teachers and students, casting the perception that education is something done <u>to</u> students rather than <u>with</u> them. The institutional discourse appears no more inclined to regard education as a moral enterprise. As a bureaucratic organization, it operates on principle-based morality. It actually strives <u>not</u> to see students as unique individuals but as anonymous entities to be treated impartially through controlling rules and procedures. The academic discourse, by contrast, ought to be fertile ground for moral agency; the place where the moral nature of institution and profession are counterbalanced. Most of the narratives of academic discourse relating to conceptions of teaching and learning show a scant moral perception, narrow moral deliberation, and mostly impotent moral response. Remarkably, though, one facet of academic discourse regularly reveals rich moral discourse.

Professors speak about and act toward students according to several themes, almost like genres. Described earlier were stories relating how professors see their relationships with students as a matter of authority, control, and respect. Also stories here reveal professors' views of students' in terms of the students' role in the learning process. Finally, there were stories of students as future professionals and college graduates. In the academic discourse, professors expose another genre of stories and actions about students. In this case, the professors relate tales about students that cast students as individuals with unique needs, desires, and dispositions. It is a view of students as autonomous people rather than as mere class attendees, or recipients of prefabricated special knowledge, a view seen more in the other discourses. When in this mind-set, the professors always seems to exercise more moral perception and imaginative moral deliberation in response to students than when they are in the distanced "professional" mind-set or the impersonal "institutional" mind-set. Mike Monroe exemplifies this phenomenon as he relates a story about a student.

"I had a student last term who, it was the second time I'd had him, and he came up to me before the first exam and started just telling me probably more than a student normally does.

Apparently he had become depressed the previous semester and dropped out of school and he was on medications. He was doing a bit better now, and you know, he was still feeling a lot of pressure and wanted to know if. . . [personal information was related at this point]. And you know, I ended up letting him do it. . . . but, you know, my daughter has gone through some depression also, and I think I kind of probably shocked the guy being as sympathetic as I was. We talked about his medication, and this, that and the other, and I ended up making sure he had my home number, which he already had, but encouraged him to give me a call if he ever has any problems. We ended up corresponding a fair amount on e-mail. He enjoyed that better, or a bit more. But you know, I probably was not the one that this guy should have been talking to. And he did real well, and he ended up getting a job. . . ."

Despite Dr. Monroe's earlier insistence on a "dividing line" between teacher and student that was evident through his professional discourse, it seems that that dividing line vanishes when his students need special attention. Inspiringly, Monroe's moral perception helps him to see beyond the professional discourse - cross over the dividing line - and engage the moral discourse of teaching. Rather than following the institution's impersonal lead, rather than defaulting to formalistic business rituals, Mike is motivated by care and sympathy. This vignette in particular demonstrates how moral responsiveness as a caring act involves more than just a cognitive appraisal of another's condition. It also requires the responsive one to make an empathetic connection with the one responded to. Mike's concern for a student's well-being invokes his personal discourse - in this case connecting his teaching to his personal experiences as a father - and enables him to transcend the cultural influences of profession and institution to make a moral response.

Jill Andersen's pedagogy relating to students exhibits the same transcendence as that of Monroe's. She reveals through her other discourses the desire for distance between teacher and student, and sees it as a necessary element of respect and control in class. Her professional discourse discloses her preference for being called by title, for always dressing professionally, and for establishing an "authority-type distinction" between students and herself. And yet, her moral perception does insist that she sometimes circumvent her preference for the formalities of the engineering profession, for she too views her students with care and compassion. Jill recognizes that her course can be tough for some students. She takes a very sensitive approach to ensuring that students have the best opportunities to perform well on her tests. First, she arranges extensive help and review sessions before each test. When grading tests, she recognizes that there is more to learning the material than just the bottom line right answer. "I probably spend a lot longer grading tests. I grade all my own tests, and most of the time is [spent] trying to make sure that . . . if somebody goes down the wrong path in a problem you have to figure out when it's partial credit, so you have to assign partial credit to things. At least I do." In assigning partial credit, she strives

for "a fair assessment of the results versus the input. And also among different people so that it's equally, that the trade-off is distributed among everybody. You can't always do it equally but as best as you can." What Jill refers to here is an instance of moral perception. Fairness to her is not just treating students equally - as in impartially - but rather as in giving each equal amounts of individual consideration. She takes into account as much of her students' individual situations - things like illness, past performance, attendance, and effort - when determining grades. She evaluates students using parameters beyond just the numeric, impersonal rubrics understood by the institution. Explaining her idea of fairness, Jill says "I wouldn't think of it as such a concrete concept. . . ." but rather something that is determined on an individual basis. Individualizing fairness requires moral perception and moral imagination. This idea of fairness is motivated by care, sympathy, and an appreciation of students as individuals.

These last two tales of teachers connecting with students are tales of moral response, tales of people performing compassionate acts for other people. These tales demonstrate how teaching transcends curriculum and how it is fundamentally a caring profession and teachers fundamentally care givers. Although much of the academic discourse is encumbered by rational deliberation and unimaginative cultural influence, the moral voice speaks clearly when folk pedagogies are examined at the level of interpersonal relationships; for it is at this level that the veneer of professionalism and institutionalism gives way to the moral "heartwood" of the educational enterprise.

The narratives to this point have revealed a wide range of discourses that in this study together weave the discourse of higher education. And while these discourses have been explored as if they were separate and distinct, the fact is that they all occur together, each taking the stage as the educational act unfolds. As I have tried to indicate throughout, the moral basis of teaching is ever-present, but its expression - the moral discourse - is oftentimes held silent. But there is indeed a moral discourse, and it too weaves its way through these folk pedagogies just like the other discursive practices do. Now with a better understanding of the elements of moral agency - moral perception, moral deliberation, and moral response - a more focused examination of moral discourse can be taken.

Narratives of Moral Discourse

A moral discourse in pedagogy is founded on the idea that education is about more than merely presenting curriculum and testing for learning. It is about teachers acknowledging and facilitating students' development of healthy and informed conceptions of self. Moral discourse is the expression of the constituent parts of moral agency. Moral discourse first necessitates that the teacher possess some capacity to perceive the morally salient features of educational situations: that is, a teacher must be able to recognize when they have entered moral territory. The teacher must

also make moral deliberations either as rational moral reasoning or creative moral imagination. Finally, a moral discourse exhibits the reactions or responsiveness undertaken in a moral situation. In addition to each of the other discourses encountered in this study, each of the participant professors regularly exhibited moral discourse during my interactions with them. While I took occasions earlier to illustrate relevant moral features in regard to the other education-related discourse, the narratives that follow more clearly depict moral discourse as moral agency outside the context of the other competing discourses.

"Do you see education as a moral activity in any way?" I asked Jill Andersen.

"Oh, definitely, yeah," she responds. "And this is the dilemma of public universities, it's a lot easier for a private, religious school than a public university. . . . As a public university we can't tell people what's right and wrong. . . ." The response that Jill gave to my question was lengthy, detailed, and a substantive argument against teaching morals in higher education. Her spontaneous reply was an elaborate one that emphasized rationalistic conceptions of morality. This seems a typical scenario whereby most people, upon first response, identify morality in its rationalistic, rule-bound form. It seems that culturally we are much more accustomed to seeing morality strictly as an ethic of justice instead of seeing it as blended with an ethic of care.

"So," I decided to probe a bit further, "what are some of the moral aspects of education?"

"Well, *morals*. . . that's a very difficult word, to say what's moral and what's not. But, I guess when I think of what we can . . . address more is things like self-responsibility, which I sort of lump into a broad moral picture. Being responsible for your actions, and we can do that by giving them [students] an 'F' on a test if they oversleep through class. That may not influence what they do on Thursday night before the test directly - sorry! - but hopefully they'll see the consequence of their actions, you know. Uh, if you wanna put work ethics into a moral situation, cheating on a test. That's sort of a moral issue that we do not steal from others type thing. Professional ethics, that's sort of an expanded version of cheating on tests as far as how do you deal with it in the professional sense and the business sense. . . . it's all based on, I guess, sort of basic moral values."

Even though Jill conceives of morality primarily as a justice function, she also tells stories of education as moral responsiveness, of the non-rational, caring morality; though she does not herself explicitly identify them as instances of morality. Commenting on the importance of *reaching* her students, Jill confides: "I'm finding it's getting harder as I get older. . . . Because certainly they're a different generation. . . . you still try to find areas of common ground, just somehow have a connection in there some way. It just gets more difficult to do it as you get older, because it's not as natural . . . 'cause what you connect with is a little bit different. So you have to go into different types of things, things that you grew up with, you know, which would be the common ground when you were younger and teaching versus getting older and teaching."

Reaching students is an important feature of Jill's folk pedagogy, yet not one that is necessarily easy to achieve. But her dialogue here indicates that she works hard at it, and sees it as important that she connect with students. Jill makes these efforts not because there is some moral code she follows which dictates that teachers must work hard to reach students, but instead because she cares about her students' learning, perceives the situation as one calling for responsiveness and the taking-in of others. Without naming it as a moral situation, she certainly perceives it as one requiring a particular caring response. Jill's connections are often quite successful as she continues to stay in touch with a handful of students over the years even after they leave the university.

Along these same lines, Jill relates that the most important part of teaching to her is her interaction with students. This facet of her pedagogy is regularly demonstrated in class as she is always pleasant and inviting as an instructor, and always took extra care to ensure students were keeping up with her lectures. Regularly after class she would stay to answer student questions, sometimes walking them back to her office for additional help. But Jill's interest in interaction extended beyond class. She also held regular review session for students who needed extra help on homework problems, scheduled extended office hours around exam times, and made herself accessible via telecommunication at home and office. An unusual yet commendable practice of hers involves students whose test performance falls below a prescribed grade. These students are required to meet personally with Jill to revisit the test and ensure they understand how they performed unsatisfactorily. Her favorite interaction with students, however, is her work with graduate students. "I do like the research aspect, working with the graduates. That's probably the funnest part, because you get to work more directly one-on-one teaching. That's pretty fun because you both are learning. So you'll sit there and look at a problem and say, 'Well, let's try it.' You don't know what the answer is, it's not like the answer is in the back of the book when you're doing research. So, you figure it out and you say, 'Oh, well, wait a minute, we can do this, oh, well, wait a minute.' And the student will come up with an idea I hadn't thought about, and so that makes it fun."

Interacting with students as teachers do is a moral action. That one person leads another to develop what is, we trust, a meaningful and appropriate view of some small part of the world - fundamental engineering, for example - is moral through and through. Jill enjoys assisting students and watching them learn things, especially in one-on-one situations. It is in such situations that formalities can give way to familiarities, when teachers can most directly extend their care and students can most readily receive it. It is difficult for teachers to reach out to individuals in classrooms full of students. It is even more difficult for teachers to know in classroom situations when their reach has connected. More intimate settings allow teachers like Jill to make connections, relate to students on more personal levels, and, importantly, to have more immediate

feedback that their caring efforts were successful. The teacher who creates opportunities to interact with students in more personal settings than the classroom might possess a pedagogy that recognizes and requires responsiveness over other interactions that are more detached and managerial.

Interactions with students also is a major feature of Susan Keller's pedagogy. But rather than continuing to illustrate moral agency along these lines, there is another feature of Keller's practice that well portrays moral discourse. Throughout my study, Dr. Keller always expressed a pragmatic view of the role of college education in the lives of students. She seems to have a realistic idea of what is the general disposition of college students and what she feels she can do as a professor to enhance their situations. Such a view is remarkably moral and calls for rather creative and imaginative approaches to teaching and learning. Much of her moral responsiveness has been displayed throughout this work, but there is still at least one more short story for her to tell; one that provides a very real idea of how a teacher morally perceives, imagines moral responses, and then implements them as instruction and learning opportunities for students.

College, Keller says, is "a unique time from a student's perspective, because for most students, it's the first time they've been away from home, they're struggling to establish their own identity, they're struggling to figure out exactly what sort of life they want to lead, and I think of myself as in many ways having input on that decision, too. I'm now an influence on them, and their parents are a lesser influence, and in many cases in my classes I challenge what they've been raised with. So I want them to think about who they are, where they're going.

"It's very difficult to shape someone's life, when they're one person in a crowd. Because you don't even know what they're about, where they're coming from, where they want to go, what they want to get out of the class. Part of what you want to do as an educator is build a sense of an intellectual community, a sense of an intellectual life. Because most people haven't experienced that in high school. I mean, high school is set memorization and regurgitation and partying with your friends. I mean, I want to suggest that there's another way to be an educated person, and an intellectual discussion can be satisfying as well as enlightening."

"Okay, now, from the student's perspective, all of this is very different. . . . They are following a trajectory set by their parents, or set by their peers. They haven't thought about why they're here. They just know, maybe they're supposed to go to college. . . . and then they'll get a job. So, what are they trying to do? Well, they're trying to live a life. And they probably don't have a well-set educational philosophy. They're trying to make good grades, because that's how they think they're going to get a good job. Maybe some courses are interesting to them, so they're actually trying to learn the material. A lot of time, they're just trying to get through. They're trying to balance a lot of things in their life. They, most of them, work, so they have to balance work and job, and maybe even have family situations they have to take care of, and friends, and I

think the social life for this age group is also extremely important, because this is a time of exploration for them to figure out, you know, what sort of relationships they want to have, with what sorts of people, where it's not constrained by parents or church, or their background. So, it's a big up-in-the-air time. So they probably don't know why they're in my class, or what they're looking for, or what they hope to get out of it. So I think in some ways, the relationship between teachers and students is adversarial, because I'm trying to convince them that all the stuff is really important, and they're coming in not caring. And not even knowing that they shouldn't care, not even having thought about it. And I'm trying to fight it out with them to get their attention, to convince them this is important, and that this is more important than drinking beers with their buddies, ditching class, you know, working at Burger King or whatever. So, in some ways it is an adversarial relationship. But in some ways I think it's also very much a parental relationship, that in 'I've been there, done that.' And I have ideas that I want to impart to these students to help them to live a better life. That's a very parental notion. And in some ways, I think I'm very different than other instructors here, because the other model for student-teacher is not sort of a parent or an apprenticeship relationship, but as a client, so I've got a product, students are shelling out bucks to come buy the product. And I'll use that language, too, right - when I say it's their nickel. If they want to come to class, then that's fine. I see that's their decision. I see them as adults. But at the same time I think I have parental concerns for these adults."

"How do you go about in this relationship?" I ask. "How do you go about your agenda with them? I mean, if it's adversarial, how do you approach it, what are the things that you do?"

"Well, I use lots of hooks, and in some ways you can see this better in the [introductory philosophy] class, because there the relationship is in many ways - I don't want to say adversarial in the sense that we're yelling at each other about it, but most of the students there are fulfilling some requirement. They're not there because they're interested in the material. [The other philosophy class] is different, because it's a senior-level class, so most students aren't there because he or she has to be. I try to find things that appeal to them that relate to my subject area. So I will use movie clips. I will talk about short stories, that's why I have short stories in the class, because most students are interested in this sort of reading, and it's a way to hook them into the topic and to see in a fun way how this material can be interesting. And then we can explore it in a more analytic framework in the classroom. I try to be an interesting person, I try to give interesting, dynamic lectures, so that they'll be interested. I try to be aware of them as people. So, I care whether they don't do their homework and why they don't do it. And I care that they're late to class. And, I care about them as individuals, and I hope that I can in some way communicate that caring to them."

What stands out about Keller's moral discourse is the depth at which she perceives the moral nature of her teaching practice and the lengths she goes to give a moral response. She tries

hard to imagine the students' situations beyond her classroom walls. She draws from her own experiences. She speculates on their emotions. She hypothesizes about the needs they have and the desires they pursue. She then uses all of these moral imaginings to inspire and guide her pedagogy. For as deep as she ponders the lives of her students, she responds with creative and relevant learning activities.

Curious, I push her for more details of her folk pedagogy: "Do you have an agenda that says 'I'm going to demonstrate care.' or any of these other objectives that you hold, or are these things that you just rely on?"

"Well, to some degree," she explains, "I've thought it out. I mean, incorporating movie clips and things like that is a deliberate attempt to hook 'em into the class. A lot of the computer stuff - that's another hook. It's fun, it gets them in there, it gets them involved, so that's a deliberate hook. Some of it's deliberate but it happens spontaneously. That is, I think humor is very important, and it's a way to demonstrate interest in a subject. So I try to use humor whenever I can. But, but I'm not good at planning out jokes, so it's something I sort of deliberately want to include but I can only include it when it comes to me. . . . Using the computer component in the second part of the class where we talk on the computer, to me is very important. Not so much - I mean, I don't tell the students this - not so much because of the topics we're discussing, but it's because these are people who are now having intellectual conversations with one another. It's that they're actually doing it! So, that's another deliberate, item on my agenda, I think."

Perhaps one reason why Dr. Keller seems to be so morally connected is because she fully understands education as a moral activity and articulates its complexities well. "I don't think you can separate questions of value from questions of intellect. Just the fact you want to value knowledge in and of itself is a value judgment. It's a moral statement. What I take to be a proper intellectual life, to me, is a value statement. Sort of respecting one another's ideas, working hard to understand the world around you and your place in it and so forth. I mean, these are all value-laden statements." The fact that Susan has such a firm grasp of education as a moral enterprise may explain some of why her teaching practice reflects such a rich moral discourse. Could it be that a deep understanding of the moral nature of education actually has an effect on the way teachers approach educating students? Perhaps some light might be shed on this question by Mike Monroe.

I asked Dr. Monroe: "Do you see education as a moral activity in any sense?"

"Uh, I'm not sure I have ever thought about it that way. There may be some aspects of it, but you know, being in the College of Business and doing what I do, I view it to a certain - to a large extent - as an economic activity. You know, you're creating wealth by going through this educational process. You're developing skills that are marketable. That's kind of what's driven a large part of the business portion of the educational experience. Now, in order to do well at that . .

. there's a morality that should come out of it. There's some moral aspects that are certainly helpful in business.

"Such as?" I ask enthusiastically.

"Uh, well, ethical behavior" he replies. As Mike goes on from this point relating cases of unethical business practice it is clear that, like Jill Andersen, he holds a very justice-based -- rule and principle driven -- conception of morality that carries a rather professional orientation. Aside from imparting lessons of professional ethics, Monroe seems to be relatively unaware of education as a moral activity, as a practice of care, concern, and connection. But again, like Andersen, there is a paradox of sorts at work here. Although neither of these professors can articulate with much sophistication the moral nature of education, they both inherently recognize and respond to its most essential elements - caring and concern for the well-being of the students in their charge. It is precisely that natural caring tendency each of these professors possess that connects them to the moral dimension. They may not articulate it, per se, but through their desire to care they are able to recognize and respond to it. A terrific example of Monroe's natural caring is revealed through this following story.

"So Dr. M, what's the most important part of your job as an educator?"

"If you want to look in broad areas, just the teaching. I love teaching. I absolutely love teaching. I love interacting with kids; I enjoy the research and that kind of thing, just because you get a reasonable amount of applause for it. But I love teaching. I love taking that topic and with lecture, where you take something that you know, you get the feeling that they're understanding it."

"But what the heck is teaching? . . . My gut feeling is always to go back to creating value for the kids, providing them with these skills that they might not have otherwise. . . . If I were to twenty years from now look back at my career and ask how did I change things, or what did I really do of value, for me personally it's been writing the books. I think I've had an effect on the way Business is taught, what's included in the classroom. I look at the number of kids that have had to struggle through my books, that's really where I've probably made the broadest meaning. Where I've . . . had the most concentrated effect is on kids like the one last semester I was talking to you about who had the emotional problems, who had considered suicide. That kid there I've probably had a more concentrated effect on. The other, a broader one, but you know, both of them I'm gonna someday look back on and feel good about."

Mike Monroe may not have ever thought about education as a moral activity, but in his practice he often perceives the moral nature of situations, is prone to morally imagining his role as teacher, and he surely demonstrates some responsive action to his students. Given the nature of his career, one that sees education as "an economic activity," it is easy to understand his claim in an earlier story that his caring sometimes causes him to "go well beyond being a teacher." His view

of teachers seems to be limited to one where teachers are merely purveyors of special knowledge. There is, though, an unacknowledged tension between his theories and discourse about teaching and his actual practice. It is possible that much of his undeniable joy in teaching may derive from aspects of the practice that he would otherwise consider unprofessional. He does not acede that teachers are care providers, that teaching and education are inherently caring pursuits. He does not overtly express an understanding that we educate young people because we care for their future, we want them to lead happy and prosperous lives, and we want them too to provide this for our future generations.

The moral discourse of these professors disclosed the inherent subjectivity present in conceptions of education as a moral activity. Jill Andersen's most immediate response was to acknowledge it as religious in nature, as a matter of rightness and wrongness. Her conception was more of *moralizing* education, whereupon moral lessons are taught as part of a moral curriculum. Jill's second explanation referred to professional ethics. Mike Monroe too identified professional ethics as his secondary response. However, Monroe's primary response was that he had not thought of education as moral and saw it more as an economic activity. By contrast, Susan Keller's view of the moral aspects of education seemed rather systemic. She insisted that questions of value cannot be separated from questions of intellect, and identified pursuit of knowledge as a valued action. In each of the first two cases mentioned, there was a noticeable dichotomy between verbally articulated ideas of morality in education and the observed actions of the professors in the study. While the above narratives indicate that all three of these professors take moral action, they themselves do not acknowledge it as such. The moral discourse exists, though it seems that it is not always recognized for what it is.

Mike Monroe's recognition of situations as moral is apparent for he under takes moral responses. However, he apparently believes that when he is in a caring situation with a student, he has abandoned his role as teacher and has taken some other role. I am certain he is not suggesting that teachers are not caring people, rather he just does not connect teaching and caring as integrated ideas. Caring deeply about the welfare of students is not "well beyond being a teacher" as he claims. Rather, it is precisely this characteristic that defines a morally active teacher, and perhaps it is this characteristic that separates the teacher from the mere professor. I am reminded of the old saw: "Students will not care what you know until they know that you care." Perhaps at the university professors need to resist being "careful" in their approach to teaching -- that is, secure in their commitment to rule-bound customs of profession and institution -- and start being "care-full" as they endeavor to enliven the experiences of their students.

Despite the vigorous competition of the various discourses, moral discourse does emerge in some situations; though in most instances in this study it seems to be a shy discourse, one that does not challenge for the educational spotlight like the other discourses seem to do. The

professors - the teachers - in this study, I discovered, care the way they do because they all love teaching and working with their students. It seems they love teaching <u>because</u> it is a moral activity; what makes it moral is what they love about it. It seems Garrison's (1997) claim is true: "We become what we love" (p. xii).

"The aim of the education of the human eros has been to enable students to distinguish between something they might desire and the truly desirable. It is the single most important aspect of all education." -- Jim Garrison

To this point, considerable discussion has been given to the ideas of folk pedagogy and moral discourse. Each topic has been discussed as separate ideas in the field of education, and they have been discussed in relation to one another. Folk pedagogy - teachers' personal, informal theories and assumptions of teaching and learning - underwrites the ideas, strategies, and actions of teaching practices (Bruner, 1996). Folk pedagogy possesses a moral dimension because, as argued throughout this study, education is a moral enterprise (Fenstermacher, 1990; Jackson, Boostrom & Hansen, 1993; Oser, 1994; Purpel & Ryan 1983). Moral discourse thus constitutes the language, agency, and demeanor teachers employ as they undertake the moral tasks of education. The theoretical explorations of Chapters One and Two provided the framework for the story of moral discourse in higher education pedagogy told through the narratives of the three participant professors. That story exposed a handful of individual discourses and illuminated some key constituents of moral agency among professors - namely moral perception, moral imagination, and moral responsiveness. Because most of the artifacts were analyzed and discussed through the connecting stories between the narratives in the last chapter, my interest now is to draw together summary thoughts and provide a generative discussion of the moral dimension of folk pedagogy.

Folk Pedagogy in Higher Education Discourse

The discourse in higher education is a very complex expression of the thoughts, actions, and exigencies related to university teaching. From this study have emerged five themes through which discursive practices tell of individual folk pedagogies. These themes, or discourses as I have referred to them, have shown here to be influential in shaping what has been encountered in each professors' teaching practice. Recall that a folk pedagogy arises from the interaction between one's personal experiences of teaching and learning and the conceptions of teaching and learning established by the prevailing culture. They are personal beliefs and meanings fashioned around cultural templates (Bruner, 1996). This is significant for it identifies the mechanism by which the five discourses in this study have emerged and interact as the folk pedagogy displayed.

Every professor at every university brings personal experiences to their jobs as teachers in higher education. These personal experiences, old and new, inform how professors go about

teaching. Coming from "a family of teachers," Jill Andersen explains, "I think the value of education was always very strong in our family. . . . I have a very strong sense of the value of education." This value of education shows up in her teaching practice in several ways, especially in her attitude that "they're [students] not going to benefit if you lower their standards . . . . I mean that's just saying that they can't do this. And that's just an injustice to them." Jill also incorporates into her present pedagogy her experiences as a student where she respected the fairness of teachers, their rapport with students, and their mastery of subject matter. Susan Keller acknowledged her dissatisfaction that the university did not "serve me as well as it could have by not taking an interest in me." Now she recognizes that "there are things that I can point to now that really bug me [from being a student herself], that I work very hard to make sure doesn't happen with my students." Mike Monroe's pedagogy too is informed by his personal experiences, those as a student (questioning students "always seemed like stupid banter back and forth between a professor and a kid") and as a parent ("you know, that could be my kid out there. So, uh, you want to make sure that if they need it, you help them."). In each of these instances, and the many others in their stories, these professors identify particular features of past experience brought to present day teaching situations.

The influence of culture on teaching is likewise exhibited by this study. Mike Monroe, like most professors, teaches at a university where his "special knowledge" of business is highly valued, but there are few if any requirements that he possess any "special knowledge" about teaching in the same way he does for his discipline. Mike and his colleagues at the university are teachers in a culture where special knowledge about teaching is not valued. To teach in this culture, one need only to have experienced teaching through ones own experience studenting; a condition that is so customary that we often overlook its significance. However, consider the significance of this culture of higher "education" through this analogy: To fly an airplane, one need only to have experienced piloting through one's own experience as a passenger. The risk of this teaching culture is, as Mike admits, not knowing "diddly-squat" about teaching and adopting a pedagogy where "what I've done is just plodded through things, just kinda made up ways: what works, you keep doing; what doesn't, you bag." In the end, Mike reports the cultural standard for teaching is that "you just have to NOT be unbelievably atrocious." This example - and the others told earlier like Jill's gender-related situation or Susan's departmental insistence on connecting with students - are all telling about cultural values and expectations, and their effect on professors' pedagogies.

The constituent influences of folk pedagogy explored here have been discussed as five particular discourses. These discourses - personal, professional, institutional, academic, and moral - when taken together, compose the theories, beliefs, and actions of teaching for the professors encountered in this study. They constitute higher education as it is enacted by these

three teachers. Thus, what a professor conceives of as learning, based on her or his unique experiences and cultural influences, is how that professor is likely to go about teaching. "Teaching," as Bruner says, "is inevitably based on notions about the nature of the learner's mind. Beliefs and assumptions about teaching. . . are a direct reflection of the beliefs and assumptions the teacher holds about the learner" (1996, p. 46-47). Susan Keller, for example, recognizes the role of students' prior knowledge in learning new knowledge. When her course design is examined, this assumption about learning can be seen through the abundance of choices she offers students in their learning activities. She empowers students to choose learning tasks that work best for them. The practices of each of these teachers bespeak their conceptions of teaching and learning and tell their individual stories of folk pedagogy.

My exploration of folk pedagogy throughout this work has been undertaken to illuminate, at least conceptually, how three professors have constituted their teaching practices, especially within the moral dimension. However, what has notably emerged from this exploration is an indication that professors organize and express some portion of their folk pedagogies around five dimensions of discourse. It stands to reason that other discursive themes exist among the melange that is higher educational discourse, but given the parameters of this research program these five themes dominated. Prior to this investigation, I fully expected to confront some of these discursive forms. Given my understanding of folk pedagogy, it was not particularly surprising to have encountered the personal discourses and the culturally-related institutional discourse. Likewise, my experience with teaching's moral dimension prepared me well for my encounters with the moral discourse, though, as I explain later, the moral discourse did not quite take the form I expected. While these discourses were more-or-less anticipated, their details are unique and could never have themselves been predicted. How the narratives of each discourse have given shape and substance to each folk pedagogy are clearly individualistic discoveries.

While there were some anticipated encounters in the study, there were also some unsuspected revelations. Prior to this inquiry I had no idea that the professional discourse even existed, much less with the predominance that it has shown. Now as I reflect on it, I am not all that surprised by this finding. Given the heavy research emphasis at the university where these professors work, it is not hard to grasp how specialized disciplinary knowledge is valued and how it must have a significant role in the larger educational discourse. Having explored some of the scholarship on professionalization in higher education (e.g., Bloom, 1987; Boyer, 1990; Bowen, 1982; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989; Johnson, 1995; Wacquant, 1996; and Wilshire, 1990), I now comprehend better why and how this particular discourse has taken such an assertive role in the higher education discourse.

Another unanticipated finding was the academic discourse. Why I had not predicted its presence mystifies me still. In retrospect, I think it due to some phenomenon like "not seeing the

forest for the trees." I suppose that in any serious educational endeavor an educational researcher might take for granted the presence of an academic discourse, so familiar might it be that it is almost overlooked. Nevertheless, it made itself apparent in this study, though I am surprised by its substance.

Once I recognized the academic discourse as a key player in the study, I began to expect certain features of it based on my own educational reference points. In many cases, these features were absent or underdeveloped. For instance, overall I expected professors' considerations of students - their prior knowledge, dispositions, and, to a degree, their interests - to be expressed somewhat more substantially than they were. I also expected the professors' ideas about how learning occurs to be more sophisticated. And, I suppose I expected (maybe hoped) that the participants could express teaching as a more holistic concept rather than so strongly as a means to special knowledge. The academic discourse did, however, reinforce my belief that professors possess very simplified conceptions of teaching and learning compared to other "educators" (i.e., professors of education and public school teachers) with whom I have worked. The academic discourse, despite my expectations, shed light on a critical dimension of folk pedagogy.

I have pursued this line of inquiry into folk pedagogy to demonstrate how these professors form and express their particular beliefs and theories about education. To me it seemed necessary to establish this psychological dimension - to ferret out the beliefs and theories - in order to explore the moral landscape upon which they reside. It turns out that these discourses not only aid in explaining folk pedagogy as an independent idea itself, but also reveal the highly dynamic relationship that these discourses have among one another and their individual influences on the moral discourse in particular. While there are a great deal of insights and expressions contained in these stories of folk pedagogy, these stories are also remarkable for what they reveal about the moral dimension of university teaching.

Folk Pedagogical Influences on Moral Discourse

Although this project has brought to light a range of discursive practices in university teaching, its focus has always been on the moral aspect of those practices. The discussion of folk pedagogy has been crafted to expose the unique characteristics of each particular discourse, as well as their individual moral orientations. Discussed among the five individual discourses was the moral discourse - a discursive practice sufficiently morally laden to warrant this singular designation. The moral discourse has been presented here as if it were a distinct entity like the other discourses. Representing moral discourse in this way - indeed, representing all of the discourses as completely separate practices - has been done to emphasize the stratification of these discursive themes among the larger holistic educational discourse. This approach proved to be a simple way

to explain the individual segments of personal and cultural influences (i.e., the individual discursive themes) on the overall educational discourse. It also was useful to illustrate independently what was meant by the idea of a moral discourse.

The presentation of the moral discourse in this way, however, does not fully tell the story of its interaction among the other discourses, nor its role in the main educational discourse itself. Rather than existing as some singular independent entity as I have portrayed it, the moral discourse instead permeates in various forms the other four discursive arenas. That is to say, each of the individual discourses possesses different moral profiles and moral potencies. At the very least, however, they are acts undertaken by the agents with an educational intent to, as Dewey (1909/1975) says, "make things better than they otherwise would be." At their moral maximum, they are deeply "care-full" acts, acts that transcend "dividing lines," professional protocols, and institutional impositions to connect teachers and students. What is noteworthy about this variable conception of moral discourse is how it seems to fluctuate in response to the other discourse types.

The variability of moral discourse is regulated throughout the educational discourse by the particular nature of the other discourse types. Each of the other four discourses influences an individual's folk pedagogy because of specific connections to personal experience or cultural canons. The moral thread that weaves throughout folk pedagogy is likewise influenced by the personal or cultural nature of the discourses. For example, the personal discourse typically exhibits a rich moral makeup. The personal discourse is one measured for public exposure. It is reserved for trusted, familiar audiences who, it was believed, would share the value of and appreciation for those special experiences. When professors are engaged in a personally discursive mode, the character of their discourse reflects moral substance in ways the other discourses were not observed to do. By contrasting example, when a professor's discourse related to institutional influences, the moral nature of that discourse appeared to wane. When the institutional discourse was engaged, the view of education generally became reductionistic (e.g., courses serving as "cash cows") and impersonal (e.g., classes of 350 or more students). This fluctuation of moral potency was a particularly conspicuous phenomenon throughout the observations and interviews. Just as obvious, however, is the revelation of a dominant discourse for each individual professor.

It was never anticipated that the moral discourse would predominate any large segment of the overall educational discourse (Jackson, Boostrom & Hansen, 1993). The moral discourse is more of a supporting actor in the educational drama. Education is an endeavor to impart knowledge, to prepare minds, to equip humans for productive lives. Although a mission such as this is indeed moral, the more tangible script of education involves curriculum, information, and skills - mental and physical. It stands to reason that if one segment of discourse is going to dominate the others, then it more than likely would be one related to this practical theme such as the academic or professional discourse. Accordingly, that is what unfolded in this story. Although

the moral discourse was found to exist in some form or another throughout all the discourses, it was not the dominate discourse in either of the three cases studied.

It is not difficult to detect which of the discourses dominate the folk pedagogies of each professor. Consider the personal and professional histories the participants bring to this study. These professors have made extraordinary investments to learn their particular disciplines. These disciplines are more than just careers or jobs at this level, they are passions. The depth of understanding, the network of collegial dialogue, research activities, and service programs all are dimensions that feed and sustain an extraordinary mastery of subject discipline. Teaching, while as germane to the discipline as those other dimensions just identified, is but one slice of the disciplinary pie. It has been my observation throughout my higher educational experience that the pie, the discipline, reaches to so many arenas of life for a professor that it seems an alter ego. This, in fact, was evident in this study too. Mike Monroe on several occasions elaborated principles of business re-fashioned for his private life. In an early interview, Mike explained a business principle whereby businesses over commit their cash flow to keep the business hungry for more cash. In his life, he said, he over commits his time to make himself more efficient in his use of time. When so much of one's life has been committed to a career, or passion, it is not unreasonable to expect that that theme will take a dominant role in the narratives that compose that individual's life.

In this study, the professional discourse took the dominant role for Jill and Mike. Jill and Mike work in highly professionalized fields. They have studied their fields extensively, they research it, they write about it, they discuss it with colleagues, they communicate to students and others in the field. Under these circumstances, it is no surprise that the professional discourse dominates the folk pedagogy for these two professors. From the story in the last chapter, any reader here should not be surprised that Mike Monroe never considered education a moral activity but instead has always viewed it as "economic." Neither should there be surprise over Jill Andersen's engineering-oriented thoughts over a metaphor for teaching as something that "has a lot of interactions and is changing all the time." That these professors see education through the lens of their profession is not bad, indeed it is good. We want capable business leaders in our society. We insist on competent engineers. Mike and Jill both strike me as committed to upholding the standards of their respective fields.

Susan Keller's dominant discourse differs from her colleagues in this study. She is in the field of philosophy - a field concerned with, among other things, the pursuits of knowledge, epistemology, and wisdom. Although the field of philosophy does itself have a professional realm - that where philosophers practice their discipline - that realm is very much akin to the discipline of education. It is from this relationship between the fields of education and philosophy that I understand how Keller's academic discourse dominates her folk pedagogy. Throughout her

narratives she consistently displayed a pedagogy that was not so much concerned with the precepts of her field as much as they were with the precepts of educating students. Her metaphor for teaching was that of a parent, and idea not necessarily connected to philosophy. Her reasons for creating wide choices of student activities were to empower her students, giving them an active role in their education. Reasoning such as this reflects a folk pedagogy where there is an understanding of the learning process that is beyond *instruere*. Keller's stories told of her knowledge of the principles of education, of an understanding of how the mind works and how a professor can teach in ways to maximize learning. Her stories, her folk pedagogy, were much more suffused with the academic discourse than either of the other discourses.

The contra-conception of this dominant discourse explains the roles of those discourses dominated. In most cases, professors have not had formal training in the principles of education like they have in their specialized discipline (McKeachie, 1990). Even though these professors teach about their respective disciplines, by their own admissions their experiences with formalized pedagogical training is much less extensive than their experiences in their disciplines. Thus, with Susan Keller's exception, the academic discourse does not hold the experiential base to influence the pedagogy to the same extent as do the other discourses.

This same effect operates on the moral discourse as well. It takes a rather sophisticated knowledge of education to recognize the features of education's moral landscape (Jackson, Boostrom, & Hansen, 1993; Purpel & Ryan, 1983). Mike Monroe claimed to have never even thought of it that way. Jill Andersen responded affirmatively, but could only identify the student honor code and professional ethics as features of the landscape. As a philosopher, Dr. Keller articulated a much more complex understanding as she stated, among other ideas, that it is difficult to separate matters of intellect from matters of value. Given that, for at least two professors here, knowledge of teaching's moral nature is one step removed from even an understanding of education's formal tenets, it is easy to see how the moral discourse gets cast as an "extra" in this particular portrayal of higher education pedagogy.

Folk pedagogy is shaped through an admixture of cultural and personal influences on a teachers' conceptions of education (Bruner, 1996). Within this mix are the discourse constituents that take dominant or supportive roles in folk pedagogy depending upon the relative experience base of the discourses. In this story of higher education pedagogy, the emphasis on specialized knowledge and professionalism combined with the lack of formal preparation in the discipline of education, renders the folk pedagogies of Drs. Andersen and Monroe with a different expression of moral discourse than that presented by Dr. Keller. That is not to say that the educational discourses of Monroe and Andersen are any less moral in nature than Keller. It is not a matter of degree of moral content. Rather, it is a matter of awareness, or lack of awareness, and exhibition of moral agency. It means, within the context of this study, that Keller recognizes the moral

landscape of university teaching and conveys through her words and actions a pedagogy that is more responsive to education's moral nature. It seems her folk pedagogy, perhaps because of its emphasis on academic discourse, equips her with a mentality that allows her to morally perceive, morally imagine, morally respond in ways and situations that the other two professors' folk pedagogies do not accommodate. Whatever the interactions, it is clear that the nature of a professor's folk pedagogy influences the expression of moral discourse among the educational discourses.

Despite the role moral discourse has defined for it by the dominant discourses, it does possess presence in these stories of higher education, and it does affect the character of the education imparted. The next section more closely examines the role moral discourse plays in the educational enterprise.

Moral Discourse as Pedagogy

Although the moral discourse was not found to be a dominant discourse among any of the three cases in this study, it did stake its claim among some aspects of all the folk pedagogies encountered. Most notably, the moral discourse revealed itself when professors told stories of or were observed interacting with students. Moral discourse was also discovered to a lesser degree in the class planning professors conducted on behalf of their students. The story of moral discourse told in the last chapter makes clear that the moral discourse is not the dominant discourse engaged by the participating professors. However, that story also makes clear that the moral discourse is expressed in certain contexts and does have a particular role and function in higher education pedagogy.

Moral discourse's emergence in student-teacher interactions seems understandable in light of the case made for relationships as part of education's moral core. In each of the three professors' cases, their vocabulary, demeanor, and actions all combine to form a rich moral discourse related to direct individual student interactions. In the cases of Drs. Monroe and Andersen, moral discourse was expressed most often in discussions of single students, helping particular students, or working with students in smaller groups. Although Dr. Keller also displayed a moral discourse in these same student contexts, she also expanded her moral discourse to relate to students in the context of the whole class rather than only in more intimate situations. What is interesting is how proximity to students - contexts where students' interests, desires, and needs can be more individually recognized and appreciated - seems to draw out the moral discourse. Mike Monroe, in particular, made noticeable shifts of moral discourse when relating narratives about his different class sizes. He told of how he was able to connect to students more readily, how he was able to get to know them, and how this closeness made for better education

and more satisfying teaching. Jill Andersen conveyed essentially the same sentiments related to teaching sparsely populated review sessions, one-on-one tutoring, and work with graduate students.

It seems that when conditions permit professors to see students in more personal ways - in contexts where the moral features of individuality and connectivity are more apparent and achievable - that the moral discourse flourishes. When these teachers can comprehend the condition of relationship, perceive the individuality of the students they engage, they let down the public fronts of reservation, dividing lines, and professional tenets in favor of connection, caring, and empathy. By contrast, in situations such as large classes where student individuality is exiled by students *en masse*, these professors are prevented from perceiving the moral features of education and so default to the dominant discourse. In situations where moral perception is challenged by over-riding conditions, the unfolding of moral action is muted. Moral perception creates the setting for moral action, without perception of a situation as morally significant moral action often will not follow (Blum, 1994). It appears that some situations are inhospitable creating a condition where, as Noddings (1984) explains, "in an important sense, teachers do care, but they are unable to make connections that would complete caring relations with their students" (p. 2).

Each professor in this study consistently demonstrated that interacting with students was a favorite feature of her or his job. When situations permitted closeness to student individuality - an unobstructed opportunity for moral perception - they naturally, and often enthusiastically, engaged a moral discourse of caring, concern, and empathy for their students. It seems that where perception of moral significance was not overwhelmed by the exigencies of profession or institution, the way was clear for professors' moral agency: Moral imagination prevailed in deliberations over how to act and students were seen as needful people not merely as young professionals or simple extensions of some human collective. This same view occasionally appeared in relation to professors' course planning.

Moral discourse was regularly exhibited by the professors when they engaged in planning their courses. Although "planning" might suggest an aspect of the academic discourse, this is a clear case where the moral discourse was itself present within another discourse. Instructional planning is a complex process whereby teachers integrate subject matter, instructional modalities, learner characteristics, features of the environment, and a host of other situationally relevant factors in an effort to effectively accomplish learning (LeFrançois, 1997). In the cases within this study, each professor expressed through words and classroom action deep consideration of her or his students in their planning activities. In most cases, these considerations involved speculating on prior experiences, deliberating over prior class performances, anticipating trouble spots in the material, and contemplation of how to stimulate the interests of their students. While these are typical planning activities, they nevertheless possess moral significance.

Planning is a deliberative process that leads to decisions about learning made on behalf of the student by the teacher. This concept was explicated at length earlier as part of the moral core of education. But planning possesses moral orientation for another reason with these professors. Through each of their narratives, spoken and acted, these teachers undertook moral perception, creative moral imagination, and moral responsiveness within their planning activities. While designing his classes Mike Monroe considered the "math phobias" that he regularly witnessed among his students. He made careful and "care-full" efforts to introduce mathematical aspects in to the course and was cautious about his use of it in his lectures. He perceived the anxiety that math raised among his students and so beneficently acted to mitigate it. Similarly, he crafted the many stories he told such that they we not only interesting but relevant to the lives of students. In this way, Monroe imagined the best possibilities for his students and was responsive to their situations as he perceived them. Jill Andersen performed similar moral acts as she tried to envision what would most stimulate her students to learn, what about them could she connect with to ensure that their interests were accommodated. Jill found the mark with her library investigations, group homeworks, and project design teams that were all popular with her students. The moral nature of Dr. Keller's planning has been elaborated throughout this work and further affirms these findings. Thus, the moral discourse associated with the planning efforts of these professors involves their perception of the needs, interests and desires of their students; creative imagination of ways to stimulate those student characteristics; and responsive action that is altruistic in the sense that the professors undertake the beneficent action for their students.

In many ways, when given conducive opportunities to connect with students, these professors eagerly attempted to do so, regardless of dominant discourse. It seemed when the impinging conditions of institutional discourse were mitigated and when relational conditions did not necessitate promotion of the professional portrait, the professors "devolved" into just plain folks; they were able to and enjoyed connecting with students on simple human relational terms. This phenomenon poses the interesting idea that, although the moral discourse - that of connecting and caring about students in humanistic terms (not just academic or professional terms) - is not the *dominant discourse*, it may be the *desired discourse*. Thinking about desired discourse, my mind repeatedly replays Mike Monroe exclaiming "I love teaching, I flat-out love it. I love the kids"; Jill working one-on-one with her students where "that's pretty fun because you both are learning"; and Dr. Keller explaining at length how she sees teaching like parenting.

In addition to the moral discourse showing signs of being a desired discourse, it looks as though it is also a useful discourse. Put in terms emphasized in this study, it seems that in morally conducive situations a professor's personal discourse - that discourse reserved for less public exposure - can merge with their academic discourse. In these instances, the professor actually "teaches" in a personally discursive manner, often integrating the formal course curriculum with

the informal moral curriculum of caring, concern, and empathy. The affect is that these connections form a pedagogy, they are themselves instructional. Perhaps these moments of moral pedagogy do not directly bolster learning major course concepts such as the Ideal Gas Law, the Time-Value Theory of Money, or Epistemology, but they do indirectly foster learning by creating feelings of efficacy, community, and acceptance. There were instances in each of these three cases where it is apparent that the moral discourse actually accomplished some educational task be it planning related, affectively oriented - like when Andersen assigns projects she knows respond to students' interests - or just a compassionate act such as Monroe and the severely depressed student. It seems that just as teachers use questions to lead students toward knowing, just as they use experiments to demonstrate key ideas, just as they use professional titles and dress to signal need for respect, they also use moral discourse to engage and convey ideas of value, "to enable students to distinguish between something they might desire and the truly desirable" (Garrison, 1997, p. 28). There are many tools in the teacher's trade and it seems that, knowingly or not, moral discourse has a place every bit as necessary to both teachers and students as any other educational tool. In this sense moral discourse is itself a pedagogy.

Thoughts Toward Future Inquiry

Studying the moral dimension of higher education folk pedagogy, or the moral dimension of anything for that matter, means undertaking a project rife with uncertainty and saturated with subjectivity. It is a difficult arena within which to work, especially as a novice. Consequently, I have reflected upon ways that I might make more value out of this research experience in the future. Let me summarize them here.

- This study produced an extraordinary amount of artifacts on folk pedagogy from which moral interpretations were made. It would be interesting and beneficial to attempt to derive more actual "moral" artifacts.

- Consistent with the imbalance of artifactual information just mentioned, the study took a very broad scope that, in my mind, did not probe the depths that I sense exist. A future consideration would be to pursue more depth through focusing on one professor case study or extending the period of the study.

- I feel that future studies would benefit from having participants more actively involved. Although the combination of interviews and observations generated an abundance of artifacts, I think that a richer artifact set could be garnered by implementing additional artifact collection activities such as actual stimulated recalls or journaling.

- An interesting follow-up to this study that may yield valuable insights into higher education pedagogy, would involve educating participants on teaching's moral dimension and then examining how their folk pedagogy's change as a result of this knowledge.

"Life's narratives are the context for making meaning of school situations. It is no more possible to understand a child as *only* a student than it is to understand each of ourselves as *only* a teacher. We are that, but we are many other things as well. Indeed, the kind of teacher that we are reflects the kind of life that we lead. The same may be said of our students." -- Connelly & Clandinin

As I prepare this dissertation for its final submittal, I think ahead to my future as a teaching professor. My forward view looks slightly backwards through the lessons I have just learned from the teaching professors in this study. All along, I have looked at them and tried to see myself through them. Sometimes this was hard, as with the professional orientations. Other times it was easy like when relating to students or dealing with institutional impositions. Now as I look back though their narratives, their discourses, I see myself as future teacher in a different way than I once did. Looking back through my experience with this dissertation, I see that my future self is much more morally adept than before I began, somewhat more wise to how my narrative is "the context for making meaning of school situations" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988, p.27).

Before undertaking this research program I had a good sense of what constituted teaching's moral dimension. I had read Simpson & Garrison, Fenstermacher, and Blum. I studied Johnson, Jackson, and Noddings. I felt like I knew what moral perception was and how it held implications for education. I understood moral imagination and dubbed it an essential capacity for my own teaching. Moral responsiveness, too, was an idea that I pondered long and hard, and decided teaching was incomplete without it. Despite all these things I knew, or thought I did anyway, there was still some important lessons yet to be learned from this research experience.

I spent a dozen or so pages in the last chapter articulating a handful of findings from this study, but these were not the most meaningful lessons I learned here. Yes, the various discourses were revelations. Absolutely, the interactions among those discourses and their individual dominances were new and enlightening discoveries for me. And certainly, to have moral discourse exhibit itself as a teaching tool, as a pedagogy, made an impression, and unquestionably helped me to reconceive my own teaching. But really, there were two other experiences which struck deeper chords within me, and I anticipate that they will have greater impacts on my future teaching practice.

Through my examination of these three professors' folk pedagogies and through their moral discourses, I was able to make real meaning from real instances about the claim "teachers teach students, not just subjects." First, let me say, that I fully appreciate the importance of teaching subjects. I am in no way arguing that teaching subjects is not important. "Building-in"

knowledge is a necessary component of any learning endeavor where the goal is mastery of some specific knowledge base. Whether the course be one in business, horticulture, or horology, there is some set of principles that we intend to convey. What becomes the decision of educators is how and who does the building-in? What I mean to convey here is that there is more teaching going on than just the imparting of subject matter. Blum (1994) helps to articulate my thinking as he explains:

> If the *only* objective of a teacher's concern is making sure that a pupil understands a certain subject matter, then this teacher does not exemplify teacher caring. To be caring, the concern must involve some regard for the pupil's overall good and a sense of how the good of learning the specific subject matter fits into the pupil's overall good. Without this, one can infer that the teacher values her subject matter but does not seem to have a clear sense of the value of her pupils as persons in their own right. (p. 109)

Thus the claim "teachers teach students ..." means to me that teachers value their students as "persons in their own right." This is a very moral view, for it requires that a teacher acknowledge students' unique interests, desires, and dispositions. It requires moral perception, moral imagination, and morally responsive teaching. It means that, in addition to imparting disciplinary knowledge, teachers encourage and assist students in self-discovery. It means fostering in students an appreciation for what Dewey (1909/1975) refers to as the moral life: "The moral life is lived only as the individual appreciates for himself the ends for which he is working and does his work in a personal spirit of interest and devotion to these ends."

My future as a teaching professor will forever carry this view of teaching students. Sure I will convey subject matter, but unlike the story I told in the Preface of this dissertation, I will no longer view teaching as just "planning-instruction-assessment." Now, I regard such simplified education as a kind of *moral outsourcing* -- turning over the moral responsibility for education to some other entity. Now I see that valuing students and valuing the subject matter are one task together, one education, one dimension of my folk pedagogy.

The second significant insight I gained from this experience relates to direct moral experiencing. It is one thing to talk about moral agency and another thing entirely to practice it. While it may not appear obvious to the reader, while I was searching for moral discourse among the three professors, I was engaging in moral agency myself. I attempted to integrate the ideas of moral agency as part of the design of this study. I wanted to be, and had to be, morally perceptive, imaginative, and responsive. I tried hard to practice moral perception here by looking at professors as individuals with unique desires, dispositions and situations. I morally imagined both what their teaching practices might otherwise be like and what I might do in their situations. And, I attempted

to be morally responsive by crafting this dissertation in a way that would hopefully return something of value to the participants when they read it. By taking a morally active role toward this project, I have attempted to practice that which I had hoped to illuminate.

In attempting to "do moral discourse" myself, I feel like I have made a much richer experience for myself and have developed a much deeper appreciation for teaching as a moral endeavor. If moral perception is like "seeing" the morally salient features of persons or contexts, then I feel like my practicing has helped me develop a keen "eye" for the moral potency of education. If moral imagination involves imagining creative possibilities, then I have deepened my capacity to consider and conceive responses that might maximize goodness of my actions, make them "better than they otherwise would be." Finally, if moral responsiveness is an altruistically motivated act that benefits those acted for as well as the actor, then I am certain I have felt it, know its sensation, and now <u>need</u> to feel it again.

A study like this one that endeavors to explore the beliefs, attitudes, and the cultural shaping of them toward teaching is a study within teaching's moral dimension. To me, it is the moral facet of the craft more than any other that gives education its deepest meanings and its highest social value. At its essence, education is a social institution of care: As a society, we care that our members are properly initiated and equipped to live peaceably and productively among us. So it seems that part of the teacher's task (albeit an oft unrecognized and unencouraged part) is to also teach the "subjects" of caring, kindness, sympathetic relationships, and the helping of others toward "their best possibilities." These are the things I did not know before. These are the things I sought to study and learn about - through this project and beyond - and make the keystone of my future teaching practice. These are the new things, now in addition to familiar *methods*, with which I can answer teaching's call.

What is, for me, truly remarkable about this dissertation and the personal and educational experiences that imbue it, is that it has been a transformative experience. I came back to school to fill an emptiness I could not identify. I knew it was there, felt it for sure, but could not name it and so could not directly pursue it. But I have learned that there is more to knowing than naming and there is more to finding than searching, for somehow I knew, somehow I pursued, and somehow I attained the very thing I desired without knowing until quite recently what it was. I think Garrison's claim is true: "We become what we love." No doubt I am transforming, slowly becoming the morally perceptive, morally imaginative, morally responsive teacher I hope to be.

References

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of Qualitative Research (pp. 377-392). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Anderson, J. G. (1968). Bureaucracy in education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Astin, A.W. (1993). What matters in college? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. Change, 27, (6), 12-25.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1987). The affective dimension of learning: Faculty-student relationships that enhance intellectual development. College Student Journal, 21, 46-58.

Bloom, A. (1987). The closing of the American mind. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Blum, L. A. (1994). Moral perception and particularity. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bowen, H. R. (1982). The state of the nation and the agenda for higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bruner, J. (1996). The culture of education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1990). Acts of meaning. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1986). Actual minds: Possible worlds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, (1989). The condition of the professoriate: Attitudes and trends, 1989. Princeton, NJ: The Princeton University Press.

Carter, K., & Doyle, W. (1996). Personal narrative and life history. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed.) (pp. 120-142). New York: Macmillan.

Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (1994). Personal experience methods. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 413-427). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (1996). Teacher's professional landscapes: Teacher stories - stories of teachers - school stories - stories of schools. Educational Researcher, 25,(3), 24-30.

Clark, C. M. (1990). The teacher and the taught: Moral transactions in the classroom. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik (Eds.), The moral dimensions of teaching (pp. 251-265). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). <u>Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education</u>. New York: Teachers College Press.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). <u>Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience</u>. New York: Teachers College Press.

Darwall, S., Gibbard, A., & Railton, P. (1997). <u>Moral discourse and practice: Some philosophical approaches</u>. New York: Oxford University Press.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). <u>Handbook of qualitative research</u>, (pp. 248-261). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dewey, J. (1909/1975). <u>Moral principles in education</u>. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Elbaz, F. (1983). <u>Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge</u>. London: Croom helm.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1986). Philosophy of research on teaching: Three aspects. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), <u>Handbook of Research on Teaching</u> (pp. 37-49). New York: Macmillian.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1990). Moral considerations of teaching as a profession. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik (Eds.), <u>The moral dimensions of teaching</u> (pp. 130-151). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1992). The concepts of method and manner in teaching. In F. K. Oser, A. Dick, & J. Patry, (Eds.), <u>Effective and responsible teaching: The new synthesis</u> (pp. 95-108). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fenstermacher, G. D., & Soltis, J. F. (1986). <u>Approaches to teaching</u>. New York: Teachers College Press.

Garrison, J. W. (1997). Dewey and eros: Wisdom and desire in the art of teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gilligan, C. (1982). <u>In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development</u>. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K.A. (Eds.). (1990). <u>The moral dimensions of teaching</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1995). <u>Ethnography: Principles in practice</u>, (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), <u>Handbook of qualitative research</u> (pp. 428-444). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jackson, P. W., Boostrom, R. E., & Hansen, D. T. (1993). <u>The moral life of schools</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, M. (1993). Moral imagination: Implications of cognitive science for ethics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, T.W. (1995). Discipleship or pilgrimage? The educator's quest for philosophy. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Joseph, P. B., & Efron, S. (1993) Moral choices/moral conflicts: Teachers' self-perceptions. Journal of Moral Education, 22, 201-220.

Kant, I. (1959). Foundations of the metaphysics of morals. Trans. L. W. Beck. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Kerr, D. (1987). Authority and responsibility in public schooling. In J. Goodlad (Ed.), The ecology of school renewal (86th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pp. 20-40). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LeFrançois, G. R. (1997). Psychology for teaching (9th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1996, November). Emerging criteria for quality in interpretive research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, Columbus, South Carolina.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Long, E. L. (1992). Higher education as a moral enterprise. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Manning, P. K. & Cullum-Swan, B. (1994). Narrative, content, and semiotic analysis. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research, (pp. 248-261). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McKeachie,W.J. (Ed.) (1994). Teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers (9th ed.). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

McKeachie, W. J. (1990). Research on college teaching: The historical background. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(2), 189-200.

McKinney, J. R., & Garrison, J. W. (1994). Postmodern educational leadership: The new and improved panopticon. In J. M. Maxcy (Ed.) Postmodern school leadership: Meeting the crisis in educational administration (pp. 71 -83). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Mill, J. S. [1861] (1979). Utilitarianism. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

Nespor, J., & Barber, L. (1995). Audience and the politics of narrative. In J. A. Hatch & R. Wisiniewski (Eds.), Life history and narrative (pp. 49-62). Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Noddings, N. (1992). The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (1995). Philosophy of education. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc.

Oliver, K. L. (In press). A journey into narrative analysis: A methodology for discovering meaning. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education.

Oser, F. K. (1986). Moral education and values education: The discourse perspective. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 917-941). New York: Macmillian.

Oser, F. K. (1994). Moral perspectives on teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Review of research in education, Vol. 20, 1994 (pp. 57-127). Washington, DC: American Educational Research

Oser, F. K., Dick, A., & Patry, J-L. (Eds). (1992). Effective and responsible teaching: The new synthesis. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd Ed). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. In J. A. Hatch & R. Wisiniewski (Eds.), Life history and narrative (pp. 5-23). Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Purpel, D., & Ryan, K (1983). It comes with the territory: The inevitability of moral education in the schools. In H. Giroux & D. Purpel (Eds.) The hidden curriculum and moral education, (pp. 267-275). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed.) (pp. 102-119). New York: Macmillan.

Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research, (pp. 118-137). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Simpson, P. J., & Garrison, J. (1995). Teaching and moral perception. Teachers College Record, 97, 252-278.

Sockett, H. (1990). Accountability, trust, and ethical codes. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik (Eds.), The moral dimensions of teaching (pp. 224-250). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sockett, H. (1993). The moral base for teacher professionalism. New York: Teachers College Press.

Stake, R. (1994). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research, (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), <u>Handbook of qualitative research</u>, (pp. 248-261). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strike, K. A., & Soltis, J. F. (1992). <u>The ethics of teaching</u> (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Stroup, H. H. (1966). <u>Bureaucracy in higher education</u>. New York: The Free Press.

Tom, A. R. (1984). <u>Teaching as a moral craft</u>. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Wacquant, L. J. D. (1996). The self-inflicted irrelevance of American academics. <u>Academe</u>, July-August, 18-23.

Walsh, D. J., & Maffei, M. (1994). Never in a class by themselves: An examination of behaviors affecting the student-professor relationship. <u>Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 5</u>(2), 23-48.

Wilshire, B. (1990). <u>The moral collapse of the university: Professionalism, purity, and alienantion</u>. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wise, A. E. (1979). <u>Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom</u>. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Yin, R. K. (1984). <u>Case study research: Design and methods.</u> Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Zeichner, K., & Gore, J. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. Houston (ed.), <u>Handbook of research on teacher education</u> (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan.

APPENDIX A - METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Implementation

Research Objectives and Guiding Questions

The main goal of this dissertation has been to investigate how professors' beliefs and conceptions of teaching and learning - their folk pedagogies (Bruner, 1996) - influence their moral agency and moral discourse. More specifically, it aimed to identify how these beliefs and conceptions might give shape and substance to their moral agency and discourse. In pursuit of these ideas, this project followed three key objectives. First, it sought to explore and describe beliefs and conceptions that participant professors' hold relating to selected educational topics (see Appendix C for interview topics) - that is, to illuminate some key features of their folk pedagogies. Second, it intended to examine the discourse that emerged from the folk pedagogy investigation for its moral expressions and the insights it offered toward understanding how professors conceive of teaching as a moral endeavor. Finally, it planned to retell these stories as a unified narrative of moral agency and moral discourse in university teaching. What this dissertation also addresses, albeit without the depth anticipated in the prospectus, is the role of culture in the educational discourse. In pursuit of these inquiry objectives, this dissertation responds to several guiding research questions:

1. What are some of the beliefs, personal theories, and assumptions that professors hold about teaching and learning?
2. How are these conceptions manifest in their teaching practices?
3. In what ways do professors' discourses reveal personal and cultural influences on pedagogy?
4. In what ways does folk pedagogy appear to influence moral agency among these professors and what are the main features of the resulting moral discourse?

Participant Selection

Participants were selected purposively according to several limited criteria. Because of my initial interest in the influence of the university culture, I wanted one faculty member from each of the university's three flagship colleges: Arts and Sciences, Business, and Engineering. An initial participant pool was determined from nominations made by several of my university colleagues. Participant candidates were interviewed and selected for criteria matching those specified below:

- gender representation
- a range of teaching experience

- teaching an undergraduate course spring semester
- willingness to participate fully with the activities of the research program (e.g., at least one classroom observation and one interview per week)
- permission from Department Chair or Dean as needed.

Collection of Field Texts

Moral discourse can, potentially, be expressed in anything a professor says or does or creates. Moreover, what is said and done may be different things depending upon the context in which the "thing" occurs or is elicited. This dynamic necessitated collecting artifacts from various sources and by various means. Field text collection began with the spring 1997 semester and continued for nine weeks. This term of field study was designed to: 1) afford a view of discourse over a large part of a semester, including the beginning when the class was taking "shape" and the middle of the semester when "shape" had evolved and classroom activities were more stabilized; 2) ensure enough time and enough encounters to generate ample field texts from which to make analyses and interpretations; and 3) allow the investigator time to gain a critical eye for folk pedagogy and moral discourse. Several methods for collecting field texts were used in the project.

Interviews. Eighteen semi-structured interviews - six per participant - were held to explore professors' folk pedagogies, to clarify points noted during classroom observations, and to create a space for folk pedagogy and moral discourse to emerge. In two cases, interviews were conducted in the professors' offices. In the third case, that of Dr. Monroe, all interviews were conducted by telephone. Interviews each week were organized around a central theme of education. While certain open-ended thematic questions were fashioned as prompts to initiate interviews, the bulk of the dialogue was derived from the contextualized discussion of the interviews themselves. Interview themes included six broad topics and adhered to the following order:

- personal background and formal preparation for and experience in teaching
- teacher-student relationships
- the learning process
- the teaching act
- perceptions of departmental, university, and professional influences on teaching
- education as a social phenomenon, including its moral dimension.

Actual interview protocols for each theme are presented in Appendix C. Interviews typically lasted between 45 minutes and one hour. All interviews were audiotaped and transcribed as field texts.

Initially the interviews were more structured in order to gather background information to create a profile of the respective teacher. These more structured interviews elaborated parameters such as teaching experience and formal teacher training, course background, characteristics of the professors' teaching context (e.g., departmental support, etc.), and as much personal information as the participant was willing to share to illuminate the histories manifesting in the "present story." As basic information became more developed, the interviews became less structured. These subsequent interviews were conducted to explore the beliefs professors held about each identified area of education. In addition, the interviews were used to confirm field texts either from classroom observations or to clarify interpretations of documents that were reviewed. In this way, some of the interviews functioned somewhat like stimulated recall activities whereby professors were able to explain actions from their point of view. This process not only aided the investigator's interpretation of events but also helped ensure congruency between interpreted meaning and the meaning intended by the professor. All interpretations that have been formulated as "findings" were offered to the respective participants for review and confirmation that fair representation of meanings was given by the researcher. This approach helped to ensure that findings from this study give realistic portrayal of professors' stories and do not over emphasize the investigator's interpretations. The results from their reviews are presented below in "Trustworthiness of Field Texts and Stories."

Observations. The actions professors undertake in classrooms and in teacher-related encounters with students and peers constitute part of their discourse. As noted by Adler and Adler (1994), naturalistic observation provides "the advantage of drawing the observer into the phenomenological complexity of the world, where connections, correlations, and causes can be witnessed as and how they unfold" (p. 378). Moral discourse in its plenitude of forms represents considerable "phenomenological complexity," consequently seven classroom observations were made of each professor.

Through these observations professors were seen enacting their folk pedagogy and engaging the moral dimension. Classroom actions offered insight into interactions with students, demonstrations of teaching, exhibitions of the professor's demeanor, and the creation of particular "atmospheres" of learning. All observations were recorded by hand-written notes which, like transcribed interviews, served as field texts.

Observational artifacts were used in this study in conjunction with interviews as one of several means to establish trustworthiness of the artifactual sources (see discussion below). As with the interviews, final interpretations were offered to participants to ensure agreement between intended and interpreted meanings; the results of which are discussed below.

Review of materials. Course-related materials provided only a limited view of folk pedagogy and moral discourse. Documents such as course syllabus, study guides, class policies,

evaluation measures, and so forth, to the extent that they were available and found relevant, were reviewed to discern their contribution to the overall moral expression. For example, attendance policies convey a professor's belief that attendance is an important aspect of successful learning. Similarly, assessment measures give some indication as to how the professor envisions that learning occurs. Document review was only moderately helpful in telling the moral discourse story because they provided little insight into folk pedagogy or moral discourse beyond what was comprehended through interviews and observations.

Field Text Storage

Artifact storage was accomplished in several ways. As a security measure for preserving anonymity, field texts were generated from transcribed audio taped interviews and handwritten observation notes. These were archived both as hard copy and electronic text files. Tapes will be erased at the end of the project. Course-related materials were likewise stored with interview transcripts and observation notes.

Narrative Analysis and Story Configuration

A narrative analysis is more than merely an amalgamation of events into linear sequence, rather it requires the researcher to discover or develop a plot by situating and finding relationships between events or happenings and actions (Oliver, 1996). In this study, field texts (i.e., professors' narratives) were analyzed according to the guidelines established by Polkinghorne (1995). These guidelines follow the elements of story - plot, characters, and setting - and range from considerations of cultural context to dispositions of actors and to issues of plausibility and understandability. These guidelines were followed in this study to ensure that descriptions and interpretations fairly represented the professors' narratives, and to ensure proper configuration of the moral discourse story. Creation of a story from collections of field texts follows a seemingly strange procedure that begins with the story's ending (Polkinghorne, 1995). "From its conclusion, the researcher retrospectively views the artifactual elements in order to link them into a series of happenings that led to the outcome" (p. 18). This retrospective view was drawn from the array of field texts collected throughout the study.

The field texts in this study served to uncover the "events or happenings" that constitute the story of moral discourse. As field texts were generated from observations and interviews, they were analyzed for their station within the story's plot. This analysis involved repeated detailed readings of the texts and indexing of narrative elements according to emergent themes that supported the plot. Indexing and thematic organization were reviewed and confirmed by four peer

investigators, a process explained in more detail below. Once so arranged, contributing pieces to the story's outcome were identified and eventually became the five discourses that were the mainstays of the moral discourse story.

Configuring a narrative, or story, involves much more than simply chronicling the progress of plot. Polkinghorne (1995) relates its more intricate purpose:

> A narrative configuration is not merely a transcription of thoughts and actions of the protagonists; it is a means of making sense and showing the significance of them in the context of the dénouement. In the storied outcome of narrative inquiry, the researcher is the narrator of the story, and often the story is told in his or her voice. (p. 19)

Thus narrative inquiry must take up and describe matters of setting, characters, voice, and plot. Although the plot is the vehicle of meaning-making, the meanings made are inevitably and inextricably situational (Bruner, 1990), and are shaped by these other story elements.

The story in this project has been organized around a plot of interacting discourses. The setting has been established as a research university, and the departments of the respective participant professors. The three professors, the story characters, come to the scene from different personal and professional backgrounds. The plot is set in motion by how each character expresses folk pedagogy and moral discourse based on their own personal experiences and the exigencies of their respective departmental cultures. The plot proceeds as each professor exposes their individual discourses and as these discourses are analyzed in the connecting stories between professor narratives. The dénouement is achieved as the moral discourse itself is finally exhibited after its encounters with the four other competing discourses.

Configuration of the details in folk pedagogy/moral discourse story was a complex and tedious process. Once the narrative elements were indexed by professor and theme, they were arranged so that the story-segment they related to made a logical contribution to the plot's overall progression. This process involved weaving together specific narrative elements - for instance professors' ideas of teacher-student relationship - such that they gave a coherent account of that segment of the particular discourse. Between each discourse narrative (e.g., Narratives of Institutional Experience) were placed connecting stories. The connecting stories served to relate emplotted elements among the discourse narratives to the overarching story plot. For example, "Narratives of Professional Experience" was connected to "Narratives of Institutional Experience" by a short story entitled "A Moral View of Professional Influences on Folk Pedagogy." In this case, the connecting story attempted to highlight the moral features of the professional discourse and set the context for the upcoming narrative on the institution, and extend the plot of moral discourse.

The final element of story configuration involves voice. The voice in which the story is told also plays a role in the formulation meanings made by the inquiry. "All texts metaphorically speak with many voices and contain within them many potential alternative readings" (Manning & Cullum-Swan, 1994, p. 469). Thus, depending upon whose voice tells the story, be it investigator or participant, different elements may be either emphasized or given less expression and result in widely different accounts of some phenomenon. The story of moral discourse that I have told here is actually a re-telling based on the story co-constructed through the study's participants in the form of their narratives and by my interpretation of those narratives. While measures have been instituted in the design of the research plan to mitigate wholesale story construction by the researcher (e.g., participant review of narratives and interpretations, peer review of thematic indexes), the end product will ultimately represent a story told first by professors' words and actions, then "retold" by the researcher. There are several considerations that must be noted here relative to the affects of researcher interpretation on the final story.

Researcher Effects and Verification

The stories produced from narrative analysis are not totally "objective" representations of the participants' lives (Polkinghorne, 1995). The very relationship between the researcher and the researched establishes boundaries which compass the nature of information discovered (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994). In addition, there is a natural interpretive bias operating when the investigator chooses what expressions to record, what meanings to make of them, and what status to give them in the larger context of the story. Says Manning and Cullum-Swan (1994): "The process of linking or connecting expression and content is social and depends upon the perspective of the observer" (p. 466). The presentation of the field texts, the discourse narratives, and the larger moral discourse story all reflect both the lives of the participants and, in some ways, my perspective as investigator. Thus, these textual constructions will always bear some difference from actual happenstance as a result of research interpretation and retelling.

To counter these effects, the story has been "co-constructed" between researcher and participants. The story itself is derived from the life narratives that the professors shared. In many cases, their own words are used to support authentic representation of meaning. Direct quotation, however, does not guarantee that contextual meanings are preserved. In an effort to preserve such meanings, each participant has reviewed the interpretive renderings of "events and happenings" to ensure that they fairly represent their actual meanings and intentions. The results of these reviews is discussed in the section just below. By engaging participant reviews, both parties have worked to establish verisimilitude within the moral discourse story. That is, we have not attempted to give some objectified, positivistic final word on moral discourse in higher education, rather we have

presented the story in a way that it is believable and life-like (Bruner, 1986). Additional specific procedures and conditions have been established to ensure fair representation, or the trustworthiness, of the professors' stories.

Trustworthiness of Field Texts and Stories

The end product of this research program is not some set of conclusions that represent some discovered truth. Rather, this project faithfully describes what has emerged from the field texts about professor folk pedagogies and moral discourse. However, this process has required specific actions to ensure its trustworthy report. Several mechanisms were instituted to ensure fair representation of professors' stories.

Researcher's stance. The researcher's stance in this project has the potential to significantly bias the artifactual presentation. The largest problem in this regard stems from the retelling of professors' stories based solely on the interpretation of the researcher instead of co-constructing them <u>with</u> the study's participants. In order to alleviate this condition, the researcher's stance has been articulated throughout this text to ensure that the reader understands the viewpoints held by the investigator. By presenting the researcher's stance in this way, the reader is made aware of the viewpoints influencing field text interpretations. In addition, the field text confirmation measures discussed below were implemented to ensure that researcher interpretations give fair representations to the intended meanings of the participants.

Field text confirmation procedures. The strength of any research program relies on its ability to demonstrate validity of the methods and findings. There are various strategies for ensuring what Lincoln and Guba (1985) call the "truth value" (p. 290) of qualitative research (e.g., Huberman & Miles, 1994; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990; and Yin, 1984). The greatest concern to fair representation of this study's findings was bias due to investigator interpretation. The most common tactic to mitigate this error is what is generally referred to as *triangulation*. Triangulation as expressed by Marshall and Rossman (1989) is "the act of bringing more than one source of data to bear on a single point" (p.146). Triangulation in the present study was accomplished by corroborating "events and happenings" through multiple artifactual sources. For example, in-class observations were confirmed through interviews with professors. Likewise, findings from interviews were confirmed through direct questioning during subsequent interviews and through looking for their in-class expression during observations. To the extent possible, additional triangulation was made across the three cases to confirm that general themes and moral and pedagogical phenomenon were sufficiently present to warrant discussion. Finally, where appropriate, findings were also confirmed through related research literature.

As an additional confirmational measure, field text indexing and thematic organization were subjected to peer review (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). A panel of four researcher colleagues was assembled and given field texts to review. They were then asked to index textual segments using the thematic classifications devised by the investigator. Peer reviews showed agreement with the investigator in over eighty-three percent of the cases.

The final confirmational procedure involved in-depth participant review of my analysis of the story presented in the dissertation. Each participant was given a draft copy of the dissertation - all the parts up through "The Moral Dimension of Higher Education Pedagogy" - and asked to confirm that their intended meanings were fairly interpreted and represented. As part of this review, a final interview was held to discuss participants input regarding their portrayal in the document. In two of the three cases, the professors were satisfied that their meanings were fairly represented and that the investigator's interpretations corresponded with their intended meanings and the prevailing contexts. These professors suggested only two slight modifications (i.e., change a single word and review a statement for a particular meaning) and did not request further review of the document. The third participant, however, requested several changes. In one case, she felt that the portrayal was slightly too judgmental when making reference to group work in her class. As a result, we discussed what she was trying to convey and how the class operated in times when I was not in for observations. Also, she felt elements of her character were too truthful and jeopardized her anonymity. Finally, she clarified that my original statement indicating it was her policy that students address her as "Dr." Was not entirely correct, that it was really her preference. Subsequent to these changes, the third participant affirmed that the story provided fair representation of her.

APPENDIX B - INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPANTS OF INVESTIGATIVE PROJECTS

Participant Protection

In conformance with Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations pertaining to "Protection of Human Subjects," this study has been designed for and established as "exempt." In conjunction with university policy for research involving human subjects, an application has been made to the Institutional Review Board at the respective university seeking endorsement as a valid exempted research project and authorization from the university to implement the program. Also as required by federal regulation, an "Informed Consent for Participants of Investigative Projects" has been prepared to ensure that participants have been duly informed as to the risks and obligations of their participation. A copy of the informed consent agreement follows.

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPANTS OF INVESTIGATIVE PROJECTS

Thomas S. Barrett

Department of Teaching and Learning

PROJECT PURPOSE AND JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of this research project is to gain insight into professors' conceptions of the of teaching and learning and to what degree they might be influenced by university culture. The results of such a study will contribute to a general understanding about how teaching and learning are conceived of and enacted by professors. The findings from this investigation will find practical application in enhancing university approaches professional development of its teaching faculty. The specifications made in this form apply to professor participants.

PROCEDURES

Because teaching as a practice is expressed in a wide variety of ways, (e.g., by words, actions, course materials, class atmosphere, etc.), a case study will be undertaken of three faculty members at your university. The investigation will proceed over seven weeks early in the spring 1997 semester. Data will be collected through multiple interviews with the professors, classroom observations, observing meetings between professors and students when feasible, observations of the professor during relevant academic meetings among their peers, and review of course-related materials. The objective of this inquiry will be to understand professors' conceptions of teaching and learning and to describe how they reflect the university's culture of pedagogy.

To accomplish this objective, professors will be observed in class once a week, at the same time and day each week, for the duration of the study. These non-participant observations seek to minimize disturbance of normal class activities and thus will be recorded by hand-taken notes rather than video or audio taping. Multiple interviews will be held to explore professors' beliefs and personal theories about teaching and learning, and to clarify points noted during classroom observations. While certain generic questions are fashioned to initiate interviews (e.g., how do students learn? How do you characterize your teaching style?), most questions will derive from observations and

the contextualized discussion of the interviews themselves. It is expected that approximately one hour's worth of interviews (in time segments partitioned as necessary) will be held each week. Student interviews will be held to confirm researcher interpretations of classroom events and to establish student perceptions of the professor's teaching practice. Like professor interviews, generic questions will be used to initiate discussions (e.g. How would you characterize this professor's teaching? What about this professors teaching do you find most effective?), but most questions will be posed spontaneously. Informed consent of students will be secured by a separate and specific form. All interviews will be audio taped and transcribed. Tapes will be erased at the end of the project. All interviewees will have the opportunity to review transcripts for factual agreement prior to their inclusion into the data set. Notes relating to observations will likewise be transcribed and returned to participants for verification. Course materials to be reviewed will be determined as the researcher becomes familiar with the components of the course, but it is expected that those materials will include the course syllabus, software packages, text books and supplemental readings, and public correspondences from professor to students. Observation of any meetings, either with students or faculty peers, will be determined jointly by participant and investigator. There is no intent to observe any meetings of a private nature.

RISKS AND BENEFITS OF RESEARCH

There are no foreseeable risks associated with this research project. All attempts will be made to preserved anonymity throughout the project. However, because only three participants will be investigated and because the data will be described in such detail, anonymity cannot be guaranteed. Participants can be assured that no data will be incorporated into the study until first verified and authorized by the respective participants. Participants are not likely to receive any direct tangible benefits from this research, and no promise of benefits is made here to encourage participation. However, the results of the study will be available to participants at the project's end for their professional use and development. This research will be documented and shared with the educational research community through papers delivered at professional conferences, workshops, and publications.

CONFIDENTIALITY AND ANONYMITY

In all cases, data derived from participants will be coded to preserve anonymity. Similarly, all materials and results of observations will be edited to ensure that participants are not identifiable through contexts or events. All data and materials will remain in the possession of the investigator or his designates and shall remain confidential and secure from unauthorized access.

FREEDOM TO WITHDRAW

Participants are free to refrain from any part of this inquiry or withdraw completely at anytime by notifying the investigator. Because participation is not contingent upon compensation, no penalty or forfeiture will be incurred as a result of withdrawal.

116

This research project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at Virginia Tech. This project has also been subjected to review and approval by the Department of Teaching and Learning in the College of Human Resources and Education. A brief summary of the investigator's experience is provided as an addendum to this document. If you have any questions regarding this research program, you may contact either of the following:

Thomas S. Barrett - Investigator	231-8348
Susan G. Magliaro - Advisor	231-5269
Jan Nespor - Departmental Reviewer	231-8327
Tom Hurd - Institutional Research Board	231-9359

SUBJECT'S PERMISSION

I have read and understand this Informed Consent and the conditions of this research project. I have had all my questions answered and am clear about my role in this research. I understand that if I participate, I may withdraw at anytime without penalty. I hereby acknowledge the stated conditions and procedures and give my voluntary consent for participation.

_____   _____

Participant   Investigator

_____   _____

Date   Date

Addendum

Investigator's Experience

Thomas Barrett is a doctoral student in the Department of Teaching and Learning. In addition to multiple courses in research methodologies, he has conducted several field investigations as part of independent study projects. Also, as a research assistant at Virginia Tech's Center for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching (CEUT), Tom has been responsible for field investigations into the teaching experiences of new faculty members. His work will be supervised by Susan G. Magliaro, associate professor in the Department of Teaching and Learning and Jim Garrison, professor also in the Department of Teaching and Learning.

APPENDIX C - INTERVIEW GUIDES

Interview Guides

Week One - Background

- Personal information
  - educational history
  - "pre-service" teaching experience / training

- Professional information
  - nature of research and connection to teaching
  - years teaching
  - courses taught
  - specialty area
  - course & specialty relationship to academic program area

- Course design and specifics
  - objectives and plan to achieve them
  - experience with this course
  - necessary course policies

- What is the best thing from your history that you bring to students through this course?

Week Two - Students and Teachers

- What are the roles/functions of teachers and students in education?
  - What are these roles/functions in your class?
- How do you characterize the relationship between students and teachers in your class?
  - Is there some desired relationship?
  - What is the most important aspect of this relationship?
  - How do you try to achieve this type of relationship?
- In what ways do students affect your teaching?
  - What do you do in your teaching practice to be responsive to student diversity?
- What about students intrigues you most about students?
- What is most problematic about them?
- How would you characterize your relationship with students?

Week Three - Learning

- What is learning?
  - Are there different types of learning?
- How does it happen?
  - Who is responsible/in control of learning
  - What is your role in students' learning?
- What do you see as the factors involved with successful learning?
- What factors preclude it?
- What is the best way to ensure learning?
- Describe an ideal learning environment.
- Do you have any specific personal axioms or beliefs about learning?

Week Four - Teaching

- What is teaching?
  - What is good teaching?
- How does teaching happen?
- What are the major aspects of teaching?
  - What do you think about when planning a course/class?
  - What do you think about when you are teaching?
- What is the most important thing to you about teaching?
- What is the biggest challenge of teaching?
- What is the most important / effective aspect of your practice?
- How do you "reach" students?
- What metaphor best represents your teaching?

Week Five - The University, Department, and Profession as Conditions of Learning

<p align="center">Department</p>

- What is the top priority of your department?
- Does your department have any sort of mission statement regarding teaching students?
- What is the dept. role in the teaching it provides?
  - What is its role in your teaching?

- Does the department have any sort of professional development program for enhancing faculty teaching?
- Does the dept. have regular faculty meetings regarding teaching?
  - If so what is your role in this activity?
- How does the department ensure quality teaching?
- In what ways does your department support your teaching practice?
- In what ways could the department better support teaching?
- How do your objectives for teaching and educating students differ from / are similar to the dept.?

The University

- What is the top priority of the university?
- Does the university have any sort of mission statement regarding teaching students?
- What is the university's role in the teaching it provides?
  - What is its role in your teaching?
- Does the university have any sort of professional development program for enhancing faculty teaching?
- Does the university have regular faculty meetings regarding teaching?
  - If so what is role in this activity?
- How does the university ensure quality teaching?
- In what ways does the university support your teaching practice?
- In what ways could the university better support teaching?
- How do your objectives for teaching and educating students differ from / are similar to the university?

The Profession

- Does the profession have a role in education? Describe.
  - Would you call this role an influence on education?
- In what ways does the profession influence your teaching?
- What role does the profession have in the course(s) you teach?
- How does the profession facilitate / encourage / enhance good teaching?
- How do your objectives for teaching and educating students differ from / are similar to the profession?

Week Six - Education and the Moral Dimension

- What is the purpose of college education?
    - What should colleges teach?
    - Are they successful at this?
- What was most meaningful about your undergraduate education?
    - What would you have preferred be different?
    - How do these experiences affect the way you do education in your classes?
- What is the role of education within society?
- What are some of the ideals that a college education is supposed to foster?
    - Is it successful?
- What is your ideal vision of college education?
- What are some of your ideals that make their way into your classes?
    - Are you aware when they do make their way there?
    - Do you try to put them there?
- Do you see education as a moral activity in any sense, explain?
    - What are some moral aspects of education?
    - What are some moral aspects of your class?
    - Are you aware when you are entering moral territory?
- What are your favorite aspects of being a college teacher?
    - What are your least favorite?
- What is the most important part of your job as an educator?

Final interviews involved participant review of data interpretations.

APPENDIX D - BACKGROUND RESEARCH ON BUREAUCRATIC INFLUENCES ON EDUCATIONAL CULTURE

<u>Cultural Space: Dominant Meanings of Teaching and Learning</u>

The cultural space of teaching in a university comprises specific conceptions of teaching that derive directly from university values. Hypothetically speaking, it would be an easy affair to interpret a university's requirement of "teaching certification" as a commitment to quality teaching and an indicator of its cultural conception of teaching. In a more real instance, the parameters of good teaching - what makes for effective education - are explicitly defined at Virginia Tech by the "Student Perceptions of Instruction" forms, or better known as "student evaluations." According to this form, "student perceptions" must fit the ten specific dimensions for assessing the goodness of teaching. The dimensions of good teaching here involve aspects like: "fairness in assigning grades"; "apparent knowledge of subject matter"; "degree to which subject matter was made stimulating or relevant"; "time and effort required." Remarkably, these criteria bear little resemblance to those developed from the research on effective teaching (see LeFrançois, 1997). Thus what we take to be "effective teaching" at Virginia Tech are those things that are "measured" by the criteria of this form. What further illustrates the quality of this culture is that there is no formal or required means beyond "student perceptions" to determine the quality of teaching. (I recognize the political and practical ramifications surrounding this issue, but nevertheless a statement is made about the culture of pedagogy at this university.) åI also recognize that Virginia Tech is not the only university facing this dilemma. It seems to be an inherent condition of universities whose major focus is research.

What follows in this section is one possible perception of the teaching culture at this university. While a proper representation of Virginia Tech's cultural meanings of teaching would no doubt constitute a study in itself, I develop here one view of it derived from some of its more general inherent traits as institutionalized education. This characterization represents to some degree my impressions of the dominant teaching culture here. They are biased in the direction of one who has a good sense of what *is* (namely from almost nine years as a student here, three as an "employee," and almost two as a teacher) and what *ought* to be (presuppositions I hold as a reasonably well studied educator). As noted in the Preface, I have developed these ideas to an extreme to not only to articulate my bias to both myself and my readers, but also to create a more dramatic backdrop against which to compare the findings that will emerge later. I must ensure the reader that I am cognizant of this bias and have instituted methods (to be explained later) for minimizing its affect on the outcomes of this study. I expect this study to change these perceptions in some way, either confirming them or reconfiguring them toward some more accurate representation of what is. With that said, let me share my thinking.

<u>Teaching as Management: Bureaucratic/Technocratic Cultural Influence</u>

You may have noticed earlier my none-to-hesitant naming of higher education as a business. This is my overarching perception of educational culture at Virginia Tech: A business management paradigm of teaching and learning. It seems the foremost principle of this "educational" model is "to maximize the production function" (p. 81) at each level of the organization - that is, generate the most product at the least cost, reporting outcomes in terms that are measurable and quantifiable (Mckinney & Garrison, 1994). This principle translates into a process-product orientation to instruction. Of course I recognize that Virginia Tech <u>is</u> a business and if it weren't none of us would be here. I am more disturbed by the fact that the university (and education as a larger institution) seemingly defines the educational endeavor in terms and meanings distilled from business management (e.g., "Total Quality Management," "Site-based Management", "Outcome-based Education", and "Putting Knowledge to Work" suggests education as process and students as inputs and products). I also recognize that the university is a large institution, one by necessity organized and operated according to bureaucratic principles. Again, my frustration lies in the degree to which I see management principles and metaphors trespassing into the domain of teaching students. Let me explain in more detail.

Most public education in this country occurs within bureaucratic organizations. According to Stroup (1966), a bureaucracy is defined as:

> a large-scale organization with a complex but definite social function. It consists ... of a specialized personnel and is guided by a system of rules and procedures. In addition, a carefully contrived hierarchy of authority exists by which the social function of the bureaucracy is carried out impersonally (p.14).

Contained within this definition are the major characteristics of the bureaucratic organization, and I want to discuss several that are central to this study.

Anderson (1968) relays some thoughts by Robert Presthus who suggests "... the accepted values of the organization shape the individual's personality and influence his behavior .... Big organizations therefore become instruments of socialization, providing physical and moral sustenance for their members and shaping their thought and behavior in countless ways" (p. vii). Anderson himself further explains that "These [bureaucratic] systems create a distinctive social structure and psychological climate conducive to highly predictable behavior by individuals who constitute the administrative staff" (p. viii). What Anderson and Presthus both suggest is that the bureaucratic organization is in fact a culture. To the extent that culture consists of shared concepts and shared meanings and depends upon shared modes of expression among people, the bureaucracy is indeed a cultural influence. Three major characteristics of bureaucratic culture make their way into the educational experience: rules and procedures, impersonal relationships, and technocratic rationality.

126

Rules and procedures. Stroup (1966) identifies the main purposes of bureaucratic rules as providing consistency, rationality, and defensibility to the operations of the organization. Established rules and procedures allow the organization to treat all its constituents the same. In this way, "bureaucracy behaves like justice itself - blind to individuality. Bureaucracy seeks the achievement of a certain kind of justice, one which eliminates arbitrariness and individualization" (Stroup, 1966, p.20). The obvious conflict is that students <u>are</u> individuals; they do not all learn in a like manner, possess identical aims, or desire similar ends. Aside from serving as the vehicle of justice, the main effect of rules is that they supposedly rationalize the main principles of the organization. If the main purpose is education, then rules are the rationalized instantiation of that purpose. Rationalization ensures conformity to "cultural" norms in the name of fairness and equality (Wise, 1979).

Hyperrationalization occurs when purposes are not being achieved and more rules are added to supplement the extant rules that "ensure" an accomplished purpose. In effect, the true purpose is lost from sight, obscured by a preoccupation with conformance to the rules (Wise, 1979). At least two effects are apparent from rationalized and hyperrationalized teaching. The intent to "normalize" operations and behaviors through extensive rules is a technique for classifying and controlling students (a topic I will take up shortly). Likewise rule-bound mentalities stifle the discourse of possibility and create educational tension by trying to rationalize a non-rational practice. Taken together, teaching loses sight of its true mission in favor of a compliance mentality.

Impersonal relationships. A second major influence of bureaucracy on teaching is its impersonal relationship with clients. "The worker in the large-scale organization must of necessity remain detached from his subordinates and his clients," claims Stroup (1966, p.22). In this case the worker in the organization is the professor, and the clients are her or his students. The bureaucracy strives for impartiality and, as noted, constructs rules and procedures to ensure it. The outcome of this impartiality is the supposed equal treatment of all clients, the idea of justice. This justice, however, often comes at the expense of recognizing the differences in personal needs, desires, or interests of students. I am not trying to suggest that detachment from students exists writ large, but that the bureaucracy creates a context within which impersonal relationships and detachment are accepted and perhaps implicitly encouraged.

Stroup (1966) identifies five aspects of classroom instruction that promote impersonality: technique, cant, lectures, class size and examinations. To be sure, not all of these aspects are under the control of the professor, but they are indeed under the control of the university. In this regard, the university's objective of justice, as served by impersonal treatment of clients, has direct manifestation in the classroom. Technique, for example, is so often emphasized when speaking about improving the quality of college teaching that the human element is lost. The rhetoric still takes a "teacher-centered" stance, not a "student-centered" one. Impersonality also results from cant, or technical jargon, and fails to induce a feeling of acceptance in "jargon-deficient" students; thus potentially failing to convey personal

127

interest about them, or invitedness to participate in collegial discourses. Stroup's other three examples of impersonality - lectures, class size, and examinations - are discussed elsewhere in this document.

Technocratic rationality. The university as a technocracy is a product of bureaucratic management engaged in a discourse of scientism that "assume[s] that everything important ... can be reduced to something measurable" (McKinney & Garrison, 1994, p. 82). We see this exemplified in many ways at the university. Grade point averages allegedly measure student learning. Devices (e.g., FTEs) are used to measure faculty productivity. The product of the two presumably tells something about successful education. Rational reductionistic thinking leads to positivistic instructional paradigms, where the object of teaching is to lead students to some matter of "truth." As a result students are potentially left with a monologic view (typically only that view held by the instructor) of the subjects they study, and often they fail to develop reliable critical thinking skills (Grossman, 1994).

Teaching as Control: Disciplinary Technologies

Many things are controlled in bureaucratic organizations: people, finances, strategies, information, and so forth. This is not surprising because it is understood that if the organization is to be successful and efficient, then it must control such aspects of its operation. Most of us accept this condition of control in the name of successful enterprise. However, upon closer examination, one target of control may prove to be somewhat unsettling, especially in the context of education. Institutions control people. Certainly we are not surprised that there are job descriptions, rules, procedures, and lines of authority, for these seem essential to operation. But when these and other means of control are examined from the perspective of how they socially regulate and construct people's behaviors and ideologies, our concern deepens. Institutions as organizations and as culture by their nature shape the personalities, thoughts, and conceptions of those working within them, and this is no more unsettling than in education where academic freedom and the nurturing of young people are the professed objectives.

One of this century's more disturbing analysts of institutional control of peoples is the postmodernist philosopher Michele Foucault. His notions of "power/knowledge" and "disciplinary technologies" serve as powerful lenses through which to inspect the relationship between the organization - in this case the university culture - and its constituents, professors and students. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (1979) describes the disciplines as "a type of power ... comprising a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of application, targets; it is a 'physics' or 'anatomy' of power, a technology" (p.215). As a constituted technology of power, the disciplines "characterize, classify, specialize; they distribute along a scale, around a norm, hierarchize individuals in relation to one another and, if necessary, disqualify and invalidate" (p. 223). He saw this disciplinary technology operating in 'specialized' institutions including penitentiaries, hospitals and schools where "special knowledge" was to be inculcated .

Special knowledge takes form at the university in what is referred to by Howley and Hartnett (1992) as the "canonization of the general education curriculum" (p. 274). This phenomenon reflects "a discursive practice encompassing the works of predominantly Western, white males that circumscribes the general education curriculum in most American universities" (p. 274). A practice, as such, works to prescribe a preferred set of knowledge principles "to cultivate certain intellectual aptitudes in the forms of particular literacy's and modes of reasoning" (p. 277). Thus the canon is particularly potent in "normalizing" populations toward ideologies of the dominant culture.

The main objective of the disciplinary technologies, however, was control and docility; to create governable individuals. According to Foucault, modern governance of people in specialized institutions is achieved through procedures originating from traditional penal philosophy and located in other social organizations. Roth (1992) describes this evolution:

> Building on earlier disciplinary traditions of the premodern world, namely, the religious confession, the medical examination, and the military exercise, new disciplinary technologies began being introduced in the mid-18th century that transformed overt punishment of transgression (sin, illness, and laziness) into much more subtle forms of social control. This transformation coerced individuals, through classificatory procedures, toward a range of behaviors that are designated as normal and that culminate in the most subtle of all forms of control -- self-control (p. 687).

The "power" of the disciplinary technologies lies in their objectification of individuals so they can be controlled. Roth (1992) explains further: "In these 'carcereal' institutions, an individual subject is constituted as an objectified self. And it is over objectified selves that control is humanely exercised" (p. 692). In "The means of correct training," Foucault explains, "the success of disciplinary power derives no doubt from the use of three simple instruments [the technologies]; hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment and their combination in a procedure that is specific to it, the examination" (p. 170).

Hierarchical observation. Hierarchical organization is a chief characteristic of bureaucratic organizations designed to distribute specialized functions and establish relations of power. In the "specialized" institutions, hierarchical observation serves a surveillance function "organized as a multiple, automatic and anonymous power; for although surveillance rests on individuals, its functioning is that of a network ... " (p. 176). Constant observation is made most effective through ordering of bodies in space and time. While not nearly as pervasive as in public schools, the ordering of space at the university is seen in the ranking of students by academic level and controlling access to certain information, i.e., courses, according to this rank. Spatial ordering of bodies toward surveillance is also manifest in practices such as row seating in classrooms, academic rank of professors, required on-campus housing of freshmen, and so on. Ordering of bodies by time is clearly visible in the practice of regular and scheduled class periods, semester schedules, and the like. In these ways, "supervisors" are constantly aware of where are,

temporally and spatially, the supervised. While a fairly extreme account but not without educational relevance, Foucault reveals a prime purpose of surveillance.

> Its aim was to establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals, to set up useful communications, to interrupt others, to be able at each moment to supervise the conduct of each individual, to assess it, to judge it, to calculate its qualities or merits (p. 143).

If these aims sound familiar certainly it is because of their omnipresence in our early education, and in some ways they have not yet left us. At the university surveillance is recorded in "dossiers," more affectionately termed transcripts, grade histories, and re-appointment or promotion and tenure portfolios. Accumulated records of surveillance have the effect of creating "cases" out of the institution's constituencies, especially students. The social security number - instead called the student number - actually serves as the "case number" and is the primary means of being known by the university. Case information finds its use in another disciplinary technology aimed at "normalizing" people.

Normalizing judgment. Surveillance is not an end in itself. Individual "cases" are studied for their relationship to the central tendency of the larger group, or to prevailing cultural norms. In predictable bureaucratic fashion, these norms are organized around values of productivity and docility or conformance (Ryan, 1991). Foucault called this process "normalizing judgment." Distributing cases across a range of normalcy - in fact "ranking" cases - allows institutions to compare and determine which individuals are normal and which are abnormal. Cases perceived or measured as exceeding the norm are called "exceptional" or "gifted", "cum laude" or "distinguished." These individuals are honored and rewarded with special considerations including advanced placement, scholarships, salary increases, or material inducements (e.g., larger office, "bigger" computer, personal secretary); in essence, more resources with which to do even better at exceeding norms. By contrast, those cases that do not meet the expectation of normalcy are, in no uncertain terms, abnormal; often referred to as "failures," "at-risk," or deficient. Likewise, professors who do not conform to normal university cultural expectations in domains like research, teaching, and service are "punished"; resources for improving performance are removed, potentially even the job itself. Students who do not conform to academic expectation are also punished. "Failing" students are put on probation or made to repeat courses; this without intervention to remedy conditions initially limiting performance. In actuality, resources for improvement are removed - a confusing practice of "punish to make more normal."

Normalizing judgment also operates between professors and students. Although discussed as the following topic, the primary function of evaluations and assessment often serves only to differentiate students, to reveal who is normal and who is not, to identify and reward those who have learned how to respond in ways measured by the professors. Normalizing judgment "measures in quantitative terms and hierarchizes in terms of value the abilities, the level, the 'nature' of individuals. It introduces, through the this 'value-giving' measure, the constraint of a conformity that must be achieved" (Foucault, 1979, p. 183).

130

Examination. If normalizing judgment "marks the gaps, hierarchizes qualities, skills and aptitudes" (p. 183), then its instrument is the examination. Tests are used to diagnose students' positions with respect to norms derived from cultural canons; often expressed in terms of mastery of the "special knowledge." According to Foucault:

> The examination combines the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of a normalizing judgment. It is a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify, and to punish. It establishes over individuals a visibility through which one differentiates them and judges them (p. 184).

Performance, or rather conformance, are recorded in grade books or transcripts and ultimately used as a confession of normalcy. Students are rewarded or punished by grades according to achievement of expectations as measured by the examination. Examinations are used as surveillance devices through which students reveal information about themselves, adding to their cases. Interpretation of test results are often limited to what is assumed to be fairly measured and honestly reported level of subject mastery. Little regard is given for differences among students in either their modes of learning or preferences of expression. The culture not only specifies, implicitly and explicitly, the canons of curriculum but often even the methods of delivery and instruments of measure.

Having revealed information about themselves through the examination, students are then controlled, rewarded or punished, and located appropriately within the university's strata of academic esteem, and eventually within the social strata of society. In this way, the "evaluation links power and knowledge inextricably as the individual becomes the object of knowledge, both to self and others, an object who reveals personal truth in order to know ... and to be known" (Howley & Hartnett, 1992, p. 281).

I have speculated here about a university teaching culture heavily oriented toward management and control, but I am in no way certain that this will be what is exclusively found. It is more likely that professor discourse-practices will reveal a variety of cultural teaching tenets, of which this management and control paradigm may be one. While I expect to find other cultural canons also operating in the practices of professors, I must also agree with Bruner (1996) that "...we have become so preoccupied with the more formal criteria of 'performance' and with the bureaucratic demands of education as an institution that we have neglected this personal side of education" (p. 39). My hope is that the personal side is present, that some form of moral discourse will also emerge. The next section elaborates what I feel *ought* to be the dominant culture of pedagogy at Virginia Tech.

VITA

THOMAS STEVEN BARRETT

1333 Thomas Lane
Blacksburg, Virginia 24060
(540) 552-6202
email: tbarrett@edfacilities.org

Education: Ph.D. 1997 - Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
   Major: Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Psychology.

MAEd. 1994 - Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
   Major: Curriculum and Instruction, Secondary Science.

B.S. 1986 - Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
   Major: Biology.

Employment   August 1997 - Present. National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities (NCEF) -
History: Associate Director.

June 1997 - August 1997. Montgomery County Public Schools -
   Instructor - Middle School Summer Institute

August 1993 - July 1997. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University -
   Graduate Research/Teaching Assistant

March 1992 - July 1993. Science & Engineering Analysis Corporation (SEACOR) -
   Director, Health and Safety.

March 1988 - February 1992. Roy F. Weston, Inc. (WESTON) -
   Section Manager, Industrial Hygiene (February 1991 - February 1992)
   Project Industrial Hygienist (March 1988 - February 1991)

September 1987 - March 1988. MMF, Inc.
   Environmental Laboratory Manager

August 1986 - August 1987. Manassas Park High/Middle School.
   Instructor - biology, physical science.

Professional   *Associate Director - NCEF (August, 1997 - present):* Oversight of acquisitions,
Experiences: production, and dissemination of information related to school facilities related to a
national information clearinghouse. Responsible for development and
implementation of an on-line database consistent with ERIC specifications as
established by the US Department of Education. Provide support to the
clearinghouse Director, contribute to NCEF publication program, provide workshops,
and assist in marketing efforts.

*Graduate Teaching Assistant - Foundations of Educational Psychology (1996 -
1997):* Instructor of undergraduate educational psychology. Course topics include
theories of behaviorism, cognitivism, social learning, and humanism; learning styles
and individual differences; motivation; planning and classroom management;
evaluation; and effective teaching.

*Graduate Research Assistant - Center for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching
(1995 - 1997):* Currently engaged in research of teaching preparation and
experience of faculty members at Virginia Tech. Responsible for conducting
interviews, designing work shops to enhance instruction, managed the CEUT website
and on-line discussion listserv, and evaluating the effectiveness of instructional
programs.

Graduate Teaching Assistant - College Success Strategies (1995 - 1996): Responsible
for course design and instruction. The course seeks to bolster the academic and
social skills of at-risk freshman as well as to impart an appreciation for learning as a
life-long endeavor. Specific topics include time management and planning, reading
strategies, thinking and metacognition, test taking skills, money management, and
notetaking strategies.

Graduate Research Assistant - Educational Administration (1994 - 1995): Assistant
to the Chairman of the Task Force on Governance and Organization for the College
of Education's restructuring program. Assisted in conducting task force meetings,
directing group assessment activities and writing reports. Served on the Dean's
Restructuring Steering Committee as student representative. Founding member of the
College of Education's Student Association. Served as coordinator of Virginia

Tech's Assistant Principals Academy, and the university's student representative to Danforth's National Alliance for the Development of School Leaders. In this capacity conducted Educational Leadership program evaluations of member universities.

Full-time Post-masters Student (1993 - 1994): Major area of study in holistic student assessment as part of the instructional design process. Course work has centered around formal and informal student assessment practices, instructional design techniques, educational psychology, and quantitative and qualitative research methods. Principles from these studies have been applied in several field-based assessment projects. Completed a year-long principal internship at the elementary level.

Director of Health and Safety (1992 - 1993): Development and implementation of corporate health and safety program for environmental engineering and remediation firm of 19 offices in U.S and Canada with over 200 employees. Program components included Hazard Communication, Respiratory Protection, Medical Surveillance, Subcontracting, Equipment Issuance and Cost Recovery, and OSHA Reporting and Workers Compensation according to U.S. and Canadian regulations. Responsible for overall corporate compliance with occupational safety and health regulations.

Project Industrial Hygienist (1988 - 1992): Evaluation of occupational hazards for a variety of industries including: hazardous waste site remediation, rocket booster manufacture, electronics manufacture, pharmaceutical research, petroleum refining/production/transportation, and office spaces. Hazard assessments provided for organic/inorganic chemicals, PCB, heavy metals, biological agents, pesticides, chemical warfare agents, and radionuclides. Asbestos abatement oversight, inspection, and monitoring.

Section Manager (1991 - 1992): Management of eight environmental scientists of varying disciplines related to human health. Responsible for employee productivity and quality, professional development, performance evaluations and budget management.

Laboratory Manager (1987 - 1988): Oversight of environmental systems lab. Responsibilities included direction of analytical testing for environmental media in

Public School *Teacher - biology and physical science (1986 - 1987)*: Taught three classes of
 Experiences: biology and two classes of physical science in a combined urban high and middle
school; participated on the accreditation self-study teams for each school; successfully
completed Virginia's mandated Beginning Teachers Assistance Program; coached
junior varsity football and eighth grade basketball; and have worked as a substitute
teacher.

Teacher - Middle School Summer Institute (1997 - 1997): Teaching a multi-
disciplinary summer program for underachieving middle school students. Instruction
involves basic mathematical concepts, reading skills, and writing proficiency. Using
computer-based programming for student research and publication of independent
learning projects.

Academic (Elementary school): As part of a one year internship my activities included
teacher evaluation, student teacher supervision, school accreditation study, technology
curriculum development, grant writing, inclusive classroom programming, designing
and implementing an intervention program for at-risk third graders, and participated
on district Grant Writer search committee.

Academic (Middle school): Have assessed students needing special assistance but who
do not qualify for such under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and have
designed interventions to enhance their educational progress. Have worked with
students with disabilities to provide interim assessments in conjunction with their
Individualized Educational Programs. Tasks associated with this project included
classroom observations, administering and interpreting standardized tests, records
review, and recommending intervention measures as appropriate.

Professional Commonwealth of Virginia - Postgraduate Professional Certificate
Certifications: Endorsements: biology, chemistry, physics.

American Board of Industrial Hygiene
  Industrial Hygienist in Training (7/93)

Professional Affiliations:	American Educational Research Association
	Eastern Educational Research Association
	Phi Delta Kappa International
	Council for Educational Facility Planners, International

Continuing Education:	Fundamentals of Industrial Hygiene, Harvard University, 1988.
	Advanced Principles In Industrial Hygiene, University of Michigan, 1990.
	Chemistry and Toxicology of Petroleum Hydrocarbons, American Industrial Hygiene Association, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1991.
	AHERA Accredited Supervisor and Inspector
	NIOSH 582 - Sampling and Evaluating Airborne Asbestos
	Post-graduate studies in Environmental Science - University of Colorado at Denver, January 1991 - May 1993
	SOVRAC Educational Leadership Academy, Virginia Tech, February, 1995.

Publications/ Presentations: O'Quinn, E. J. and Barrett, T. S. (1997, November). *Careful and "Care-full Justice: The Postmodern Challenge.* Presented at the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Moral Education, Atlanta, GA.

Barrett, T. S. (1997, March). *Exploring Moral Discourse Among the Professorate.* Presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, Chicago, IL.

Barrett, T. S. (1997, February). *Looking for "Learner-centeredness" in University Classrooms.* Presented at the Eastern Educational Research Association Conference, Hilton Head, SC.

Barrett, T.S. (1996). *Meeting the Needs of New Faculty*. <u>The Pedagogical Challenge</u> ,<u>4</u>(3), 8.

Parks, D.J. and Barrett, T.S. (1995, April) *Using Problem-based Learning to Teach Research Methods*. Presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, San Francisco, CA.

Parks, D.J. and Barrett, T.S. (1994) *Principals as Leaders of Leaders*. <u>Principal</u> ,<u>74</u>(2), 11-12.

Barrett, T. S. (1991, September/October) *Writing and Negotiating Environmental Workplans: Health and Safety Planning*. Presented for Executive Enterprises, Inc., Chicago, San Francisco, and Washington D.C.

Barrett, T. S. (1991, May) *A Preliminary Evaluation of Benzene Exposures During Removal Of Gasoline Underground Storage Tanks.* Presented at the American Industrial Hygiene Conference and Exposition, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Grants/

Contracts: Lead author/investigator for $2,700 grant to investigate the moral dimension of college teaching. (Fall 1996)

Lead author/investigator for $10,000 grant for a technology mentoring program for at-risk third graders. (April 1995).

Environmental: Proposal development and management of over thirty projects ranging from $1,000 to $150,000 (1988 - 1993).