

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7922420

RUBIO, CARMELO ALBERT
AN INTERPRETIVE INQUIRY INTO THE WORLD OF THE
TEACHER,

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT
GREENSBORO, ED.D., 1979

COPR. 1979 RUBIO, CARMELO ALBERT
University
Microfilms
International 300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

© 1979

CARMELO ALBERT RUBIO

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

AN INTERPRETIVE INQUIRY INTO THE WORLD OF THE TEACHER

by

Carmelo Albert Rubio

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1979

Approved by


David E. Pursel
Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser David E. Pappert

Committee Members *[Signature]*
William B. ...
Richard H. Wolfe
[Signature]

March 15, 1979
Date of Acceptance by Committee
March 15, 1979
Date of Final Oral Examination

RUBIO, CARMELO ALBERT. An Interpretive Inquiry into the World of the Teacher. (1979)
Directed by: Dr. David E. Purpel. Pp. 214

The underlying assumption of this study is that a meaningful study of man entails an understanding of his humanity.

In this study, a research effort is directed toward obtaining a sense of person of the teacher. The study considers the teacher from a variety of research viewpoints such as research on teaching effectiveness, and sociological and psychological research on teacher characteristics. In this context, a case is made for studying the teacher through the perspective of the individual teacher rather than through the perspective of the hypothetical "average" teacher.

A concern with the individual from his/her point-of-view requires a new research approach and method; i.e., an inner view of man. This research endeavor advocates this approach and method of inquiry. This study articulates the relationship between approach and method of inquiry on the one hand, and the content area on the other, to illustrate that the kind of understanding that this study requires can only be obtained through an interpretive perspective.

The interpretive-qualitative mode of inquiry is contrasted with the traditional empirico-quantitative research mode. This study proposes to show that the

phenomenological assumptions about the nature of man embodied in the former modality offer a greater possibility for gaining a sense of person than the mechanistic assumptions about the nature of man inherent in traditional empiricism.

Having made a case for adopting an interpretive-qualitative avenue of approach, a particular model of interpretive inquiry is proposed for the specific study of the world of the teacher. The model involves interacting phases of observation, participation, and criticism.

The Participant-Observer-Critic Stance is explicated through its phenomenological assumptions as well as through its practical implications for educational research. This inquiry stance combines the subjective involvement of the participant-observer with the critical reflectiveness of the distanced critic. The understanding of the human subject is made more complete by allowing for both vantage points. Ultimately this research stance rests on the basic assumption that to understand the teacher from an individual perspective, it is necessary to see as he sees, feel as he feels, and perceive as he perceives.

This inquiry explores the world of four individual teachers who, in the researcher's view, have remained "alive" throughout their teaching experience. It portrays their individual worlds through a series of dialogs and interpretive sessions. The purpose is to discover not only who they are, what they do, and how they feel about it, but

also to shed light on how they see themselves in the context of the school as institution, and how they maintain their own individual aliveness and viability as teachers.

A number of general themes emerge from the dialogical encounters with each individual teacher as the researcher attempts to understand what characterizes the world of each of these individuals. A fundamental concern is to portray the predicament of the individual struggle to maintain personal integrity in the course of coming against "the system"; i.e., the inevitable clashes of everyday life in the school.

The study is concluded with an interpretive discussion of the findings and with recommendations for further interpretive inquiry into the world of the teacher. These suggestions open up new possibilities for understanding the full range of consequences of being a teacher.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to express my gratitude to all of those who have provided personal and professional support throughout my doctoral program. I am especially indebted to members of the faculty and doctoral students of the School of Education at UNC-G who shared their ideas and opened up new possibilities as I embarked upon my dissertation and beyond. Special thanks go to William Purkey for his many "invitations," and to Ira Weingarten for his valuable critique and suggestions on portions of this work. In addition, I wish to extend my thanks to Warren Ashby of the Department of Religious Studies for sharing with me "the joys and agonies of teacherhood."

I am indebted to the members of my doctoral committee: Richard Bardolph, Marshall Gordon, Donald Russell, and Richard Weller for their constructive criticism, open-mindedness, and genuine concern.

Most of all I want to thank David Purpel who directed this dissertation and who in many ways lived it with me. His sensitivity and perceptiveness allowed me to find my own way with the reassurance that he always knew where I was. In no small way his intellectual and spiritual guidance made this dissertation possible.

This work would not have been possible without the four participant teachers who so openly and wholeheartedly shared their perceptions, feelings, and reflections with me. I wish to convey my special thanks to each of them.

Finally, I want to acknowledge my family for their encouragement, patience, and understanding during the long and trying times when all my efforts were channeled toward my work. I am very grateful to my wife Fran and my daughter Michelle for generously giving me all the space I needed and taking little in return.

A final note of thanks to Mrs. Elizabeth Crabtree for her diligence and able typing, for her graciousness in fitting me into her busy schedule, and for her helpful suggestions that minimized the problematic nature of my timetable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION: PERSONAL PROLOGUE AND PREFACE	1
Personal Prologue	1
Preface	11
CHAPTER	
I. TEACHERS, TEACHING, AND THE SCHOOL	22
Introduction	22
Teacher Effectiveness	24
Teacher Characteristics	35
<u>Schoolteacher</u>	37
<u>Life in Classrooms</u>	50
A Sense of Person	58
II. METHODOLOGY	63
Modes of Inquiry	63
Inner and Outer Perspectives	68
Phenomenology	71
Approach	75
Method	77
Content	84
Educational Inquiry in the Interpretive Mode	89
The Participant-Observer-Critic Vantage Point	94
III. SPECIFIC INQUIRY	100
Introduction	100
Dialog and Personal Meaning	102
Consciousness and Intentionality	110

CHAPTER	Page
Aliveness	114
Procedure: A Method	118
Background	120
Preliminary Dialogs	124
Dialogical Framework	127
Participants: A Profile	129
Initial Dialogs	131
Interpretive Narratives--Point of View	134
Final Dialogs	138
IV. INTERPRETIVE NARRATIVES OF CASE STUDIES	142
Joe	142
Kathy	153
Charles	163
Jack	172
V. REFLECTIONS ON THE INQUIRY	182
The World of Teachers: As Four Teachers See it	182
The Individual and the Institution.	183
Compromise and Adaptability	187
Personal Orientation--Sense of Purpose	192
The Interpersonal Dimension	196
Some Generalizations	197
Methodology	200
Suggestions for Further Inquiries	204
In Retrospect	207
BIBLIOGRAPHY	209

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. The Human Perspective: Methodological Dimensions (Basic Research Orientations)	69

INTRODUCTION

PERSONAL PROLOGUE AND PREFACE

Personal Prologue

I am a teacher. I am also a unique individual who is many more things than a teacher. It would be an oversimplification of my existence to delineate the essence of my being solely to my being a teacher. I am aware that these two self-views are not one and the same; however, I am also very aware that a very significant part of my self-view is intimately tied to the teacher in me. Being a teacher is very important to me; being a good teacher is even more important even though I am not sure what the attributes are that would make me a good teacher. I consider myself to be a good teacher and being a good teacher is a struggle; a very personal struggle that takes many façades: arrogant rebelliousness, stoic acceptance, willful compliance, idealistic fantasies, physical and emotional withdrawal . . . ad infinitum . . . With what or whom am I struggling? Why am I struggling? What is this struggle all about? Dealing with these questions simply points to me that I cannot honestly answer them. But then again maybe my task is not to answer them, but to keep asking them over and over, to keep

looking at the possibilities, I am not sure. In a way it all comes down to Who am I? The choice I can make is to spend a substantial part of my life attempting to answer what I know to be unanswerable. The driving force maybe is a belief (faith?) that there is an answer (somewhere), or maybe a need to keep looking for the sake of looking.

I am probably today a reflection of what Hugh Misseldine (1963) called "the inner child of the past"; my past in this case. At the risk of being drawn into the realm of psychodynamics, I must confess to seeing myself today as a fairly predictable product of my childhood years and early life. I am hesitant to admit that I am simply a product of my childhood, and I will not simply leave it at that, but I, at this point in my life, can see some meaningful connections between then and now. These ties are very real to me now and often scare me because they offer perspectives that I was never aware of. Interestingly enough, I never saw them until a few years ago. They significantly altered many of the self-views I had, the feelings I experienced, those beliefs I held to be as certain and as factual as the light of day and the darkness of night. This was truly a point of crisis in my life; an identity conflict that shook my whole world. It certainly was and is painful. There were specific crises although I am not sure what brought them about.

The specifics are not my concern now and I do not want to dwell on them. I am more concerned with the impact of the re-awakening, of the new dimensions that opened at that time, and with the growth that has resulted since.

One significant aspect of this re-awakening has been my awareness of those sources that are painful, threatening, or unpleasant to me. Among other things, for example, I realize that I am generally resentful of that which I consider to be sources of arbitrary authority, of sources that I perceive as having a power over me. I have difficulty dealing with these unless I can see some measure of legitimacy involved. Very often legitimacy for me translates as either a relationship or covenant entered in through mutual agreement and based on sharing, or a relationship where the one-way authority is based on expertise. I deal with this source of tension in different ways: I comply, I withdraw, I retaliate, I sermonize. Each mode brings about some sense of personal meaning. Paradoxically, I must admit to being very vulnerable to these sources. I often seek their approval and recognition, so I know I cannot claim the untouchableness that I thought I possessed a few years ago when I claimed that "I'm immune to it, I am not bothered by what they say or think about me or what they do . . ." I wish sometimes that I could be so aloof, but the reality

is that I cannot--for whether I deny it or not, I am inevitably involved.

Most of my adult life has been spent as a teacher. In fact, many of the discomforts and tensions that I experience today are associated with my being a teacher. By virtue of the fact that I take myself seriously as a teacher, I cannot help but fall into these dilemmas. Even the relationships with my family and friends are heavily colored by the world of the teacher which I inhabit.

I relate my experience as a teacher to my experiences with teachers--especially the teachers of my childhood. When I think of "teacher" a number of images are conjured in my own mind. I have memories (some fond, some vivid, some vague, and some frightening) of my own schooling and how I saw my teachers throughout school. It is difficult now to look back and remember accurately the pictures that I had created of my teachers. I am very aware, however, that I definitely created my own subjective images of what my teachers were like. I wonder if I was aware then of any significant dimensions or obvious characteristics along which I created my imagery. Looking back now and trying to think of my teachers, I seem to have my most vivid memories of those teachers who somehow appeared to me as being real, individual, and alive; not necessarily good or bad (for there were enough of both

kinds), nice or unpleasant, caring or unconcerned. It seems that a general sense of "aliveness" was common even in the uniqueness of each. Today, as I find myself in the professional world of the teacher, I also see those around me who seem somehow alive, but I also see around me many who, as Maxine Greene (1977) says, "go through the motions of life, move, and act--those who find the springs of their lives and drives of their actions not within themselves" (p. 9). Like Antoine Bloye, these teachers are those who perhaps

never thought of allowing themselves the leisure to ask what they were doing on the earth, what they were good for, which way they were headed--what the whole business of life meant . . . those who amused themselves little, badly, and seldom. (Greene, p. 9)

These teachers are like many individuals who are caught in the rotation of the many institutional machines we have created; this particular machine we call education and you can get into it very easily through the school. I think it is possible, but difficult to avoid being engulfed by these machines. I know that I often feel caught, trapped, hopelessly doomed to rotate in its center with little hope of breaking free. This is a real dilemma: to stay in and risk being devoured or to check out. What frightens me most is the fact that I fear that the process of being devoured is a relatively painless process. It is slow enough to go on unnoticed. It is subtle but corrosive. It does not seem to come from any

one direction; it seems to seep in from nowhere in particular. It starts to debilitate your very foundation, to tire and exhaust you until its grip becomes so substantial and firm that it becomes unnoticed. Its presence is so pervasive that soon it becomes reality; the "given" from where you begin to see yourself. I have felt, often, as if I were almost caught. I think I have managed to break away; or have I? Maybe the fact that I am aware of this, is an indication that I am still "out." I imagine that it is possible, at least in theory, to gravitate in and out with moments of stupor and moments of lucidity. I equate this process of engulfment with the painless and tranquil state that seems to precede and forecast the moment of death of some chronically ill patients. It is almost a welcome relief from the constant agony which had preceded it all. In a way, there is a sense of security in being engulfed by that slumber state. Everything will be provided, you have no more efforts to exert since your reality (or the lack of it) is now being created and structured for you. You are now passive and at rest; no longer a struggling force. It is a willful surrender of conscience and consciousness.

My experience as a teacher tells me that I maintain my integrity and viability by creating a realm of personal meaning that transcends my simply being a part of a world in which I follow directions and follow lines of authority.

If this is all I did (if I felt this was all I could do), I do not believe that there would be any sense of personal meaning and purpose in my being and doing as a teacher. I want to be unique, different, I want to stand out and not merely to be considered one of the parts and cogs that makes the machine go round and round. The system to me is that source from which I perceive messages of power and authority that expect a certain degree of compliance. If and when I can see myself as a meaningful participant, my outlook is very different than when I see myself as being just another functioning part of a very impersonal team. I guess maybe in the former instance I sense a feeling of community legitimacy and in the latter one of arbitrary compliance. In a nutshell, the one is social involvement and the other is institutional functioning. My reconciling these two dimensions entails a state of tension, an intentionality of consciousness, and a quest for meaning.

The state of tension reflects the energy present in any conflicts or dilemmas inherent in the notion of self vs. other. Perceived consonance of this "I-Other" dichotomy would tend to minimize the tension, but probably at the cost of a higher level of consciousness that can transcend the relationship. Personal meaning is a dynamic consequence of the tension and is always in a constant state of flux by virtue of the fact that the

individual who refuses to simply equate I with Other is more open to the multiplicity of possibilities of his "being-in-the-world." Meaning is thus constructed by the individual in the context of a dialog between I and Other.

The notion of dialog is central to my own personal search for meaning. The tension and consciousness of being of which I just spoke seem to depend on a dialogical process that taps issues which lie beneath the surface. The dialog that I am referring to is the reflection or the expression of the tension. It is often tacit and then I am not aware of it. It can be verbal or non-verbal, overt or covert, and it can encompass any meaningful dimension of experience. I think it can be between individuals, between individuals and collectives, and within the individual. I do not believe that life is possible without some form of dialog, but I also believe that there are many levels of dialog and many degrees of awareness. I am particularly concerned with a dialogical model that involves my own notions of self, community, and institution. In a way, what I am referring to here is a process of triologue and I am conceptualizing it as taking place within me as an individual. The nature of the triologue involves my existential self, my community self, and my institutional self. These "three selves" are all a part of the "core-I"; of the real me. I am not attempting to minimize my responsibility by labeling

certain parts of me as being community or institution--bound or created. They are all me. Each is as valid as the other. They are interwoven phases and aspects of my being, my biography, my here-and-now. I must again, however, emphasize that this is not akin to the three faces of Eve. This is a natural state of affairs and the labels are only useful constructs for my understanding. Unlike Dr. Jekyll, I take no potions to become Mr. Hyde as I enter different arenas in my daily life. What do these three selves represent?

Briefly stated, this is how I personally view each of these selves:

Institutional Self--I am a part, a representative of a collective body over which I exercise little if any influence. This part is seen as representing something impersonal. It is detached and serves controlling and regulatory functions as it gives me a sense of being worthy of institutional functioning. It emphasizes teamwork, compliance, and uniformity. It is efficiency-minded and values loyalty.

Community Self--I am aware of my presence in-the-world and my sharing of meaningful experiences. I am a part of a larger entity, but it is my uniqueness as an individual that is valued in a context of social responsibility and cooperation. I relate to other individuals who share with me a mutual sense of commitment and purpose. In the

community-self, the relationships are intrinsically meaningful and not merely means to an end or to completion of a task. It fosters a feeling of social adequacy, acceptance, and recognition as an individual being. It also stresses a sense of responsible participation and a willful commitment to community values. In this light it values interdependence.

Existential self--I strive to maintain my sense of uniqueness and integrity independent of any relationship or accomplishment. This part of me is in constant tension with any notions of collective (whether these be reflections of the institutional or community self). This part of me experiences the paradoxes of maintaining an individual identity while attempting to live in a shared world of social responsibility and to function within the boundaries of institutional frameworks. It values independence.

The triad within us is inevitable for we are individuals possessing unique consciousness in a social reality. In our culture living implies some degree of participation in the system. Today the sheer magnitude of living makes it (at least for me) unlikely, if not impossible, to be effectively isolated from realms beyond those of traditional community. Being who I am and having lived the life I have lived, I am not sure that I could simply erase the institutional-self in me. I am not sure that I would want to. I think I need it to survive, to add fuel

to the fire, to propel my quest for personal meaning. Without it, I might not have any reason to search any further . . .

Preface

This study is a journey into the world of the teacher. It is a journey of exploration that I must undertake because it entails looking at one of my most immediate realities; a reality that, because of its proximity, becomes so pervasive that it goes unnoticed. A fundamental assumption inherent in this study is that the world of the teacher is a very special world, that teachers are very special people, and that studying the teacher in his world can be an insightful experience for theorists, practitioners, and consumers of education.

The *raison d'être* of this study is the fact that I am a teacher, and I am personally and intimately involved in this world. It is my concern with teachers that prompts me to find out who they are, what they do, how they feel. It is that deeply-seated, intimate part of me; the teacher-self that provides the thrust to look at other teachers and to see what they see. It is this personal element of involvement that injects life into this inquiry.

A teacher, in addition to being a teacher, is an individual and this entails many other attributes--i.e., many other "selves" which he perceives as being part of him. Therefore, what a teacher feels, what he believes,

how he behaves, and how he sees, is ultimately and intimately interwoven with what he values and with his "general sense of self and others." It is this general sense of self and others that provides the lenses through which the teacher looks; i.e., it lays the groundwork upon which the teacher views are anchored. It is in this light that the teacher-world acquires a uniquely personal flavor; intimate and real. I cannot, then, attempt to understand the individual-as-teacher apart from the individual-as-being. In this inquiry I want to explore this dialectic between selves as the teacher looks inward in a reflective stance, and outward in a dialogical stance. It is this dialectic that defines his world. In addition to general personality factors, there are other elements more specifically related to his teacher-world that define his self-view and perceptions as a teacher.

The daily routine of the school experience provides a certain sense of the reality of the school which, I assume, is intersubjectively shared to some degree and exerts a major influence on how the teacher perceives his world. The daily routine of school life is a kaleidoscopic reflection of a number of explicit and implicit influences which are perceived differently from different vantage points. For this reason, it is unlikely (if not impossible) that any two teachers would ever share identical views of this world. The potential for shared experiences,

however, is there and this can facilitate, at least in theory, the opportunity for dialog. The fact that routine is standardized, that certain rituals and rites take place, that spatial and temporal confinement is shared, and that language and meaning are narrowly defined, makes it very likely that there is some perceptual consensus.

The reality of the school, I have said, is a composite of many factors. One of these--and the most explicitly obvious perhaps--is the formal impact of the institution (the rules, regulations, sanctions, expectancies, etc.). The teachers' "professional handbook" embodies the institutional doctrine to which they are expected to adhere and which should define their professional creed as teachers.

Another aspect of this reality is the everydayness, the taken-for-granted givens that remain largely tacit and which exert a powerful influence on the school world. This is the dimension that everybody knows but nobody articulates; it is seldom questioned because "it" is the framework for asking those questions; "the way it is." Perhaps because it is so obvious and unnoticed, it exerts such invisible influence. This is the area of the hidden curriculum where the rhetoric of formal institutional policy gives way to the reality of praxis. There is no formal document for there is no formal doctrine.

A third aspect of the school experience for the teacher revolves around the semi-formal code of the profession. In the school this becomes a largely informal, collegial

framework that carries no legitimate authority but which is often encouraged in certain ways by the institution. Whatever authority is conveyed here is more of a horizontal acknowledgment of expertise and peer-recognition and not legitimated by the vertical hierarchy of institutional authority. For many teachers this aspect is self-defined and little weight is placed on collective-collegial notions of professionalism that, to many teachers, represent further institutional pressures for compliance to a professional body that is oriented more toward the institutional notions of education than to the professional teacher.

It is within these dimensions: the personal, institutional, and professional that I wish to make my journey and derive new insights.

In the conventional mode of empirical research, this type of study has no design; i.e., no well-devised sets of specific hypotheses to be tested, no data-gathering instruments, and no set of analytic procedures specified in advance. Insofar as the term "experimental design" implies these features of specificity and prior planning, this inquiry has none. If, however, I take the notion of design in a larger context of general purpose, order, consistency, and careful critical reflection, then this inquiry has a design. The research problem initially was not wed to any specific methodological procedure, this was developed in the course of the inquiry and became the central

focus of the study only in the specific process of interpretation. The original problem was to attempt to find out how the teacher viewed and felt about his world in the school. My concern was to see that world through the eyes of the individual teacher and from the perspective that school was more than simply a place of employment. The focus was the teacher, the context was the school, the perspective was the teacher's. It seems reasonable to assume that many teachers share perceptions and views of their school-world, ideas that differ systematically from others in different vantage points outside that world. It is also reasonable to assume that this occupational ethos is not uniform for all teachers, and, therefore, the concern of this study is not the teacher as a collective occupational group, but rather, the individual perspectives from which this world is seen; i.e., the individual working in the institutional-professional world of the school.

In this inquiry I am concerned with gaining a sense of person as I study the world of the teacher. I am aware that my concern is with the subjective world of the individual teacher. Because my concern is with this "inner view"--as opposed to the more traditional "outer view" provided in traditional research--I find that I must also be equally concerned with the manner in which I can obtain this subjective view of the teacher. My focus, therefore, becomes two-fold as I need to consider questions of

both content and method. It seems that as soon as I ask "Who is the teacher?", I find myself asking "How can I get a sense of person while answering this question?" Clearly this second question opens up a whole new dimension.

My work, therefore, reflects both questions of content and questions of method. Chapter One basically deals with content. First, I provide a rationale for my wanting to obtain this subjective sense of person of the teacher. Second, I consider a number of general types of research on teaching and the teacher in light of how they provide or fail to provide the sense of person I seek. Third, I hope to point to the need for this sense of person in understanding the teacher. In this first chapter I aim to locate the substance of my inquiry in the context of what has been done to explicate the kinds of questions I want to ask.

Chapter Two deals with questions of method. In this chapter I indicate that one reason for the relative absence of the type of research I am advocating is that such research endeavors entail distinctively different methodological considerations; i.e., these questions necessitate different modes of asking. This chapter considers traditional ways of inquiring of quantitative-empirical research vis-à-vis the ways of inquiring of interpretive-qualitative research. The chapter touches upon the philosophical assumptions, value premise and methodological

implications of both modalities of research. Finally, this chapter considers specific methodological procedures of more specific relevance to my own inquiry, and attempts to establish a case for the interpretive mode of inquiry in gaining a sense of person in human/social research, and more specifically of the teacher.

In Chapter Three, the focus is narrowed to the articulation of approach, method, and content in my own inquiry. This chapter provides a detailed description of the specifics of my inquiry into the world of four teachers. This chapter is the heart of the inquiry (in content and methodology) and follows from the general framing of content and methodology provided in Chapters One and Two.

In Chapter Four I render my account of the four case studies explicated in Chapter Three. These are provided in the form of four interpretive narratives and they should be read in the general contextual framework provided in Chapter Three.

Chapter Five summarizes the major conclusions I derive from the inquiry in regard to both content and methodology. This chapter considers the general questions posited in the preface. In this light, it reflects on the findings and, inasmuch as it considers possible limitations

and suggests further questions, it opens up new areas for inquiry.

At this point, a few words about the languaging, constructs and value-premise of the inquiry are in order.

Such notions as teacher-self, self-concept, "teacher-ness," and teacher-world, are all experiential constructs. They derive from the humanistic tradition in education inasmuch as they define all that is viewed as being ultimately perceptually anchored to the "I" which is the source of those perceptions and through which interpretations are filtered. My concern here is not to engage in any technical discussions of these concepts, nor is it to provide a rationale for the validity of the perceptual point-of-view. Even though I implicitly accept these, any specific discussion of these is beyond the scope of this paper. These terms provide a useful framework for viewing the I-Other relationship; they are means to an end and not ends in themselves. I do, however, hope that the general meaning is clear enough to the reader so that he "does not lose sight of the forest because of the trees." The reader is referred to Combs (1962, 1964), Combs, Avila, and Purkey (1971), and Purkey (1970) for a more detailed discussion of the perceptual framework in teaching.

The approach and subject matter of this inquiry necessitate that I adopt different stances vis-à-vis my subject matter (this will be explained further). At this

point, I want the reader to know that these different stances entail different points-of-view and hence different kinds of language. Generally, the reader will become aware that there is a level of language which is rather linear and straightforward and aims for a maximum of objective communication of what I am doing, why, and how. In addition there is a level of language that is more descriptive and aims for literary richness of detail in what is done. I have made an attempt to frame this more personal form of language within the boundaries of the more linear form. I am not sure how successful I have been in these efforts; however, I believe that, at least I have informed the reader that these changes in language were inevitable (as part of this work) and, in this manner, I have sensitized him to the implications. In short, I cannot be certain that the reader will understand all that I say and do; however, I have told him what I would say and do; this should facilitate my communication with him.

Finally, there are a number of very important assumptions that I hold about the nature of the teacher, teaching, and education which color the overall tone of this work. I feel that it would be best to lay out these general biases at this point and to clarify my initial vantage-point.

1. The ideal teacher, I believe, is an emancipatory teacher; an agent of change; an individual who can open up new possibilities to his students.

2. The emancipatory teacher is more than a catalyst for, unlike a catalyst, he does not remain unchanged after triggering a change. In a very real sense he is changed by the very changes he precipitates. He must constantly liberate himself and accept the liberation of his students.

3. Teaching in this manner is always a risk since it entails the pain and agony of searching, questioning, and creating new meaning-worlds. This entails not just finding new answers, but asking new questions; finding new metaphors, constructing new paradigms.

4. Education is ultimately a human endeavor. Man is its ultimate concern, and a very significant aspect of man is spiritual. The teacher must deal with that spiritual dimension at some point in his relationship with the student. The curriculum and the school must also reflect this concern.

5. These new realities need to be explored. An understanding of the dialogs of the teacher, through dialog, could provide new perspectives in an otherwise too familiar world.

It is with this deeply personal concern that I undertake my inquiry. I aim for a disciplined inquiry where openness is tempered by critical reflectiveness, where flexibility does not imply lack of rigor, and where subjective involvement is balanced by objective detachment. I am aware of the difficulties and near impossibilities

inherent in attempting any study that seeks both personally meaningful knowledge and knowledge that can be objectivated and shared in a reasonable manner with the community of knowledge. In a way the value of this inquiry lies in how well it can successfully combine both of these aims.

CHAPTER I
TEACHERS, TEACHING, AND THE SCHOOL

Introduction

This is a study of the teacher; more specifically, it is a study about people who are teachers. Notions about teachers and teaching have become central to our educational concerns. Education, broadly defined, is concerned with schooling, curriculum, instruction, knowledge, classroom management, individuals, relationships, and values. The list can go on and on. The teacher is simultaneously involved with these different facets of education every day of his school life. Hence it is in the person of the teacher where all these dimensions come together and where these issues are ultimately played out. It is the individual teachers who are responsible for what happens in the schools. In this respect, today's public school teacher becomes a jack of all trades as he is expected to successfully fulfill a variety of formal and informal roles. The teacher of today must simultaneously be a willing employee, a cultural messenger, and a knowledge specialist (Lamm, 1976).

Theorists, practitioners, administrators, and consumers all have their own views of teachers. The vast domain of

educational research has certainly included the teacher in its investigative efforts as innumerable hypotheses have been postulated, tested, validated, rejected ad infinitum . . . We probably have access today to more knowledge about the teacher than we are aware of or would care to know. We can learn about the psychological and social characteristics of teachers, their personality traits, demographic attributes, attitudes, training, educational level, and effectiveness in the classroom. We know the interrelationships among many of these variables and what each indicates taken singly or in combination. We know a great deal about the teacher, but we do not seem to know, however, very much about those dimensions in ways that provide a sense of person; i.e., a feeling of the "individual teacherness" experienced in the context of self-perceptions, relationships, and of the everyday routine that permeates the world of the teacher. The kinds of research endeavors that abound in the literature are not very likely to tell us much about individual teachers: who they are, what they do, how they feel about it, and why. My contention in this study is that the best way to answer these and other similar questions about the teacher is to study the worlds of individual teachers and their views about their own experiences. As Becker et al. (1968) indicate, it is important to take the subject's vantage point to see as he sees in the framework of complex social

relationships, institutional demands and constraints, and temporally connected contingencies in order to understand what he does and why. What do we know about the teacher? I would like to consider some of the major questions asked and the findings generated from various research areas.

Teacher Effectiveness

The focal importance of the teacher has long been acknowledged in educational thinking; however, in spite of the recognition and lip service paid to good teaching, relatively little substantial information is available regarding its nature and the teacher characteristics which contribute to it. One major reason for this situation is the general lack of understanding of and agreement on the various patterns of behavior that characterize teachers in general (Ryans, 1960).

What constitutes effective teaching? Ryans (1960) states that definitive answers can be given to this question. Teaching can be said to be effective to the extent that the teacher acts in ways that are favorable to the development of basic skills, knowledge and understanding, value judgments, and personal adjustment of the student. This definition, however, is far too abstract to be translatable to specific teaching behaviors in the classroom. Until recently, little progress had been made in describing the specifics of effective teaching in given settings.

This general area of research places emphasis on specific processes such as teaching, learning, and classroom behaviors. The teacher is not really the focal point of concern, but rather the agent through whom these processes are "acted-out" and thus become "real." The individual actor becomes more of an impersonal entity and is defined in terms of how closely he conforms to or deviates from notions of a hypothetical average. There is no special significance attached to the unique individuality of the participant involved inasmuch as he is viewed primarily as a means to an end. In this area of research, studies often convey a general sense of disconnectedness between actor and action. Subject and object become dichotomized so that the former becomes a background against the saliency of the latter.

The nature of this research is prescriptive rather than descriptive and the content is generally specific and operationally predefined (e.g. the effect of teaching styles on classroom learning, the effect of individualized instructional techniques on motivational level of student, etc.). Embodied in this research approach is the belief that the study of teaching is the heart and essence of all research that should govern the future course of education (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974).

The methodology used in these studies is generally the traditional empirico-deductive approach where variables

are operationally defined, where hypotheses are formulated and tested via statistical inference, where the setting is carefully controlled, and where the validity of the study ultimately depends on acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses as they conform to notions of statistical significance.

Research in the area of teacher effectiveness is concerned with events and process that take place in the classroom. Generally a basic tenet of this research area is that the research must involve some format of systematic study of teaching in the classroom; i.e., a measurement of classroom functioning. In this light, this research stands separate from other forms of educational inquiry. It is not concerned with the study of background and characteristics of teachers, pupils, or other participants of the educational process; it is also not concerned with participant-observer accounts of classroom phenomena that exclude the vantage point of the researcher. This research also excludes studies of the school as a social system and biographical inquiries into teacher and student behavior in settings outside the classroom context.

Generally, the value of this research is evident as theories of teaching are formulated based on empirical findings. These models for classroom teaching acknowledge that teaching is a complex activity that reflects many factors and relationships that have yet to be accounted

for, yet they emerge in attempts to provide a sense of order and understanding to the many findings accumulated. A basic assumption is that the classroom is the locus of the teaching process and the logical vantage point for assessing it. Another assumption is that even though each classroom, each teaching situation, and each teacher-student relationship is unique, the teaching process is sufficiently invariant and sufficiently different from other non-teaching activities to warrant a categorical study as a special phenomenon in its own right. Its advocates claim that this field of research is narrow, but crucial to learn something definitive about teaching (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974). What are some of the findings about teachers and teaching revealed by this type of research endeavor?

Most of the teaching models generated through research on teacher effectiveness assume a mechanistic systems-approach to the classroom setting as they identify input, context, process and output variables and their interrelationships. There are a number of research concerns reflected in these models. One of these concerns is the area of classroom climate. The major model in this area is the Flanders Interaction Analysis (Flanders, 1960). Inherent in this area of teacher-effectiveness research are the notions of democratic education and group dynamics and the fact that traditional teaching is authoritarian and unresponsive to

the needs of the individual students in the classroom. Much of this research reflects the belief that teachers need to be more open, to foster student initiative, and to allow for more two-way communication (i.e., be more indirect). This research effort has generated a number of studies and research instruments to measure the degree of teacher directiveness/indirectiveness, types of classroom communication, and general classroom climate. Empirical findings (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974; Rosenshine, 1971) do not seem to support the claims that teacher effectiveness is enhanced by democratic teaching strategies or by more democratic classroom climates.

Another model of teacher effectiveness is reflected in the work of Kounin (1970) which focuses on the problem of discipline and classroom management. Kounin is concerned with the teacher behaviors that are necessary to keep the students involved in the classroom tasks and to minimize pupil deviancy and classroom disruptions. A major recommendation in his research is that teacher-training courses must include experiences in classroom management.

Related to the area of control and management is the area of behavior modification in the classroom. This concern centers on what the teacher needs to do in order to gain control over individual students who, for some reason or another, are singled out as problematic in the

classroom. Research in this area has grown from traditional laboratory studies of animal research in psychology. A problem identified by this research area is not the effectiveness of externally manipulated contingencies of punishment and reinforcement, but rather the practicality of applying such consistency-demanding schemes in classrooms with a large number of students and where only one or two are the concern of specific behavior modification programs. Furthermore, the claims that positive reinforcement is more effective and humane than punishment are undermined by the fact that its administration requires much greater discipline, patience, energy investment, and alertness on the part of the teacher than does punishment. Generally, teachers will probably resort to the contrived manipulations of behavior modification programs only when students fail to respond to ordinary classroom treatment in terms of failure to achieve, involve themselves, or conform to classroom norms.

Another general area of teacher effectiveness is exemplified by models that focus on teaching as related to findings of cognitive development (knowledge and intellect) as opposed to simply transmission of factual information. Studies by Bloom (1956), Taba (1966), and Guilford (1956) focus on classroom communication of higher-order intellectual categories (synthesis and evaluation), on divergent thinking as opposed to convergent thinking, and on the teacher's

efforts to raise the "level of thought of the students" in the process of teaching. In these studies, teachers were trained to intellectualize more in their teaching and then measures of intellectualism in the students were determined. The evidence does not seem to support that this aspect of teaching behavior has any significant positive effects on pupil achievement and suggests that variables reflecting student attitudes toward the subject might be more important as predictive factors.

Studies of teacher effectiveness are not necessarily limited to specific single-variable experiments such as student verbal responses to teaching behavior (Hiller, 1971), manipulation of classroom rewards (Lipe & Jung, 1971), and the effect of teaching presentation (Worthen, 1968) or teacher influence (Measel, 1967) on student achievement and conceptual thinking. There are a significant number of research efforts on teaching and teacher effectiveness that aim to incorporate findings into a more comprehensive framework. These studies generally prescribe a specific teaching model as being a significant step toward the understanding and enhancement of teacher effectiveness. Gage (1972) attempts to outline a teaching model based on a scientifically grounded technology of teaching. Smith (1963) also attempts to document teaching strategies as the stepping-stone to conceptualize a general theory of teaching. Some of these efforts, on the other hand, tend

to be more descriptive as they compare alternate models of teaching (Gage, 1964; Nuthall & Snook, 1973).

Research on teacher effectiveness identifies specific procedural variables in the classroom setting which are hypothesized to have some effect on variables pertinent to the students as a class-group. In essence this research assumes a number of basic premises concerning the role of the teacher, teaching, the classroom, learning, the students, and the purpose of instruction in general. First, definitive empirical knowledge has been and must continue to be generated from research on teaching. Second, this general research is central to any attempts at improving instruction and, as such, must be the foundation for teacher training and the basis for teacher evaluation (as opposed to idealistic teaching models, philosophical foundations, personality analysis of teacher characteristics, and organizational studies of the school). Third, all the knowledge so far developed must be considered tentative and not final and must be subject to further research procedure before any valid generalizations can be made. Fourth, the ultimate goal of this research is to integrate and incorporate the knowledge gained into general comprehensive theories of teaching; however, care must be exercised so as to avoid constructing a theory that seems plausible, but which does not conform to empirical findings. In the previous review of research

findings, we saw that many of the more comprehensive-integrative models (Flanders, Behavior Modification models, etc.) may not be theoretically sound or may not be applicable in practice. Fifth, a corollary of this previous point is that research on teacher effectiveness, in addition to conforming to careful scientific procedure, must also be feasible in practice so that theoretical models must go hand-in-hand with teaching practice if the former are to be considered useful constructs. Sixth, along this pragmatic vein, this research focuses on the classroom almost to the exclusion of other aspects of the school world. The teacher is conceptualized as a specialist in the craft or science of instruction; i.e., a professional practitioner. The institutional dimension of the school and the personal dimension which the teacher unavoidably brings into the situation are either not taken into account or considered only in the light of how they relate to the teacher behaviors in question; i.e. the teacher is seen as an important variable in a process. Seventh, this research assumes a cause-effect paradigm between teacher behaviors (causes) and student behaviors (effects). Implicit in this paradigm is the belief that a carefully controlled setting and systematic observation and measurement of significant variables will point to direct causality of events in a way that is significant enough to divorce the findings from factors external to the classroom or from

personal idiosyncracies brought into the situation by the individual participants. The cause-effect paradigm reflects a mechanistic conception of man and views him as a manipulable entity lacking individual consciousness. Eighth, the mechanistic conception of man yields models and experimental frameworks in which process variables (teaching process) become independent variables manipulated in the interaction with input variables (student characteristics) and context variables (general classroom setting), and their main and interaction effects are assessed as they are reflected in the final products (output variables that reflect learning or other desirable effects that teaching should yield).

Procedural precision and predictability of results are highly valued in research on teaching effectiveness. Dunkin and Biddle (1974) underscore the importance of obtaining knowledge that is scientifically sound and that is amenable to applications by the informed practitioner. They cite an example where they consider a hypothetical relationship between the teaching variable of teacher-warmth and the product variable of student achievement. For this relationship to be meaningful, they say, the following must be spelled out:

that the concepts used in the findings are meaningful, and that they had been measured with instruments that were valid and reliable; that the studies reporting the finding had used valid, uncontaminated designs; that the effect applied over a wide range of teaching

contexts, or if not to what range it was limited; and finally that we understood why the effect took place. (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974, p. 358)

Dunkin and Biddle indicate that research on teacher effectiveness generally does not meet these five important criteria and so conclusions from particular studies must be tempered by the limitations inherent in them.

Advocates of research on teacher effectiveness are not likely to fall into the trap of "unfounded findings" inasmuch as they are rigorous and methodical in their inquiries. The model becomes all-important as a way of arriving at "truth in teaching." For this reason, if they fail to provide significant knowledge about the teacher, they do so by restricting their focus, by being too rigid in their criteria for validity, and by insisting that careful measurement is a prerequisite for significance. In this way they could be said to sacrifice possibility of substance for accuracy of procedure and maybe not realize "that the trees they have so carefully analyzed are part of a larger forest and that the trees might look differently when viewed as such." This, of course, is not an indictment of this type of research--which is obviously needed--it is rather an indication of one of its strong limitations and, perhaps, a warning for practitioners and researchers who would view teachers from this vantage point to the exclusion of all others. Clearly, research on teachers is more than what is revealed by the findings of teacher effectiveness. What

else do we know? What other findings illuminate the world of the teacher? In this light I would now like to consider the teacher from the vantage point of traditional sociological research into the world of the schools.

Teacher Characteristics

Most of what we know about teacher characteristics is derived from sociological studies of teaching. There have been relatively few systematic studies done in this area. A number of studies have been made of the school as a social organization. The works of Corwin (1965), Bidwell (1965), Dreeben (1968), and Waller (1932) have attempted to define the normative functions and describe the social relationships that characterize the school. These attempts have been rather comprehensive, but with the possible exception of Waller's classic on teaching, the teachers have been viewed as parameters that help describe the school. In these studies, the teachers as the focal point of concern have been virtually ignored (Grace, 1972). Shipman (1968) indicates that what these studies reveal is an institutional profile of school life. It is often indirectly that we can derive some knowledge about teacher characteristics through such avenues as analysis of educational relationships (Gross, 1968) and through a knowledge of the culture of the school (Mead, 1951).

Teaching is a complex task and, as such, demands a multiplicity of human traits and abilities; i.e., a teacher

has many sides (Ryans, 1960). These traits and characteristics may be grouped under two major headings: one involves the teacher's mental abilities and skills (knowledge of subject matter and understanding of psychological and educational knowledge); the other involves characteristics stemming from the individual's personality (values, beliefs, interpersonal skills). More is known about the intellectual characteristics than about the personal-interpersonal ones. Often, the latter have been considered intangibles and thus not amenable to traditional analysis. There are indications, however, that suggest that these intangibles can and should be subject to careful and systematic study to provide an integrative picture of the teacher. Waller (1932) was the lone pioneer in this area of research; Lortie (1975) continues in this tradition and brings much of the earlier work up-to-date. The works of Waller (1932) and Lortie (1975) provide us with comprehensive studies of the teaching profession. Their concern is to define teacher characteristics from the collective vantage point of the ethos of the occupation. Their approach is integrative as they aim to study the teacher through the personal as well as the professional and institutional dimensions, and eclectic as they employ a variety of both quantitative and qualitative methodological techniques of inquiry. Their goal is to provide the most complete picture of the teacher. It is their degree of thoroughness, comprehensiveness

and systematic inquiry that make them unique (and useful) in understanding the teacher and his world.

Waller and Lortie focus more on the participants (i.e., on who they are rather than on what they do or where they do it) than the research previously discussed. Compared to the instructional and institutional perspectives, there are relatively few studies that take this person-perspective of the teacher. Lortie (1975) emphasizes this fact when he states that

. . . public schools have received relatively little sociological study (from the participant rather than the institutional perspective). Schooling is long on prescription, short on description. That is nowhere more evident than in the case of the two million persons who teach in the public schools. (p. vii)

These studies provide insights into teacher characteristics; they provide the sense of person (the human element) that seemed to be either missing or incidental in the other types of research studies. For this reason this type of research is more relevant to my own inquiry and I want to give it a closer and more careful view.

At this point I will look at teacher characteristics through the insights provided in Lortie's (1975) School-teacher and the general findings of this research area.

Schoolteacher

Lortie's work, published in 1975, is an attempt to integrate a variety of issues and concerns relevant to the world of the teacher. His inquiry incorporates a variety of approaches and methods but the goal is to find

out what teachers do and how they feel about what they do. His "unifying theme is a search for the nature and content of the ethos of the occupation" (p. viii). By ethos he refers to "the pattern of orientations and sentiments which is peculiar to teachers and which distinguishes them from members of other occupations " (p. viii). Lortie does not assume that teachers, by virtue of their occupation, are unique in every respect. He emphasizes that it is not the fact that their perceptions and sentiments are distinctively different from members of other occupational groups; what is different, he says, is the particular constellation; i.e., the special combination of orientations, sentiments, and notions that prevails among teachers vis-à-vis other occupations. This special ethos he attributes to the structure of the occupation as well as to the meanings that teachers attach to it.

In order to accomplish his purpose, he formulates a very thorough comprehensive study on the world of the teacher which had not been undertaken since Waller's (1932) classic study, Sociology of Teaching. He makes use of historical reviews, large-scale field surveys, observational studies, content analyses of open-ended, intensive interviews, and findings from other sources. Some of the data is drawn from large population samples while other reflect a more individual concern. His interpretation necessitates both quantitative analysis and the interpretive

understanding of the subjective world of individuals. Some of his inquiries are extensive with normative implications while others benefit from depth and intensity at the expense of scope and generalizability of results.

Why do teachers want to teach? Lortie addressed himself to this question through data obtained in his "Five Towns Study" (Boston metropolitan area) and in national surveys conducted by NEA. The majority of answers given indicated that most teachers want the steady interaction with people, particularly youngsters, which teaching offers. This desire to work with people certainly distinguishes teaching since few other occupations entail such degree and frequency of interaction with young (or younger) people. This interpersonal theme was the chief attractor for the teaching profession; however, he points out that this should not be interpreted as indicating that a single major personality type is attracted to teaching. Among teachers, there are undoubtedly multiple psychological needs underlying their personal desires for wanting to teach. There is no evidence to warrant any other conclusions.

It seems that individual teachers attribute a certain aura to the teacher's ability to work with people. By defining their work in these terms, teachers seem to add meaning to their task and, thus, to enhance their dignity and self-esteem. Subject matter attraction did not seem to be anywhere as important a drawing card for teachers

as was the interpersonal theme as much more emphasis was placed by the respondents on the special sensitivity and creativity needed to work with people than on the transmission of knowledge. It seems that the notions of the art of teaching reflect more an art (intuitive knowledge, innate ability, natural inclination) of dealing with people than an art of knowing and transmitting the substance of certain fields of knowledge.

Another powerful attractor that Lortie found among his respondents reflects the traditional ideas that teaching is a valuable service of special moral worth to the community. Teachers indicating this reason for teaching were quick to point out that they wanted to be of some meaningful service to society, and perceived themselves as having a special important mission to perform. Lortie inferred that this reason for teaching is probably more prevalent among those teachers who are content to accept and transmit the status-quo than to those who are critical of it and propose to change it in their functions as teachers.

Another reason given for teaching reflects the teachers' needs and desires to maintain a life-style within the boundaries of the educational world. These respondents liked their school experiences or had specific interests in certain academic areas which they could sustain through pursuits that are school-based or school-related. Lortie

indicates that this reason for teaching satisfies interests "which might have originally been fostered and reinforced in school; this attraction has a built-in quality" (p. 29).

The other two reasons given for teaching underscore the themes that Lortie identifies as material benefits and time compatibility. Both of these notions are underplayed in comparison to the other reasons for entering the profession; however, Lortie points to the fact that the material benefits coupled with the working schedule have been important to women and to men who come from homes of low socioeconomic status. The fact was borne in the survey to indicate that the teacher's schedule with convenient breaks and long gaps plays a major part in attracting people to the occupation.

In spite of the attractiveness of the teaching profession, teachers do not seem to place much emphasis on their teacher training and professional corpus of knowledge. Teachers say that their principal teacher has been experience; their teaching has been the product of trial and error and they claim that instructional theory is meaningful only when screened through individual filters and subjected to practical applications. Collectively, they do not see themselves as possessing a common technical culture and this makes them less ready to assert their professional authority on educational matters and to justify their work to the inquiries and demands of the

lay society. In this respect teachers' self-perceptions are more likely to center on institutional belongingness than on a sense of profession. Teachers have little control of matters concerning the teacher profession (Lieberman, 1956) and they see themselves in this light. Generally they acquiesce to institutional bodies (education boards, legislatures, community groups, school administrators) in key decision-making matters. In general, they tend to rely more on the security, protection, and authority of institutional dictates than on professional self-regulation.

A dilemma for teachers that Lortie perceives concerns the fact that teachers are forced to rely on individualistic responses in a professional vacuum because of their inability to think about their concerns in terms of a collective framework. This incapacity to respond to problems and demands as a professional group reduces the status of the occupation and creates subjective problems for individual teachers who, because of inability to communicate professionally, doubt the value of their personal effectiveness and of the services they offer. This individualistic conception of teaching increases the burden of failure, lays the basis for personal, intuitive approaches to teaching in which personal reasons are the key for decision-making, and makes the individual more resistant to change. Marsh (1973) indicates that a lack of shared

experience is prevalent at the most basic professional level of the teacher's life. Given this lack of a professional esprit-de-corps among teachers, what challenges does teaching present to teachers? What meaning do these individuals attach to what they do? Why do they do what they do?

Lortie indicates that teaching as an occupation is a present-oriented as opposed to a future-oriented endeavor for most teachers. Few beginning teachers acknowledge any intent to make teaching their lifelong occupation, and those who do stay, generally have little interest in leaving the classroom for other more prestigious and financially rewarding occupations in the educational institution (principals, supervisors, etc.). For these reasons, they seem to derive most of their satisfaction from those rewards they can derive in the present rather than from those that can be reaped through more distant future aspirations. Most classroom teachers connect their major rewards in teaching to the satisfaction derived from classroom events. The Five Towns interviews revealed that respondents internalized their work goals as part of their work gratification, and they cited task-related events as the single most important reason for their feelings of satisfaction in their jobs.

It is of great importance to teachers to feel that they have been able to reach their students, and much of

the meaning they attach to their work is closely tied to that perception. Other sources of personal meaning in teaching such as scholarly activities and collegial relationships are minor when compared to the emphasis placed on teacher-student classroom interaction and the feeling that students have learned. Five Towns teachers indicate a belief that their task is a complex one which transcends any one individual personality and teaching style; however, they seem impressed by those teachers "who get results" and not by the "crowd pleasers." Although they acknowledge the value of a charismatic element in teaching, they are much more inclined to lean on the teacher's effectiveness in meeting everyday demands as a reflection of a good teacher.

Lortie's findings indicate that the major responsibility for effective action in the schools is placed on the teacher's shoulders. The value of the school system as a whole rests on the aggregate of individual teachers as they perform their tasks in the classroom. The teacher must exercise the roles of task leader and emotional leader to govern and coordinate the events of the classroom. Teachers hold themselves professionally accountable for fulfilling these obligations and the responses in the Five Towns Survey indicate that they perceive two general areas of serious error. One involves behavior which violates their responsibility (as teachers) to their students

(e.g., imparting knowledge), and the other is behavior that damages the quality of their relationship with their students (i.e., the relationship as an end in itself). The angry outburst seems very threatening to these teachers since it represents a loss of self-control and of control of the class. Perhaps for this reason, these teachers indicate that interpersonal qualities of a more personal nature (patience, consideration, warmth) are more important for teaching than intellectual qualities.

The realities of classroom life reflect how teachers feel about what they do, but Lortie is quick to point out that the world of the teacher is much more complex than it appears from some of the responses given in his study. Their preoccupations and beliefs seem to convey a certain ambivalence as they question whether or not their central mission is really understood and appreciated by those to whom they are responsible (students, parents, school). The teacher yearns for more autonomy, greater resources, and more decision-making power, but, at the same time, does little to actively challenge the basic order, and accepts his role vis-à-vis the system on which he is economically and functionally dependent. These feelings are internally contradictory and reflect the dilemmas of the role as the personal, professional, and institutional wishes and demands converge. The teacher lives the tension of wanting to control his work life while attempting to

accept its vagaries and perhaps he holds back because ". . . he is at heart uncertain that he can produce predictable results" (Lortie, 1975, p. 186).

One of the consequences of this sense of tension and uncertainty is that teachers draw themselves more deeply into involvement with classroom events. In this effort, they tend to perceive the classroom boundaries as a defense against disrupting influences. They become concerned with their influence over students and with conditions that enhance that influence. They perceive themselves as the central catalyst for student performance and resent wasting energies in organizational tasks which they view as trivial. Improving things for them implies time and effort concentrated toward more teaching and warding against the constant threat of wasted time. Their concern here is to be left alone to do their teaching.

Lortie indicates that the processes of recruitment, socialization, and allocation of rewards in teaching tend to foster particular outlooks among teachers. He identifies these general orientations as conservatism, individualism, and presentism. These general themes, Lortie says, are characteristic of the ethos of the occupation. Teachers in the Five Towns Study show an overwhelming preference for continuing to do things the way they had done them in the past as opposed to trying out new ways and change for them amounted to little more than

"more of the same." Perhaps the teacher stakes out his own autonomy by resisting change as he finds personal ways of coping in the absence of institutional and professional definitions of problems and solutions. The lack of common definitions forces the teacher into an individualistic stance, but one which Lortie considers guarded and cautious rather than self-assured; one that ". . . lies behind a formal rhetoric given to praising cooperation and denying conflict" (Lortie, 1975, p. 210). This sense of uncertainty also clouds the issue of means-ends which already is not clearly perceived by most teachers. In the absence of a clear sense of direction, few teachers are unwilling to sacrifice present opportunities for future possibilities and their educational perspective (in terms of success and failure) develops around short-range outcomes. Because of the effects of these three factors, the search for occupational knowledge and the development of a teaching culture based on sound empirical grounding tend to be undermined.

Lortie concludes his study with an analysis of the historical ethos of teaching vis-à-vis the demands of the future. He discusses this phenomenon in the light of three frameworks. The first framework focuses on the erosion of tradition and the reality of cultural change as the rapidly increasing knowledge and the creation of multiple educational alternatives provide a challenge

to the world of the teacher as it is now defined and perceived. The second framework focuses on the changing perspectives of the teacher's role and of the professional-occupational image of teaching. Power struggles and action through collective means attest to the new light cast upon the social image of the teacher which proves inconsistent with the social expectations normally held for teachers. The third framework considers the school world against the backdrop of other political structures as today's schools become more widely centralized as large systems under the control of a large bureaucratic umbrella. In addition, control of these school systems tend to be going away from local community and toward state-level governance. This changing scenario magnifies the issue of teacher autonomy as claims for professionalization and self-supervision come face to face with bureaucratic accountability of the teacher. It is clear to Lortie from these three general trends that the future perspective for the teacher will necessitate a much more adaptive capability.

In this light Lortie sees the need for inquiry-based intervention as the teacher deals with the inevitable tensions of his role in the light of a changing world.

Lortie prescribes a course of action for teachers as they engage in an open-ended, critical inquiry of their world. He says: "The target for intervention, as I see it, should be reflexive conservatism; teachers ought not to

reject change out of hand or be unwilling to give serious thought to alternative ways of attacking pedagogical problems" (Lortie, 1975, p. 230). They must meet the demands of a common occupation and, as such, their collegial responsibility must transcend personal or institutional responses as they confront their world.

The sense of person provided in Lortie's Schoolteacher seems to lack the concern for individual subjectivity as teacher characteristics are viewed primarily in the light of hypothetical averages from large sample surveys. Even though Lortie's work is not limited to the traditional sociological approach of objective, quantifiable research, his work is more concerned with extensiveness than with intensiveness of probing and with generalizable averages of the occupational ethos than with individual viewpoint. His concern is "with the trees viewed as a forest rather than viewed as individual trees." In any inquiry of this magnitude, demographic data become essential to provide a sense of order. In this study an individual sense of person of the teacher, in my opinion, cannot be adequately provided; the focus does not permit it inasmuch as one cannot get a close-up view and a wide-angle view with the same lens, at the same time.

Another type of study that considers teacher characteristics from a different vantage point is embodied in the work of some sociologists and researchers who take a

a more subjective approach; i.e., Jackson (1968), Stubbs (1976), Willis (1978), and Delamont and Hamilton (1976). Their work tends to be less comprehensive and less bound to the traditional stance of sociological research than the works of Lortie and Waller; generally they are more phenomenologically oriented and less eclectic as much of their basic premise is grounded on the tenets of the sociology of knowledge: Berger (1963), Berger and Luckman (1966), Polanyi (1966), and Young (1971). The phenomenological assumptions of this interpretive framework will be considered in the next chapter in my discussion of methodology. At this point it is sufficient to say that unlike the traditional sociological stance, this research framework stresses the subjective framework of objective knowledge (the reader interested in an overview of contemporary sociological viewpoints is referred to the work of Freidheim (1976).

Philip Jackson's Life in Classrooms explores teacher characteristics from this interpretive framework.

Life in Classrooms

Philip Jackson (1968) offers us a very different view of the teacher and his world. His focus is on the classroom, his approach is more intensive and detailed, and his concern is with what goes on in the life of the classroom. He uses a variety of perspectives to grasp the meaning of what school is like for students and

teachers because he says classroom life is too complex a phenomenon to be properly understood from any one perspective. He, therefore, in his inquiry must "read, and look, and listen, and count things, and talk to people, and even muse introspectively over the memories of our own childhood" (p. viii). In his inquiry, he becomes observer, interviewer, questioner, critic, and interpreter as he lives the classroom world of three elementary school teachers.

His interest lies not in the unusual or extraordinary, but rather in the common, everyday experience of being in school. His participant-observer stance makes everydayness problematic as he ponders the significance of seemingly trivial events that come and go unnoticed in a flash and which together combine to form the routine of the world of the classroom. He believes that this routine which we seldom talk about and which we take for granted is probably more important in giving shape and meaning to our world than those isolated memorable events that are more likely to hold a listener's attention. His concern is ". . . the practical activity that takes place in the classroom . . . the ebb and flow . . . the intermingling of idea and action . . . the whole matrix of experience of children and teachers" (Marsh, 1973, p. 3).

Because my concern is the teacher, I am more concerned with reviewing the sections of the book that deal more directly with the teacher (four and five) than with those

which focus on the school, the student, and the classroom (one, two, and three). Jackson's explorations of the teachers' world is threefold. First, he wants to find out their self-awareness in terms of their classroom performance. Secondly, he wants to look at the relationship between the teacher and the institutional framework of which he is a part. Finally, he is concerned with the personal satisfactions derived from being a teacher. He interviews a sample of 50 teachers who had earned a highly favorable reputation in their school systems. Jackson cautions that this sample is probably not representative of teachers in general and his interview findings should not be interpreted as generalizable findings. As Jackson interprets the responses in the interviews, he finds four major themes underlying the teachers' views of self-evaluation, institutional authority, and job satisfaction. These are: immediacy, informality, autonomy, and individuality.

The first theme reflects the teacher's here-and-now orientation and the possible conflicts it might have with the school's more future-oriented outlook. This present-orientation seems to provide the spontaneity that adds challenge, variety, and excitement to the teacher's world. An interesting aspect of this notion is the extent to which these teachers made use of fleeting behavioral cues to obtain feedback on how they were doing. He draws a parallel between the good actor who is sensitive to the moods of his

audience and the good teacher who is equally aware and responsive to subtle changes in his students. For these teachers, spontaneous expressions of interest and enthusiasm are important indicators of good teaching. They are much more likely to emphasize intuitive feelings as determinants of good teaching rather than institutional dictates that seem unconnected to what teaching is all about: e.g., when contradictions between test scores and teacher judgment occur, the teacher is much more likely to deny the accuracy of test information than to alter his previous assessment. Jackson's findings indicate that even this reputable sample of teachers could not avoid the discomfort of being present-oriented in a future-oriented institutional setting.

The informality-formality dimension reflects primarily the teacher's exercise of authority and control in the classroom. In fact, teaching style generally refers to the teacher's way of being in charge. Informality is not really an absence of forms, rules, and conventions, but rather a less formal or structured way of dealing with these. These teachers may exercise their authority more casually; however, they are not willing to surrender it nor are they bothered by the institutional norms that define their realms of responsibility and authority in the classroom. Most teachers confess that their own personal style tends to be more stilted and rigid at the beginning of the year, and more relaxed as the year goes on.

One of Jackson's interviewees (a veteran of forty years in the classroom) states that she tries to create a family atmosphere in the classroom, where discussion is encouraged and the atmosphere is relaxed, where the discipline is not the arbitrary authoritarian type but one based on openness, trust, and social responsibility. A common concern among many teachers is their initial inability in knowing how far to let the class go before setting limits. Ryan(1970) indicates that this concern often becomes an obsession for first-year teachers. They seem to intuitively get a feel for this as they become better acquainted with their classes. This is an important issue for two reasons. One, because it indicates a certain degree of openness that these teachers must maintain to get to know their classes. Two, because the degree to which they remain rigid or flexible is determined by the individual and not by institutional policy. This second reason takes us to the theme of autonomy which Jackson identifies in his interviewing.

Whereas the theme of formality-informality focused on the teacher's relation with his subordinates (students), the theme of professional autonomy focuses on the teacher's relations with his superiors. Responses indicate that teachers would prefer more substance and less ritual in this dimension and the major threats perceived are the limitations of an inflexible curriculum, and the

interference of supervisory personnel coming into the classroom to evaluate their performance. Teachers clearly indicate that they must have the final word in what to teach and how to teach if they are to maintain any sense of professional integrity. In addition to this insult to their professional pride, most teachers feel that too much red tape and too many constraints undermine what they want to accomplish in the classroom. Implicit in these responses is the idea that uniqueness is what gives character to what these teachers accomplish and any attempt at uniformity or standardization is to destroy the essence of education. This certainly goes along with the beliefs held by these (and other) teachers that "too many cooks spoil the broth."

On the other hand, the teacher's desire for professional autonomy is not to be interpreted as a desire for complete isolation and total independence. These teachers ". . . do not want to be alone with their roomful of pupils; they merely want to be free from inspection while performing certain of their duties" (Jackson, 1968, p. 133).

Individuality is the fourth theme that Jackson detects in his interviews. It reflects the teacher's interest in the well-being of individual students in his class. These teachers seem to receive a great deal more personal and professional satisfaction from what happens to individual students in the classroom than from attaining

stated classroom objectives. The satisfactions derived from individual students are strongly tied in with the teacher's emotional involvement with teaching and with the class. Jackson finds that these emotions range from the teacher who experiences the low intensity but continual satisfaction of being personally useful in serving a worthwhile cause to the one who experiences intense emotional arousal and satisfaction by the occurrence of unexpected, unpredictable events. Present in some responses are more spiritual, dramatic transformations which the teachers experience as "classroom miracles" and which they often consider akin to events of religious experience. Jackson indicates that the unanticipated variety of experiences as well as the teacher's desire to witness and have a hand in precipitating dramatic classroom experiences provide the attractiveness and challenges for these teachers.

Even though most teachers point to their interest in individual students, most teachers insist on working with a group (20-25 students) rather than working on a one-to-one basis of tutorial instruction. This paradox seems to be resolved in Jackson's summary statement that teachers want ". . . a collection of individuals . . . large enough to 'keep things moving' and small enough to preserve the visibility of individual members" (Jackson, 1968, p. 143). Perhaps it is the difficulty of the task

(e.g., the "lost" student who has found his way) and "the odds" that define the challenge and provide the reward.

Jackson concludes that there is a fundamental ambiguity in the teacher's role inasmuch as he is simultaneously working for and against the school as he strives to preserve the value of the institution while looking after the welfare of those who inhabit it. In this sense the teacher is an agent for softening the impact of institutional life for the students; however, he must consciously want to act in this capacity. It is his acting out in this capacity that increases the uncertainty of his role, but also imbues it with a certain quality. The personal qualities of the teacher that enable him to withstand the demands of institutional life and classroom life have not been described; however, Jackson indicates that a simplistic view of causality, an intuitive rather than a rational approach to classroom life, an opinionated rather than an open-minded stance when confronted with challenges to his status quo, and a narrowness of the working definitions assigned to abstract concepts, point to personal ways of coping in the absence of a professional language with which to respond.

Like Lortie (1975), Jackson concludes his study in a prescriptive vein by pointing to the need for teachers to develop a common descriptive language to describe what they do rather than to rely on the old clichés and

slogans of traditional educational measurement for describing the phenomena of their school world. He emphasizes the need to break away from the traditional engineering model of inquiry and to develop new critical perspectives from which to view classroom events. Teachers, he says, must become observant participators in the schools, and, as such, become internal critics of their world.

A Sense of Person

Lortie's Schoolteacher (1975) and Jackson's Life in Classrooms (1968) both in different ways focus on the teacher as a person. Lortie's approach is more comprehensive and general and Jackson's is more personal in nature. Both deal with the personal, professional, and institutional dimensions that define the teacher. Lortie's vantage point is the occupational ethos and Jackson's is the everyday reality of classroom life; their findings clearly reflect those vantage points. Something, however, seems to be missing in the sense of person provided in these two perspectives; i.e., possibly the personal implications of being a teacher are not considered subjectively enough or in enough depth. Perhaps the notion of a person perspective embodies more of a psychological-philosophical concern for what defines the "individual teacherness" beyond what is accounted for in a general occupational ethos or specific observational findings.

The sense of person that I am looking for in my inquiry of the teacher, however, has not been altogether lacking in the literature. There have been a number of inquiries that provide a psychological profile of the teacher. These inquiries reflect a clinical-therapeutic approach with existentialist overtones as they focus on the teacher's feelings and perceptions in the human context of the school. In this type of inquiry the introspective view of the teacher is more important than the outward view; i.e., the focus is the teacher's reaction to himself and not to his world.

Jersild (1955) looks at the ". . . strivings, satisfactions, hopes, and heartaches that pervade the teacher's life and work . . . It searches into meanings we all seek to embrace . . . it centers on teachers . . . from a personal point of view" (p. 1). The work centers on teachers but admits that the feelings explored (loneliness, anxiety, hostility, compassion, and the search for meaning) could apply to any person in any walk of life. Inherent in this work is the belief that education should help people (teachers, in this case) attain a degree of humanness that comes only through self-acceptance and self-understanding. For the teacher the sense of personal meaning entails commitment and involvement that imply more than mere conformity to institutional norms. Personal meaning provides the

individuality and the sense of self that are needed for teaching to be more than a formality in an impersonal setting.

Jersild's (1955) work is clearly a humanistic inquiry into the self-concept of the teacher. His data and conclusions are derived from a relatively large sample of teachers through analyses of a number of questionnaires, personal inventories, and interviews. Even though the concern is with the person, the method of analysis is quantitative and the matter of interpretation ultimately comes down to numerical significance. In this respect, the sense of person is lost in the numbers.

The work of Knoblock and Goldstein (1971) is a similar attempt to deal with the feelings of loneliness and separateness of the teacher and his attempts to gain a sense of community. In this approach teachers explore their feelings and perceptions in interactions with other individuals in the school. This type of approach is more of a group dynamics inquiry into the self-concept of the teacher. Much of the data is derived from psychological testing of teachers and significance is also statistically defined in this study. However, in addition to the testing component, this inquiry makes use of dialogs between teachers on certain topics (e.g., teacher openness, teacher change, and authenticity of self). These dialogs

occur in the context of group dynamics in a clinical setting and, as such, their aim is psychotherapeutic.

Both of these works and other attempts in group dynamics, classroom communication, and values clarification provide a forum for the teachers to reveal aspects of their teacher-self that are not normally revealed in traditional inquiries into the world of the teacher. They open the door to look at an experiential side of teachers that is normally hidden from view. Although I want to capitalize on this sense of person, these inquiries are not the type of inquiry that I am proposing to pursue. My concern is also with a sense of self, a sense of person that transcends the role definitions, professional functions, effectiveness, and occupational characteristics of the teacher. Unlike these psychological inquiries, however, my concern is not a clinical one, my approach is neither through group dynamics, questionnaires, or psychological testing. Instead, the sense of person that I am after is more elusive, more biographical, more individual and can only be approximated through interpretive analysis but never captured through statistical certainty.

One of the reasons that it is difficult to obtain this sense of person in any inquiry attempt is that exploration of this content area necessitates a different approach and method. The whole question of content or substance of the inquiry becomes a question of methodology

when the sense of person desired requires that the researcher enter into the world of the subject and experience his world from his vantage point. My concern here is much like Castaneda's (1968) attempt to learn the Yaqui way of knowledge through the eyes of don Juan; to enter a separate reality and at the same time to be able to step out and look from outside. Like Castaneda, the approach necessitates my adopting the inside view of the involved participant and the outside view of the distanced observer. This is the crucial methodological problem inherent in this kind of study as the boundaries of subjective experience and objective knowledge are no longer categorically specified a priori. How I choose to look determines what I see. With this assumption, the methodological dimension becomes problematic and presents another issue to consider.

In the following chapter I want to consider the whole question of approach and methodology in light of two very different modalities of inquiry and their implications for the sense of person which I hope to explore in my inquiry of the teacher.

CHAPTER II
METHODOLOGY

Modes of Inquiry

In The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution, Sir Charles P. Snow (1959) distinguished between two opposing cultures that have evolved in the intellectual life of modern man. One culture is that of the literary intellectual and it is represented in the humanities. The other is that of the scientist represented by the sciences and technologies of our modern era. Each culture has its own characteristic common denominators--its own familiar symbols that distinguish it and keep it a world apart from the other. This distance is such that men of letters have no basis for conversation with men of science and technology.

Later, in a revised presentation, Snow (1964) mentioned the emergence of a "third culture" that had been developing in a number of fields. This third culture was a relatively recent vintage and could not be properly understood either in the category of the humanities or in the category of the sciences in the traditional sense. Its essence was uniquely different and although it resembled both traditional cultural streams, it suffered

from a lack of identity. The cultural or social sciences were the primary manifestations of this culture.

Traditionally, the social sciences have derived most of their cultural support from the natural/physical sciences so that most of their rationale has rested on their scientific character. The close identification with the scientific pole of the cultures has often assumed that the essence of their cultural phenomena is of the same "kind." There has been little understanding of the grounds on which this mixed culture rests. It is only now that some of its followers are becoming aware of the distinctiveness of their area of knowledge as having a special character and integrity all its own. It is only this systematic awareness of its human character that will generate new modes of theory and practice in the study of human-social phenomena. The inadequacy of the naturalistic orientation and of physical models becomes evident as man tries to find out more about himself. In the next section, I shall discuss the major modes of inquiry generated by these cultural traditions.

Durkheim (1950) had stated the essence of nineteenth-century Naturalism when he postulated that every object of science is a thing. His approach to the discovery of empirical knowledge triggered the beginning of classical statistical research studies in the analysis of social problems. In the Durkheimian tradition, empiricism had

been equated with hypothesis testing through carefully controlled experimental procedure involving quantifiable sense data. He defines this approach as follows:

The subject matter of every sociological study should comprise a group of phenomena defined in advance by certain common external characteristics and all phenomena so defined should be included in this group. (Durkheim, 1950, p. 35)

This research tradition has been variously labeled scientific, empirico-deductive, quantifiable, hard, objective, experimental-laboratory, etc. and embodies an elaborate research methodology that emphasizes sensitivity, precision, replicability, predictability, and control. In the social sciences this research tradition has been incorporated in mechanistic models and paradigms borrowed and adapted from the physical sciences. These models view man as an impersonal entity, a product that is to be processed in prespecified ways to meet desired criteria. Failure and success are determined by general probability estimates, indexes of efficiency, and statistical inference. Man is thus viewed collectively and typologically and not individually or uniquely.

The other major mode of inquiry (qualitative) has been built on a separate foundation altogether and like the cultural tradition which it represents, it provides a sharp contrast to the mainstream of traditional scientific culture and its quantitative study of human phenomena.

In direct opposition to Durkheim, Florian Znaniecki (1934) stated that

if the scientist tried to study the cultural system in a manner analogous to his studies of the material or natural system as though it existed separately from human experience, the system would disappear and leave only a disjointed mass of natural things and processes without any similarity to the reality he had hoped to investigate. (Znaniecki, 1934, p. 37)

Scientific data, he says, consist of things (natural objects) and values (cultural objects). These are intrinsically different in nature and must be viewed differently in the process of inquiry. Durkheim and Znaniecki have become "classics" representing the quantitative and qualitative cultural traditions respectively. Following these leads, social research has generated much valuable knowledge; primarily in the tradition of the positivist and behaviorist, but, to a lesser extent, also in the more interpretive types of inquiry of the phenomenologist, ethnomethodologist, and participant observer.

Both traditional empiricism and interpretive inquiry derive scientific knowledge from their research experiences guided by professional rules for investigating human phenomena. However, the differences between the rules and their experiences are great and have extensive implications for the formulation of social theory. Some social theorists assume a comprehensive theoretical stance that allows them to construct a complete, coherent body of knowledge that is consistent with both research orientations. Max Weber (1949) represents this comprehensive

theoretical orientation in his attempts to integrate the divergent and often conflicting findings. His integrating temper assumed from both modes of inquiry whatever he felt contributed to the pursuit of knowledge.

Weber, while maintaining an empirical-analytic stance, questioned the applicability of physical laws to the realm of the social sciences. Furthermore, he saw the necessity of the researcher entering into the life of his subjects to seek personal understanding (Verstehen) of their position while, at the same time, maintaining a certain value-free perspective in drawing conclusions. His concern for both causal relationships and human meaning attempts to bring together the objective world of explanation with the subjective world of understanding.

Weber's efforts have been further elaborated by Talcott Parsons (1951) who attempted to bring together the divergent philosophies underlying the unsystematic but integrative work of Weber. His work on philosophic issues, however, left many questions untouched. It soon became obvious that subjective constructs such as freedom, justice, purpose, and community which are fundamental to the study of society could not be adequately understood with labels of structure, function, action, and system. The need for a drastically different methodology was evident, a methodology based on the underlying philosophical

assumptions of the social sciences, a methodology that would study the human phenomena with Verstehen.

Inner and Outer Perspectives

Bruyn (1966) gives an interesting account of the quantitative and qualitative modes of inquiry. He goes beyond the obvious differences in methodologies to compare and contrast the foundations, assumptions, and purposes of both orientations (see Table 1). The essence of his comparative portrayal is summarized in what he calls the Inner vs. the Outer Perspective.

The Outer Perspective stems primarily from naturalistic philosophies and has been reflected in the methodological framework of the scientist. Science has traditionally taken an "outside" view of its subject, and through systematic observation and analysis of data, has discovered regularities that are translatable into quantifiable language. The physical and natural sciences observe the "behavior" of their subjects with a relative degree of control over them. The social scientist has carried this tradition into the study of man. He has modified the methods but has left the assumptions pretty much unchanged.

The Inner Perspective has derived primarily from idealistic philosophies and its contribution to the social sciences lies in the fact that it has added a human/cultural perspective. Its concern is more with the "inner" study of man as he derives and constructs meaning. Unlike

Table 1
The Human Perspective: Methodological Dimensions
(Basic Research Orientations)*

	<u>INNER PERSPECTIVE</u> (Participant Observer)	<u>OUTER PERSPECTIVE</u> (Traditional Empiricist)
Philosophical FoundationIdealismNaturalism
Mode of: Interpretation. . .	Concrete Procedures	Operational Procedures
Conceptualization . . .	Sensitizing ConceptsFormal Concepts
DescriptionSynthesis.Analysis
Explanation		
Principles.Telic.Causal
ModelsVoluntarism.Determinism
Aims.Sensitively Accurate Inter- pretation and Explanation of Man's Social and Cultural Life	.Accurate Measure- ment and Prediction of Man's Behavior

*From Sevryn T. Bruyn's The Human Perspective in Sociology: The Methodology of Participant Observation, p. 49.

the outer perspective, it attributes to man the element of consciousness that sets him apart as a unique human entity. It hopes to understand people from their own frame of reference. It does not accept the traditional empirical tenet that the inner perspective is meaningful and understandable only when explained in terms of the outer perspective. Instead it contends that the inner perspective is meaningful in and of itself and can be interpreted only in terms of itself. What are the peculiar ways of knowing of the human/social sciences? How do they approach their subject matter? How do they inquire into the infinitely complex realm of human/social phenomena?

The emphasis of the social/human sciences is with knowing man in a human sense; i.e., with the realization that individual man is unique and that human nature is complex and ultimately undefinable. The qualitative-interpretive mode of inquiry has evolved under various methodological guises from this phenomenological premise. Qualitative-interpretive inquiry is not a clearly defined camp nor a specific theoretical framework. It rests on the assumption that the historical, social, purposeful, meaningful, and conscious nature of man defies simple quantification, reductionism, abstraction, and generalization. It wants to apprehend the phenomena of man.

Phenomenology

Knowledge for the phenomenologist is apprehended directly and intuitively through the immediacy of the human experience. Edmund Husserl (1962), the "father" of phenomenology, explained that this mode of seeking original knowledge involved the bracketing of preconceptions and the reduction of concepts to a point where the observer can obtain a pure apprehension of reality. Unlike the methodology of participant observation (that I shall discuss in a subsequent section), phenomenology never developed in the United States as it did in Europe. The phenomenologist attempts to understand individuals by entering into their perceptual field in order to live, feel, and see life as these individuals live it, feel it, and see it. Florian Znaniecki indicated this when he said, "There is one way of experiencing an object: it is to observe it personally. . . . you cannot fully realize what they are doing until you do it yourself. . ." (Znaniecki, 1934, p. 37).

The concept of "essence" was the major theoretical contribution of phenomenology to interpretive field studies. For Husserl, essence suggests a

quality of social or cultural life which underlies and basically defines the particular phenomenon being studied . . . a quality which is permanent and necessary to the existence of the phenomenon, a quality which is intrinsic and primary to its being. (Husserl, 1962, p. 17)

The term essence may be applied to any institutions, values, concepts, or groups being under inquiry. Phenomenological inquiry into social phenomena moves behind surface realities (i.e., presence) to the inner quality of form (i.e., essence) which is the being of the phenomenon.

Douglas (1970) states that social phenomena must be, at some level and in some way, studied as subjectively meaningful social phenomena. It is at this point that phenomenology rejects the validity of so-called objective methodology as a mode of inquiry; however, this does not imply that phenomenology would reject man's attempts to search for objective knowledge and for a valid conception of objectivity. The point of contention is the phenomenologists' claim (Schutz, 1962; Husserl, 1962) that man's thought is purposeful in nature. Because of this intentional nature of consciousness, all thought, scientific thought included, must be seen as grounded on human purpose. It is this intentional thought that provides us with knowledge about ourselves and our world. All knowledge, in this respect, is purposeful knowledge.

For the phenomenologist, human thought is essentially symbolic in nature and its existence depends on a high degree of human cooperation; i.e., human knowledge is shared knowledge. It views the life-world as being intersubjectively experienced, and one of its tasks is to interpret and understand the experience of intersubjectivity.

His fundamental criterion of objectivity is that of making knowledge more useful through its shareability or public nature. This is true for both common sense and scientific knowledge; however, scientific thought proposes to become more useful and to have greater claims to truth than common sense knowledge by becoming more objective (shareable). Knowledge is thus objectified by progressively freeing knowledge of concrete phenomena from the situation in which they are known; by abstracting and generalizing concepts, and by formulating rules that govern them. This "casting of knowledge as an absolute act" independent of its original context, is the major phenomenological criticism of traditional empiricism in its quest for absolute objectivity. Many social scientists have, as a result, considered human evidence divorced from their human source, failing to realize that by so doing they immediately imposed a constraint that prevented them from seeing the realities of the human phenomenon they wanted to study.

In addition to this separation of form from meaning, traditional social scientists are criticized on the grounds that they expect to quantify human phenomena that by virtue of their very essence are qualitative and nonquantifiable. This process segments the whole into meaningless concepts and processes that falsify the properties of the phenomena for the sake of suiting a scientific purpose. Furthermore,

even when such distortions and segmentations are justified, it is imperative to state explicitly what has been done and why in order to avoid self-deceptions if and when these known distortions are forgotten or ignored.

Understanding of everyday life is the only source of empirical evidence for meaningful social inquiry. Phenomenology takes these social meanings as the key for understanding. Phenomenology is a reaction against the natural stance which takes for granted the everyday world as unquestionable reality. It brackets the realm of common sense everyday experience by standing back from and consciously reflecting upon the taken-for-granted. It suspends the assumptions of everydayness and in so doing, it makes the implicit explicit and the unquestionable problematic.

Since man is rooted in the social world as a participant, he cannot be studied as a physical object devoid of consciousness and self-awareness. The knowing subject cannot be arbitrarily divided from the object of study. Since consciousness is intentional (i.e., it is always consciousness of something), the only meaningful inquiry into human phenomena must focus on the subject-experience rather than concentrating solely on subject or object. These assumptions are, as I said earlier, diametrically opposed to the positivist stance that viewed man as being causally determined by impersonal forces outside the self.

I think that phenomenology is constantly pointing to the fact that under the guises of detachment and objectivity, traditional empiricism has been "scientifying" everyday phenomena.

The phenomenological approach, unlike traditional empiricism, does not restrict the researcher to a narrowly defined methodological procedure or theoretical perspective. Psathas (1973) states that "phenomenology is philosophy, method, and approach; it is difficult to explicate since it is still developing and refusing to stand still" (p. iv).

Approach

The concept of approach takes into account the role of the researcher himself in the enterprise of inquiring. Approach can be defined as the basic viewpoint toward man and the world that the researcher incorporates in his inquiry either implicitly or explicitly (Giorgi, 1970). The task of making one's premises explicit is inexhaustible and no researcher could ever make explicit all of the characteristics of his approach; however, a requirement of all sound research is to explicate all that the researcher can about the fundamental assumptions and value premise underlying the research endeavor. The nature of any inquiry conveys a note of indefiniteness and incompleteness in its very core, but by clarifying his basic assumptions, the researcher transcends the specificity and momentariness

of the knowledge he has identified and the boundaries he has created.

It is in the consideration of approach that the human element is brought to bear in the inquiry. To state one's approach is to reveal one's stance vis-à-vis his inquiry. Stating one's approach is a risk inasmuch as it makes the researcher vulnerable for being subjectively involved as opposed to being objectively detached. The approach is a statement that the researcher is going to report "the truth" as he sees it or understands it; it is a fundamental assumption that no inquiry can and should be considered independent of the human perceptions and choices from which it originates.

Giorgi (1970) makes the case for the inclusion of approach in all research endeavors and indicates that this issue has been left virtually untouched in traditional works. Discussion of method and content, he says, is the backbone of conventional research; however, it is in the realm of approach that the human implications of research must be considered. Any assumptions or presuppositions about the nature of man could never be settled in the realms of method and content where stereotyped answers minimize or overlook the role of the inquirer in the inquiry. Consideration of the role of the researcher opens up new possibilities as well-entrenched perspectives are challenged.

Method

If approach refers to the basic value premise that defines the perspective and provides the underlying spiritual guidance for the research activity, then the method refers to the rules that define the techniques used in the research. If the approach is the "Why?," then the method is the "How?" and the content is the "What?."

It is difficult to consider method devoid of either approach or content. Both approach and content determine, to some degree, the method of any inquiry; approach, I think, more implicitly and content more explicitly.

In the traditional paradigm of research, the method acquires major significance and often becomes an end unto itself. The approach is implicitly imbedded in a narrowly defined methodological precision that relies on operational definitions, measurable realities, and careful statistical controls. The method, in this light, becomes the chief criterion for the adequacy of the research; i.e., it seems that "the method is the message." An advantage of this attitude for researchers is the fact that the method can (and must) be clearly spelled out in relation to the content of the inquiry. Error rather than confusion is the negative consequence when the precision and carefully controlled conditions of the cause-effect model are violated. This follows the tenet of traditional empiricism and positivism.

which believes that truth arises more readily from error than from confusion (Bacon, 1928).

The method, thus, becomes the vehicle for the empirical verification of all theoretical foundations and, as such, reflects the ideas of the researchers as to what it is that they are trying to do (Madge, 1953). The method is the means through which knowledge is derived and validated. The experiment is the classical, though not the only method, of the scientific tradition. In some form or another and regardless of technical sophistication, the experiment consists of a comparison between two sets of circumstances which ideally match each other in all respects but the one(s) manipulated by the researcher. This methodological model assumes a direct cause-effect relationship among variables, and tests its validity by the measurable effects of one variable upon another. In this manner rules are established and theories are formulated; there is little reason for confusion as to what the method is and as to what the results of the method are. The same clarity and simplicity, however, cannot always be attributed to the methods reflecting the inner perspective of inquiry.

In pointing out the merits of the inner perspective many of its advocates (e.g., Brody and Oppenheim, 1967) have pointed to a general confusion existing between matters of approach, content, and method. The reflective role of the self in any method of inquiry, they state, often assumes an

external viewpoint towards oneself. Thus, for example, introspection has consistently been characterized as a method of internal observation, but, in fact, it assumes an outer perspective of internal contents. This is an important distinction for establishing the method in the interpretive framework. Giorgi (1970) makes this distinction:

It can be called a "method of inner observation" only if one first believes in "inner contents"; but it really means stating the facts about oneself as any other person would do if he could be observing what the introspector happens to be observing. This means that the introspector must ignore his personal viewpoint and his unique proximity to his own experiencing. This is why it can be classified as an external attitude or viewpoint toward oneself. (pp. 181-182)

Inherent in the methodology of the inner perspective is the ambiguous nature of behavior. Merleau-Ponty (1964) challenges the notions of complete clarity that are often taken for granted in methodological assumptions as he indicates that the whole problem of method is far from settled. He considers too simplistic the assumption that a self-reflective stance is sufficient to establish an appropriate method that conforms to the demands of the interpretive framework. Furthermore, the whole issue is clouded by the hazy distinctions between inner and outer perspectives, and by the fact that the inner or outer stance could be taken in respect to self or to other (the object of study). It is not my intention here to belabor the fine points of methodologies "à-la-inner or à-la-outer," but I do want to make clear the notion that in the interpretive

mode of inquiry the concepts of approach, method, and content are unavoidably interwoven and defy definitive description and clear-cut categorization.

Interpretive methodology aims for "knowing" as opposed to "knowing about" which is more akin to the outer perspective. Lofland (1971) draws a distinction between "knowing about" which is knowing through mediated means by creating a portrait of people through generalizations and categorization, and "knowing" which involves direct, face-to-face interaction with individuals over a significant length of time. "Knowing about" serves the purpose of distancing the observer from what is being observed, while "knowing" is aimed at involving the observer with the observed in the fullest possible conditions of participation. The methods of participant-observation, criticism, and participatory hermeneutics all attempt to replace "knowing about" man with "knowing" man. These techniques of interpretive methodology are all grounded on the phenomenological assumptions of Husserl (1962), Schutz (1962), and Spiegelberg (1965), and on the work of the sociology of knowledge of Berger and Luckman (1966), and Polanyi (1966). These assumptions reflect the concern that human/social phenomena must ultimately be studied as subjectively meaningful events. Phenomenology dwells on the intentional nature of consciousness and it is this sense of purpose which provides us with our knowledge about ourselves and the world.

The methodological implications of phenomenology require that the researcher of human phenomena who aims to understand individuals, enter into the individual's perceptual field in order to live, feel, and see life as closely as possible to the way the individual lives, feels, and sees it. Unlike the more abstract notions of phenomenology and ethnomethodology (such as the general concept of essence and the reflective nature of symbolic meanings in human consciousness), the interpretive methodologies of participant-observation, criticism, and participatory hermeneutics are more concerned with how symbols are constituted in particular cultures. The researcher inquires into this realm by taking the role of those who experience these symbols. He becomes personally involved, but in drawing conclusions he must constantly balance his involvement with objective detachment in order to provide an accurate accounting of the phenomena. This degree of personal involvement coupled with the necessity of distancing oneself from the experience is not necessarily a part of phenomenological procedure. Unlike the mother discipline of phenomenology, these methods of interpretive inquiry make more of an effort to provide what I can only describe as "an outer view of the inner view"; i.e., alternating between the viewpoint of the involved participant and the distanced critic. Unlike the traditional methods of empiricism, however, these methods explicitly acknowledge

the need for both perspectives and indicate the shifts in vantage point which traditional empiricism either ignores or takes for granted (Lofland, 1971).

Becker (1970) illuminates the methodological issue permeating research today. He opens his chapter on methodology with the statement that "methodology is too important to be left to methodologists" (p. 3). His contention here is that methodologists generally do not deal with the full range of questions they ought to. Instead, he says, they become overly prescriptive in trying to influence other social scientists to adopt certain kinds of methods. In so doing, they exclude practitioners of other methods from receiving needed methodological advice. The proselytizing character of traditional methodology fails to make an adequate analysis of alternative modes of methodological discourse. The current mainstream of methodology concern clearly favors carefully-controlled quantitative methods of inquiry. This "science-as-machine-activity" has proven very useful with all controllable variables, but not so successful with the more elusive biases not amenable to reliable measurement and definition. What then? One solution is to transform all methodological problems into quantifiable terms that can be dealt with through machine-like procedures. Or, another option is to ignore (or consider trivial and unscientific) all the problems not readily amenable to this quantifiable transformation on the grounds

that the focus should be on those problems that are most worthwhile (because they can be quantified). This latter position has been the major stance taken by traditional research in the social sciences. His position is that research cannot afford to ignore the problems that cannot be accounted for in conventionally rigorous ways. The problem is not solved by omission; instead, there must be an effort made to confront these problems of method and technique with a combination of logically rigorous analysis and interpretive sociological skills in order to create a viable comprehensive avenue of inquiry into social phenomena (Becker, 1970, p. 24). Cicourel (1964) indicates that social science research is faced with a unique methodological problem; the very conditions of their research constitute an important complex variable for what passes as the content of their investigations. "Field research, including participant observation and interviewing, is a method in which the activities of the investigator play a crucial role in the data obtained" (Cicourel, 1964, p. 39). He emphasizes the need for the researcher to explicate his methodological premise.

Rather than entering the research scenario with a prespecified theoretical scheme and design, the field researcher frequently develops his theory during the study or after the data have been gathered and while interpreting and summarizing the findings. Cicourel (1964) indicates that the field researcher makes legitimate use of

his own common-sense assumptions to interpret his observations. If he, however, states that he is following scientific procedures when there is no established theory with which to do this research, then he is not making clear the bases of his observations and the premises of his interpretations. Without making this distinction and clearly stating the premises of the inquiry, the reader cannot distinguish between accepted scientific procedure and personal interpretive findings of the study. The basic everyday reality must be the concern of social research. This largely substantive area must be explored through appropriate means and these often are not traditional scientific procedure. This study is valid in and of itself and need not be camouflaged under the guises of traditional methodology in order to be useful, rigorous, and significant. Its illuminating capability, however, lies in its straightforwardness and in its not being contaminated by other methodological assumptions.

Content

The content of the inquiry refers to the subject matter, the phenomena of interest to the researcher. The events studied by the researcher represent a segment of reality inasmuch as the researcher has identified it as being such and has delineated the boundaries that define it. From the vantage point of traditional empiricism, content is viewed as a portion of a reality that is

measurable and which can be objectivated and made operational. In this perspective, the researcher operates from the tacit premise that such reality exists independently of him and would be there even if he were not. In line with the assumptions of the outer perspective, traditional content is also seen as being external to the observer's experience. Traditional empiricism tends to reduce and segment content to levels that can be carefully controlled and categorized in the research endeavor. This, in fact, reduces reality to manageable units. The methodology and approach of traditional empiricism are amenable to dealing with this kind of content so that the nature of content influences the nature of the method and vice versa.

Of concern to many researchers is the problem of drawing the boundaries that define the content area. The more traditionally oriented researchers can deal with this problem better because they rely on criteria of precision, predictability, and operational grounding to determine the adequacy of the content. This possibly attests to the fact that so many statistically significant relationships have been found among so many inconsequential variables. This is not to say that trivial inquiries must necessarily reflect traditional empiricism, nor am I suggesting that the more significant inquiries are interpretive inquiries. I am saying, however, that under the sophisticated guises of

sound methodology, the inherent soundness of the content area is often overlooked.

The content of interpretive inquiry also needs to be delineated, and no matter how unstructured the researcher proposes to be, he must ultimately make some concession to order and structure even if the boundaries remain private. The major differences between the process of defining content for the traditional as opposed to the interpretive framework lie in the emphasis and nature of the boundaries as opposed to the presence or absence of them. The interpretive researcher is more likely to define boundaries around a reality that is more natural and akin to the actual real-life situation. In this respect, he is less likely to segment it since he is not guided by criteria of predictability and precision of measurement. His criteria for boundaries reflect a concern with integrative understanding as opposed to the traditional concern of analytical proof; therefore, the boundaries for the former tend to be more flexible, porous, and open to modification. Another aspect of the content which differs according to the mode of inquiry is the role played by the general background. This is somewhat like the gestalt notion of figure-ground inasmuch as the focus of concern (content) must always be found against a general context that provides its background. As the focus of content is changed, then other parts which were formerly the focus now acquire the

backdrop effect. I think that the interpretive researcher is more likely to be aware of this notion of content background and of its implications to his inquiry. I believe he is more sensitized to viewing the phenomenal events being studied as occurring in a larger context of life from which they can never be extricated. Traditional inquiries, on the other hand and possibly because of the nature of their methods, are more inclined to view the events of content in isolation from the surrounding milieu.

It is important in a discussion of content to acknowledge that from the inner perspective of research, it is impossible to reduce the actual or the real to definitive form and physical presence. The content, thus, must be viewed in the light of ideal-functional constructs that embody entities, attributes, and relationships that are experiential and not physical in nature. This is a fundamental difference in the conceptualization of content between the two perspectives. Furthermore, the question of content in the interpretive mode requires a different concept of nature than that endorsed by the naturalistic viewpoint. The human content of consciousness, experience, or behavior requires that intentionality be always present, therefore, trying to understand these phenomena within a cause-effect paradigm or in terms of external relations is not adequate. The inner perspective delineates a

content in which man is not simply part of the world, but one for whom the world exists; a level of content of a properly human level where man is at his most integrated functioning (Merleau-Ponty, 1963).

At this point in my discussion of methodological considerations, I have attempted to provide contrasting views between the qualitative and the quantitative modes of inquiry. This view has been panoramic in scope; nonetheless, through it I hope to have provided a general rationale for the interpretive mode of inquiry as a needed paradigm in the study of human phenomena. I focused on the phenomenological assumptions of this mode of inquiry and their implications for the researcher as he considers questions of approach, method, and content area. The qualitative-interpretive modality thus becomes a "form of life" within which these specific questions can be adequately understood.

Since the major concern of my work is the educational realm--i.e., the teacher in the school--I would like at this point to shift my focus to issues that are particularly germane to educational inquiry. This necessitates that I again consider some of the inquiries and findings about teachers cited in Chapter One; this time, however, from the methodological perspective. Furthermore, I hope to develop a case for qualitative-interpretive inquiry in education and, in this way, provide a rationale for my own inquiry.

Educational Inquiry in the Interpretive Mode

Eisner (1977) states that the study of education in this country has evolved not from the humanities but from the social sciences, and since the models of the social sciences have, by and large, been those of the natural/physical sciences, it follows that educational research has been synonymous with traditional scientific methodology. The humanistic-artistic-interpretive modes of inquiry have not been in the mainstream of educational thought. This dependence of education on the assumptions of traditional empiricism have been responsible for the mechanistic-industrial models of education which have made it a technology of the behavioral sciences much like engineering is a technology of the physical sciences. In this view education is considered to be more like a science than an art. It uses the constructs, techniques, and even the language system of other disciplines (e.g., I.Q., programming, input, objectives, finished product, efficiency, etc.). Lacking an effective language of its own, education often falls back on cliches and slogans to describe its work and the semantic grounding of this language tends to color what we see with what the language indicates "should be going on."

As alternatives to traditional inquiries, a number of educational researchers have considered educational questions and issues from a framework that allows for more

interpretation and less analysis, and that seeks more understanding than proof. Eisner (1977) as well as Jackson(1968, 1977), Lortie (1975), and Becker (1970), among others, relies on more interpretive techniques such as historical surveys, case studies, intensive interviews, educational criticism, and participant observation.

Criticism, as a generic method, has been primarily limited to the area of aesthetics and the arts. Eisner believes that this method is especially well suited to articulating the human element involved in the educational experience. Educational criticism, like all interpretive techniques, relies heavily on "thick description" to get at the meaning and significance of human events. Unlike simple behavioral description, it requires an understanding of the context (symbols, rules, traditions, acts, etc.) in which the object of study is embedded. Lofland (1971) refers to this as analyzing the social setting.

Educational criticism is more akin to an art than a science inasmuch as it creates a vivid, emotionally evocative description of educational life through which the reader can feel the quality of life being described. It is a type of what Eisner calls "connoisseurship" with a strong tradition in the humanities and derives from the basic premise that the process of education (teaching, learning, instruction, and evaluation) cannot be adequately conceptualized as scientific technology. Its portrayal,

thus, breaks away from representation through ratios, coefficients, and levels of significance. It is in this light that Eisner distinguishes between the primary and the secondary surfaces of educational inquiry. In the former, the emphasis is on the intended effects of instruction and outcomes deal with levels of achievement defined by prespecified objectives; the latter focuses on the many unintended effects evident in the phenomena of the educational milieu.

The role of the educational critic is to search in this secondary surface where, Jackson (1968) said, the researcher must consider the significance of the seemingly insignificant events that come and go in a flash and for seemingly no reason at all. The backbone of Life in Classrooms rests on this simple statement. Jackson's findings on the teacher and the world of the classroom are framed through the lens of a participant-observer-critic. Through lengthy participant-observer experiences that involved extensive observation, intensive dialogs, and careful reflection (as well as more traditional surveys and supplementary questionnaire data), Jackson was able to approximate an "inner view" of the classroom world, and consequently provide a sense-of-person of the teacher that would have eluded an exclusively quantifiable approach. His study requires an appreciation of the organic nature of classroom life and of the complexity of the teacher's

influence and responsibilities (Marsh, 1973). Lortie's (1975) Schoolteacher also relies on some open-ended, more interpretive designs to construct their integrative profile of the teacher. Teacher-respondents from The Five Towns Study (Boston metropolitan area) provided feedback through intensive open-ended interviews that transcended the clear-cut, forced-choice answer format of traditional formal interviews. Schoolteacher is not and cannot be considered an interpretive research study; however, in its integrative efforts to define the occupational ethos of the teacher, Lortie also allows for the role of the critic and distanced (unlike Jackson's participant) observer and as such opens the door for interpretive description of the teacher in a general if not in an individual sense.

This openness to interpretive accounts as a valuable source of data is characteristic (in different degrees, from different levels) of the works of Lortie (1975) and Jackson (1968); however, this does not seem to be the general rule with inquiries made into the world of the teacher. In Chapter One, the review seems to indicate a preponderance for research that is more amenable to reliable measurement and more precise definition (e.g., research on teacher effectiveness) and for organization-theory research (e.g., the school as a social system).

Becker et al. (1961) react to this methodological narrowmindedness that they see reflected in the types of

inquiry I have mentioned. They stress that the study of the school-world must be done through matters that are important to the individual participants. The inquiry must transcend behavioral analysis and the assumptions of simple cause-effect. Instead, to find out about the teacher, it is necessary to look at the individual's attitudes and perspectives and on the experiences that might have fostered them. In their study of medical students they aim to capture the essence of what it is like for the participants: the experience of becoming a doctor. In his participant-observer stance, the researcher participates in the daily life of the people under study--observing things that happen, listening to what is said, and questioning people over some length of time. "Such a method affords the greatest opportunity to discover what things were of importance to the people being studied and why, and to follow the multiple interconnections of phenomenal events" (Becker et al., 1961, pp. 22-23). What insights does the stance of the participant-observer-critic provide in the study of teachers? What knowledge do we gain from this type of experiential but disciplined form of inquiry? How does this perspective capture the sense-of-person that has been partially revealed, camouflaged, minimized, distorted, or completely ignored in some of the specific works and general types of studies mentioned throughout the last two chapters? Responses to these questions should further

illuminate the role of qualitative-interpretive methodology in the study of teaching.

The Participant-Observer-Critic Vantage Point

The methodological features of participant-observation have derived largely from the phenomenological model described by Spiegelberg (1965) which focuses on the investigation of particular phenomena and general essences as they constitute themselves in consciousness.

What does the participant-observer-critic strive for in his inquiry? First, he must establish and maintain close physical proximity in a face-to-face interaction to the subjects for a significant period of time and in a variety of circumstances. Second, he must have some degree of intimacy with them. Third, he must be aware of the minutiae of everyday life which he experiences. Fourth, he must provide a significant amount of descriptive information, must rely on direct quotations and first-hand observations, and must be truthful in his reporting. Finally, he must always attempt to represent the world studied in terms that are meaningful and that maintain the integrity of the subjects.

The basic rationale of the participant-observer-critic is the belief that the best way to approximate knowing is to put oneself in the other person's shoes; i.e., to take the role of the other and try to see as he sees (Jacobs, 1970). There can only be degrees of approximation for one can never

completely divest himself of his own consciousness and acquire the consciousness of another (witness Carlos Castaneda's (1968) apprenticeship to don Juan). The inherent paradox of this tenet is that no two people can ever share identical perceptual worlds because, through perceiving, each person excludes himself from the object world perceived. Bakan (1967) referred to this as the "mystery-mastery dualism." The participant-observer-critic thus can attempt to enter another person's vantage point, but must always bring his own into it. His awareness of this dilemma is paramount to meaningful, disciplined inquiry from this vantage point. As he inquires he shifts between two different stances. In one, he becomes personally involved by taking the role of the individual in the particular culture studied so that he can experience his symbols. In this involved stance, he draws conclusions from his inquiry. However, to complete the inquiry he must shift stance so as to become a distanced critic and balance his participant involvement with objective detachment. Through this leap of vantage points, he can provide an accurate accounting of the phenomena experienced. Both stances acknowledge that knowledge is ultimately subjective; neither claims the independent validity of external, objective knowledge independent of the researcher's experience as does the traditional empiricist. The difference between both stances is one of degree rather than

one of kind. Knowledge is subjective in both; however, the framework of the participant is more intimately personal while the framework of the distanced critic allows for a more careful rational reflection that is not possible in the immediacy of the involved vantage point. The vision of the critic is clearer; that of the participant is more vivid. Both are real and the combination should provide a check against too much farsightedness or nearsightedness.

Jackson (1977) underscores the need for participant-observers as well as observant-participants (teachers, students, administrators) who can step back from their own experiences and analyze and describe them critically and articulately from the vantage point of the informed critic. In this role they would serve as internal critics to the teaching process and their descriptive language could provide the dialog for bridging the worlds of the insider and outsider in educational inquiry.

The world of the teacher represents a concrete reality and this approach to an inquiry attempts to understand the characteristic uniqueness of that reality through certain meaning-constructs that define the way the individual teacher perceives his world. The significance of these concepts is that they are personal and presuppose a certain value orientation from which his perceptions are interpreted. The world of the teacher is made comprehensible

to the participant-observer-critic by virtue of the fact that in the process of dialog between the subject and the critic no preconceptions of reality are superimposed from outside to specify, label, or categorize the individual's experience. Whatever reality is constructed in the dialog, it is one of significance to the teacher. Meaning is constructed from within as the inquirer attempts to share a common dialogical ground with the subject on the subject's own terms. The critic does not, in this conception, enter an alien reality as Castaneda (1971) did with don Juan, because the critic in this case already shares much of that reality. In this type of inquiry the task of the researcher is not so much entering a separate reality as it is explicating and expanding the common ground already shared by making explicit knowledge that had previously remained unspoken. This process allows two things to happen: taken-for-granted givens become problematic and thus noticeable, and tacitly-shared knowledge is articulated and thus sensitized to a higher level of consciousness. The former phenomenon enables the inquirer and the subject to get new and different glimpses of "old scenery" while the latter phenomenon provides new, previously unseen sights to be viewed, interpreted, and integrated into the meaning-world.

The inquirer-critic does not necessarily attempt to encompass a broad spectrum of the subject's reality.

Often, in fact, only a relatively small portion of that reality becomes meaningful enough to be shared by the critic and subject in the inquiry. The chief aim of this inquiry is intensiveness as opposed to extensiveness although no specific attempt is made a priori to delineate hard and fast the boundaries of the inquiry. It must be able to resonate on many levels of meaning (Jacobs, 1970). This looseness or flexibility embodies a "messy" reality when compared with the more logical, orderly process that describes reality in terms of laws and principles of direct causality.

The purpose of this mode of inquiry is to arrive at the essence of the individual reality, and not to provide comprehensive explanatory principles that would dilute content for the sake of generalizability. The approach embodied in this inquiry of the teacher does not accept any claims that equate any single view of the reality of the school as being the "right" view held by teachers, does not consider the validity of the world of the teacher external to the individual's perceptions of that world, acknowledges the purposeful intent of the teacher as an individual being giving meaning to his reality, and considers the teacher's perception of his world only a finite portion of that individual's total meaning-world. In this light the participant-observer-critic stance becomes an empirical position; however, one that values

direct experience as opposed to mediated knowing through the constructs of traditional empiricism.

Lefland (1971) indicates that the seemingly anti-theoretical stance embodied in this mode of inquiry seems to be a reaction against the excessive dependency we seem to have on externally imposed constructs that define our reality and against the uncritical attitude with which we allow these to dictate our lives with unquestioning acceptance. The objection, however, is not against theory, but against the face value of any theory which claims a monopoly on truth. Weber (1949) was instrumental in pointing out that truth is a cultural product and not inherent in man's original nature. Our truth, he says, is based on those ultimate values upon which is rooted the core of our being, and generates from the many constructs we create to give meaning to our world.

The participant-observer-critic of the teacher is particularly sensitive to meaning construction as he hopes to illuminate an elusive, uncertain, and arbitrarily finite segment of a dynamic phenomenal world; i.e., the world of the teacher. In the following chapter I will share the worlds of four individual teachers. I will explore these worlds both as an involved participant and as a more distanced critic.

CHAPTER III
SPECIFIC INQUIRY

Introduction

I am inquiring into the worlds of four individual teachers in order to obtain a phenomenological perspective of their "teacherness." This necessitates that I focus on their individual experiences, self-perceptions, attitudes, values, beliefs, and behaviors primarily within the boundaries of their "teacher-world," but in the general context of their total perceptual world. The substance of the inquiry is a portion of their lives, a segment of their worlds, a revelation of their unique selves. It is truly a human subject matter that comprises the content of my inquiry.

Any inquiry attempt presupposes problems in the conceptualization and definition of relevant parameters. This is certainly true of an interpretive inquiry such as this one. I am aware of the degree of arbitrariness that is inherent in any attempt to bracket a portion of the phenomenological world of experience. I am also aware that the finiteness provided with boundaries is only one of many possible ways "to slice the pie." I cannot and I do not assume any special validity of the teacher-world as I define it other than the fact that it seems a reasonable

and convenient way to share in the experiential world of individual teachers and to provide a common ground for meaningful dialog.

Given the fact that I must ultimately draw some boundaries of some sort--my interpretive openness notwithstanding--I find it more useful to acknowledge their limitations than to deny their existence. In this mode of inquiry, perhaps more than in traditional empirical research, it is difficult, if not impossible to separate content from method and approach. Before I proceed with further explication of my inquiry, I want to summarize three key assumptions that reflect the articulation between the What?, How?, and Why? I find that they embody the essence of my inquiry and that they provide a general sense of direction about my priorities and a set of principles to which I, as an interpretive researcher, should adhere.

1. Within the confines of approach, method, and content, the inquiry must, above all, stress fidelity to the phenomenon of man as a person. Person refers to all the specifically human characteristics attributed to man in his life-world. The aim here is to counter any reductionistic or simplistic tendencies that may be prevalent in the process of interpretation.

2. There should always be a special concern for phenomena that are uniquely human. This emphasis opens up a vast array of possibilities inasmuch as the inner perspective views the intentionality and relational character

of man as the basis for dealing with such notions as freedom, justice, responsibility, etc. This notion is based on the idea of the irreducible nature of the human order stressed by Merleau-Ponty (1964).

3. The third assumption is that in this kind of research endeavor where humanity is the content, relationships--as opposed to independent units or entities--should be of prime concern. This is one of the chief premises of phenomenology as it assumes a dialectic stance between man and his world. In practice the implication is that the inquiry can not overlook the context of the world-at-large, and the fact that whatever phenomenon is considered, must be understood as already involving both man and his world.

Dialog and Personal Meaning

Basic to my inquiry is the assumption that the teacher must engage in a continuing dialog in order to maintain his viability and integrity as an individual. This dialog encompasses a number of encounters as the individual takes a dialogical stance vis-à-vis other individuals, institutional bodies, and his own self (inner dialog of an introspective-reflective nature). In dialog, the individual is capable of sharing in the perceptual world of another, of questioning the taken-for-granted, and of becoming open to new possibilities. He constructs meaning by expanding and sharpening his awareness of his being in the world.

Dialog is a way of explicating that which is normally tacit or taken for granted, a way of providing new perspectives into an otherwise familiar reality.

Much of my own model of dialog was influenced by the notions of Martin Buber (1955) in his essays of "Dialogue," "Education," and "Education of Character." For Buber, the teacher is the essence of education inasmuch as the effective world is concentrated and manifested in him and through him it becomes the true subject of study. The process of education, he says is a process of encounter and the teacher must meet the student in a relationship of "giving and withholding oneself, of intimacy and distance, which of course must not be controlled by reflection but must arise from the living act of the natural and spiritual man" (Buber, 1955, p. 95). Buber points out that this relationship must not degenerate into the wish for domination, manipulation, or enjoyment of the other individual or else falsification comes into play and the authenticity of the relationship is destroyed. For Buber the value of this dialogical relationship seems to be marked by spontaneity and a desire for communion rather than by deliberate conscious intent. Inherent in the task of the teacher Buber indicates is the unavoidable paradox of showing intentionality of purpose while remaining authentic in the relationship. Translated into practice is the implication that the teacher's will to educate may become arbitrary as the

teacher educates from his own vantage point and perceptions of the student, and not from the student's own reality.

Buber states that the relationship between teacher and student is one of dialog. Genuine dialog is described as the experience "where each of the participants really has in mind the other or others in their present and particular being and turns to them with the intention of establishing a living mutual relation between himself and them" (Buber, 1955, p. 19). He distinguishes this realm of dialog from technical dialog which is prompted only by the need for objective understanding, and from monologue disguised as dialog in which two men encounter each other but fail to communicate, each being an echo chamber for his own responses. The basic movement of dialog is the turning toward the other in the context of community. The basic movement of monologue is not turning away, but rather turning inward toward reflection. The life of dialog is not a spiritual luxury; it is a necessity, a matter of creation. Unlike the activity of dialectic, it is not the privilege of intellectual power. It begins where humanity begins and it is simply a matter of giving or withholding oneself.

The implications of the life of dialog for the teacher require a trust in the world, a trust that because another human being exists meaninglessness could never be the real truth. Even so, however, dialog between teacher and student is often a one-sided rather than a mutual experience of

inclusion because the teacher must include the student, but the student need only to acknowledge the teacher. For the teacher the grace of influencing the lives of his students with his own life becomes a matter of function and law in the school setting. The teacher, in this relationship, experiences the education of the student, but the opposite is not necessarily the case. If and when the latter occurs, then, Buber says, there is a shift as the student takes a dialogical leap of inclusion. This new relationship is one of friendship and is characterized by mutual inclusion. I do not think that Buber views this as central to or necessary for the teacher's role; rather, I think he would consider this an unusual happening in the student-teacher relationship.

Buber states that the task of any teacher is the education of character and what the educator needs is not the touch of genius, but the willingness and ability to communicate himself to his students. Only in his whole spontaneous being can he affect the being of his students. In this light the paradox of minimum effort seems to operate inasmuch as the teacher is most strongly and purely a viable force of influence when he has no intention of affecting his pupils. Buber stresses the notion of spontaneity as being central to the giving of oneself in the educational dialog.

Buber defines the educational process as the cultivation and shaping of the originator instinct; i.e., of the creative powers present within each individual. Its concern

must ultimately be the person as a whole. In this light, Buber discusses certain functions that the teacher must fulfill. Above all, the teacher must be a force in the development of character as he is aware both of what the person is and of the possibilities of what he can become. He must win the confidence of his students by participating in their lives and he must accept the responsibility that arises from such involvement. He cannot forget his limits and always expect agreement; in fact, the presence of conflict in a healthy atmosphere is beneficial to the students and becomes a true test of the teacher. He must maintain his integrity in the quest for truth rather than resorting to dialectical maneuvers with which to merely prove a point. It is the educational meeting and not the intention or outcome which is educationally fruitful. In this capacity, the teacher must become a force for emancipation as he challenges the student to search for new insights. The teacher is also a bearer of traditions and, in this capacity, must be careful not to become an individual imbued with a sense of power as the authority of tradition is overlooked in the educational encounter.

In Buber's view, one of the tasks of the teacher is to bring into consciousness the feeling that something is lacking; to awaken in his students the desire, the strength, and the willingness to take on the responsibility of life. The teacher too must assume this responsibility for without

it the spirit becomes sterile and education cannot take place. Assuming responsibility entails keeping the pain of existence awake as the individual attempts to maintain his personal self from being swallowed into impersonal collectives.

In the light of the individual-institution dialog, Buber distinguishes between inner obedience and outer obedience. The former is exemplified by the personal relation between self and absolute. The latter is seen in the individual who claims no absolute universal values, but rather who adheres to a pragmatic set of maxims embodied by a collective. In today's technological world, Buber believes, the collectives reign supreme. Each collective is the supreme authority for its adherents and there is no higher idea of universal faith or truth that they recognize as valid. Most modern institutions would fall into this category of collectives inasmuch as their utmost concern is survival. The ever present danger is that in order to attain the institutional values they desire, institutions tend to demand the kind of collectivist loyalty that destroys individual self-hood. The desire for collectivist acceptance distorts the individual's relation to himself and suppresses the desire for individual expression. The teacher who views himself as an explorer and as a creator and who sees himself as cultivating the individual minds before him, must remain aware of the adversary relationship between his personal self and the institutional forces. The mark of the outstanding teacher

would be his ability to react not out of compliance for external constraints, but in accordance with the uniqueness of every situation which confronts him.

Buber believes that the task of the teacher today is made more difficult by the fact that individuals today are socialized into the collectives in their everyday events and because of this absorption they seem to lose a sense of their personal responsibility to themselves and to their fellow man. The confusing contradictions of living in the world cannot be remedied by the collectives, but by the feeling of genuine sharing and unity which only the individual self can bring about. The task of the teacher then is the task of educating for community in the midst of efforts to collectivize in education. It is not a matter then of choosing between collectivism and individualism since both leave the individual without any sense of responsible participation in the world. It is an effort toward community which Buber describes as follows:

It is the longing for personal unity, from which must be born a unity of mankind, which the educator should lay hold of and strengthen in his pupils. Faith in this unity and the will to achieve it is not a "return" to individualism, but a step beyond all the dividedness of individualism and collectivism. A great and full relation between man and man can only exist between unified and responsible persons. (Buber, 1955, p. 28)

He distinguishes further between the implications of community and collective for the teacher. Community is a binding while collectivity is a bundling; community is being with one another in the multitude while collectivity

is simply standing side by side. The common feeling emanates from within community, but it is imposed from outside in the collectivity. Community necessitates self while the collectivity is devoid of it. Community involves the risk of staking one's self out. The collectivity is a flight from community, a flight from the essential dialog of life that is at the heart of the world. Both aspects are mutually exclusive. The school by virtue of its institutional framework is a collective, but the teacher must be the force for community within the collective. His dilemma is to fight the very concept of which he is a part; therein lies his plight of awareness. How does he resolve this? What is his dialogical stance?

The teacher must engage in a dialog with the collective; part of his self is a collective self inasmuch as part of man is a sociologically conditioned being; however, in his efforts to engage in dialog he adds life to an otherwise passive and static existence. His dialog must encompass the whole domain of his reality from the trivial and mundane to the majestic and profound. He constructs meaning as he establishes the dialogical bond.

The process of dialog with the institution enables the teacher to transcend the collective masks of the persons and to comprehend them as individuals. In this stance he must also look at his own individuality in his world. Buber considers an inner dialog (within self) as reflection or

introspection, but not as viable dialog. I, however, feel that a vital part of the dialog between man and man in which the teacher must engage depends on the clarity of his own inner dialog.

In my inquiry the process of dialog becomes the means through which to bridge the inner view and the outer view of the individual teacher; a way of integrating the personal, professional, and institutional dimensions which so much of the research considers separate and exclusive realities. It is the tension inherent in the dialogical stance that propels the individual to construct personal meaning and to derive a sense of self amidst the sense of "otherness" around him.

Consciousness and Intentionality

There is, I think, an element of intentionality in this dialogical stance as the teacher becomes reflectively conscious and open to the world. Buber (1955) does not seem to allow for this element of intentionality as it would tend, he says, to undermine the spontaneity and hence the authenticity of the dialog.

Maxine Greene (1973) is more directly concerned with this intentionality of consciousness as the teacher must make choices, create values, and identify possibilities. In Greene's view, the teacher must choose his involvement with the world. In this light, he must be aware of his own philosophy of education; of his own stance vis-à-vis his

students, the institution, the curriculum, etc. inasmuch as this defines how he views himself and his world.

Greene (1973) is concerned with what she calls the existentialist educator and personal, conscious choice becomes of the essence in the teacher's world. Unlike Buber, she does not seem to sense any contradictions between intentionality and authenticity; in fact the former seems to be a necessary condition for the latter. For Greene the key distinction would be whether the personal choice is authentic and meaningful (i.e., conscious), or whether it is externally imposed and arbitrarily accepted and in this way a sign of what she calls false consciousness. In my own framework this notion of conscious intentionality is an important notion and I attempt to focus on it in my dialogs with individual teachers.

Much of the teachers' sense of personal meaning is derived from how they see themselves as teachers, how they define the role of the teacher and teaching, and from the beliefs they hold about the nature of education.

For some teachers education is a process of unfolding and the teacher's function is to enable the student to actualize himself in the process. These teachers tend to prize spontaneity and differences. They believe in a society of autonomous individuals, each of whom is committed to his own brand of excellence, but all committed to a common good.

For others, education is a process of selective rearing where certain notions are cultivated and others discouraged as defined by the cultural norms. The end product for this teacher is to have productive members of society. His role is to equip them with the necessary skills, knowledge, and beliefs with which to function properly.

A third view is that education is a process of initiation through which youngsters are made able to shape their experience-world by means of the cognitive disciplines and the arts. The function of the teacher here is to "re-educate perception", to liberate and sensitize the minds of the young to the possibilities of the world, to enable them to make responsible choices.

Greene (1971) states that whatever the view, education cannot take place in a vacuum; what teachers intend or achieve in their task is to some degree a function of the setting in which education takes place. Central to these views of education are the integrity of the individual, the perpetuation of the culture, and the social responsibility inherent in "being-in-the-world." In our culture we tend to study the phenomena of education from without. This may be appropriate for historians and behavioral scientists bent on describing the institutional patterns of society; however, the teacher must look at education from within from the perspective of personal involvement with

other individuals in a common enterprise. This inner vision is the only one which can describe the role of the teacher because it is the only one which takes intentionality into account. This is the view that the existential educator must take as he defines his possibilities.

The existentialist teacher cannot avoid the responsibility of his choices. He lives in the tension that originates from one who is truly concerned about stimulating action in his students while knowing full well that every person must be the author of his own situation. This tension involves a dialectical process as he attempts to reconcile his professional commitments as a teacher with his personal desires that his students choose themselves. In addition, he lives in another sphere of dialectical tension as a self-conscious, autonomous individual functioning in a public space where the institutional pressures demand a certain amount of conformity and compliance. Unlike an artist or a scholar, he cannot remove himself from his world and still remain a practitioner. He cannot avoid the students, the supervisors, the colleagues, and the social structures of the outside world. He cannot ever work alone, and must always mediate between his responsibility to those structures and to the students whom he hopes to liberate for reflection and choice.

The state of tension and disquietude which the existential teacher lives is essential to his growth. In the pain and

anxiety of dialog, he struggles to become. It is this strain that makes him conscious of his being and which drives him to create and give meaning to his reality. His freedom to be lies in the dilemma of formulating his identity in the world, in the possibilities he perceives, in his involvement, and in his taking responsibility.

Maxine Greene points to the necessity for breaking away from the traditional ways of viewing the teacher:

. . . as if he had no life of his own, no body, and no inwardness . . . (defined) . . . by the role he is expected to play in a classroom . . . (overlooking) the numerous realities in which he exists as a living person . . . his personal biography . . . the perspectives through which he looks on the world. (Greene, 1973, pp. 269-270)

Her concern in this book is to make the teacher visible to himself; to make him aware that he cannot escape constituting meaning. His task as a teacher will be enhanced "if he is able to think what he is doing while he is vitally present as a person" (Greene, 1973, p. 298).

Aliveness

Maxine Greene's notions of intentionality of consciousness sharpen my focus on those characteristics which I feel characterize teachers who are "alive"; i.e., those who maintain their viability, alertness, and individual integrity when they come against the system. The notion of coming against the system, as I see it, is not so much an expression of major conflicts between individual and institution but rather of the "minor bumps and impacts" which are

inevitable as the individual functions in his daily life. The notion of aliveness is in peril, I feel, when these bumps and impacts are no longer felt and the "dents" they leave become unnoticeable.

Teachers maintain this aliveness, I feel, through some major sense of purpose within their school world. This sense of purpose translates into some domain with which they identify and around which they develop an orientation or a general philosophical stance as teachers. Through these orientations they can give meaning to how they see themselves as teachers and to what they do. These orientations become "handles" through which they can function within the institutional framework and, at the same time, preserve their own individuality. Some teachers view themselves as subject-matter oriented and in that capacity they are scholars and/or adroit dispensers of valuable knowledge and skills. Others see themselves as counselors and guides to their students and their aliveness is maintained through meaningful personal relationships with students. Others still might consider their *raison d'être* the general concerns of the profession; in this light they see themselves as specialists and technicians of a craft. For others, the school and the traditional cultural values embodied in the sense of school-community may be what provides fuel to their fires. Whether the orientation is toward the disciplines, the students, the

profession, or the school, teachers who remain alive, I feel, find an area of intimate personal meaning which becomes their haven or inner sanctum and which colors their uniqueness against the blacks and whites of the institutional background.

Teachers who are alive are compelled to take a stand and make choices; they are not and cannot be content to punch in and out, to "do time," and to always follow the path of least resistance until their time runs out.

An inherent part of their being is a state of tension. Viktor Frankl (1959) refers to this state of tension as being essential to sustain one's search for meaning and to maintain mental health. For Frankl, this will-to-meaning becomes a catapult from which to constantly launch oneself. The will-to-meaning is the drive that characterizes the teacher who is alive.

The alive teacher does more than cope with the environment; he transcends it in such a way that he maintains a vital dialog with the institution without insulating himself or losing his own unique sense of person. He establishes his freedom; "not a freedom from conditions, but the freedom to take a stand toward the conditions" (Frankl, 1959, p. 205).

The teacher who is alive is potentially an emancipatory teacher and can enable his students to "unveil the reality they have assumed to be given" (Greene, 1978, p. 20).

He often lives the paradox of questioning the very grounds upon which he stands. He is not defined simply by personality attributes, but by a general "sense-of-self-and-others" that transcends teaching style, subject matter competency, and interpersonal skills. Inevitably, at some level, to some degree, in some form, he is bound to take an adversary stance vis-à-vis any attempts that embody uniformity, sameness, and routine.

These teachers have no uniform way of coping, of staying alive. Some internalize the institutional goals into their own frameworks, others create their own distinct worlds, some cannot seem to avoid constant, open clashes, others realize the proximity of losing their individual integrity and leave. Some, I am sure, failed to leave when they should have. I feel certain that this process of staying alive is not automatic; it requires effort in terms of both thought and action. I know some teachers who were once alive and no longer are.

In this inquiry I am looking at four teachers who are alive. Three of them still are, one left the profession a few years ago in order to remain alive as an individual. These individuals are good teachers: morally and psychologically competent, knowledgeable in their subject areas, well-rounded intellectually, personable, and truly concerned with youngsters, with teaching, and with education in general.

I think their aliveness will come through in the interpretive narratives of the case-studies which follow in the next chapter.

Procedure: A Method

The specific methodological procedure of my inquiry was outlined at the end of the last chapter. At that point I indicated the general framework of the participant-observer-critic through which I hope to enter into the worlds of four individual teachers. At this point, I will focus more sharply on the specifics of my inquiry.

I am not sure of the specific name given to the method I used (other than it is obviously an interpretive approach involving a phase of participant involvement and another phase of critical observation). The general framework was built around a series of intensive dialog sessions with individual teachers with whom I am acquainted on a personal and professional basis. In the dialogs I was both participant and observer; later on, after the initial sessions, I adopted the role of a critic-interpretor of what had transpired earlier including my own involvement. Later on in this chapter I will give a more specific "blow-by-blow" account of the inquiry. At this point I want to share two important notions with the reader which are essential to viewing my inquiry in a proper perspective.

First, I must caution the reader to the shifts in perspective as I shift from the vantage point of participant

to that of critic and vice versa. These shifts are not always clearly stated--often it is burdensome and repetitious to do so. The stance of the observer-critic is more distanced, more objective, and more linear in its language. The stance of the participant is clearly a subjectively involved stance and reflects the ambiguity and affective coloration of such involvement. It is more difficult to follow, but it is often a richer language as no attempt is made to become overly reflective or analytic. Both views should provide a more complete, if not a more consonant panorama. In the section on the Interpretive Narratives I address this issue of perspective shift in more detail.

Second, I would like to discuss a methodology of inquiry that illuminates what I have attempted to do inasmuch as it combines interpretation with participation and observation.

Harvey Cox (1973) discusses a method which combines the techniques of theological hermeneutics with the methods of participant observation. He summarizes the following steps that comprise this method:

1. a careful effort to discover the prehistory of the event or phenomenon now being studied; 2. an equally rigorous attempt to learn about the larger setting within which the present activity takes place; 3. a thorough observation of the phenomenon itself in all its many details; and 4. a meticulous awareness of the meaning it all has for me, the interpreter-observer-participant. (Cox, 1973, p. 147)

In my own inquiry the first two steps are essential inasmuch as it is difficult to understand any phenomenon without knowing something of its origin or background and development. It is also crucial to understand the specific phenomenon in question in the context of the larger setting in which it takes place in order to obtain a more complete picture of the whole life-world. The third step underscores the assumption that nothing is trivial and focuses on the significance of the insignificant (Jackson, 1968). The fourth step points to the importance of acknowledging how "I" the inquirer feel throughout my whole involvement. Cox (1973) emphasizes the need here to be fully aware of one's own feelings before, during, and after the experience. The rationale for this self-awareness is twofold. First, he says, an increased inner awareness deepens one's own interiority which, in turn, makes him more likely to appreciate the inner meaning of another person's actions. Secondly, a person who knows how he is feeling is more capable of detecting the inner recesses of another person's state--even if it is a different one--than a person who is determined to remain a detached, distant observer.

Background

My concern is not with an analytical approach to the study of the teacher which tends to reduce teachers to functional units that fit prespecified categories. My inquiry is not the type of specialized study that looks at

teachers as a typological group that can be studied in the clear-cut manner of cause-effect models. I am concerned with capturing the uniqueness and individuality of four teachers. My concern, therefore, is four teachers as opposed to "teachers," or "the teacher." What I am interested in I cannot reduce to or translate into quantifiable data. My conception of the world of the teacher necessitates a larger, more probing view than that afforded through analyses of specific components. I want to be open in this inquiry to the multiplicity and variety of phenomena that characterize that world and give it a flavor uniquely its own. I am concerned with the teacher in the totality of his experience and this itself presents a paradox inasmuch as I am conscious of the need to define boundaries that could never hope to encompass the ideal totality I wish to explore. This is the dilemma that interpretive inquiry must always wrestle with and which requires a willingness to accept indefiniteness, ambiguity, complexity, and arbitrariness as inherent in any process of disciplined inquiry into the human life-world.

I am interested in teachers, in the specific attributes which define their "teacherness," and I want to find out how they see themselves and their world. Who are they? What do they do? How do they feel about it? Why? These are the major concerns that I have stated throughout and which provide the impetus and direction for my search.

My eleven-year experience as a teacher in the public schools provides me with a set of lenses through which I tend to view myself as a teacher. This vantage-point offers many perspectives on the world which I as a teacher inhabit, and from it I can locate myself as a person, as a professional, and as a part of an institutional framework. Often I wonder if others who co-inhabit that world with me share in my perceptions. Some, I feel, share a substantial common portion of reality with me; others, I feel sure, do not. Each of us, undoubtedly, has his own unique view.

In a way, I guess I want to touch bases with some teachers with whom I feel I share a significant portion of a world; individuals who do not necessarily perceive as I do, but who are aware of their perceptions and this becomes an important part of their lives. I have selected four individual teachers whom I consider to be "alive." Teachers who are competent, compassionate, concerned, and committed to their tasks. They are not alike in most ways and few who know them would be inclined to consider them similar in their personal and professional demeanor. Their teaching styles are quite different, their subject matter and academic interests vary widely, and their respective outlooks-on-life are distinctively their own. Even their respective educational philosophies and visions of the teacher, teaching, and school are more divergent than convergent. What they do share, however, is a sense of individual integrity that makes each "real" and "alive" as opposed to simply

being clichés or caricatures that conform to a role but who lack any depth of identity. Each of these teachers has, in my opinion, managed to maintain a sense of his own individuality as each has defined a realm of personal meaning within the framework of institutional meaning that is defined for them. They share a concern for education, a concern for people, a concern for establishing meaningful educational relationships. They also share in a self-awareness that necessarily includes the anxieties and uncertainties of their tasks. They experience the tension of unresolvable dilemmas and the contradictory nature of much of what they do. They also have in common the belief that there are no simple answers lying around waiting to be discovered, and the certainty that they do not have all the answers. Finally, and most importantly, I feel, is the fact that all four of these individuals maintain a dialogical stance both as they look inwardly toward the self and outwardly toward their world. This dialogical stance is what Maxine Green (1975) described as:

. . . the need to rediscover my actual presence to myself . . . remaining in contact with one's own perceptions, one's own experiences, and striving to constitute their meanings . . . achieving a state of what Schutz calls wide-awakeness . . . a plane of consciousness of highest tension originating in an attitude of full attention to life and its requirements . . . open to the world . . . condemned to give meaning . . . to recreate or generate the external world in terms of his own consciousness. (Greene, 1975, p. 300)

These are the four individuals whose worlds I want to explore. I want to engage in dialog with each of them in such a way that I can share an inside view of his own reality. I can never see as each sees, but I can approximate an inner glimpse as I acknowledge my otherness and rely on the limitations of intersubjectivity.

Preliminary Dialogs

A dialog between two people requires that both parties be agreeable to such a relationship. I asked these four individuals and a few more whether or not they would be interested in having a series of dialogs. This preliminary work involved talking with ten individuals about the nature of my inquiry, what I proposed to accomplish, and what I would want of them if they agreed to participate. All ten individuals seemed interested in my proposed endeavor, and seven of the ten showed genuine concern and a real personal interest in participating. In the course of the seven months since my initial contact, however, because of logistical problems and other circumstances beyond my control, I narrowed down my field to five individuals. Initially I had planned to use five individuals in my study; later as the process began and I began to gather data and interpret my findings, I realized that three might be a more manageable number. I had problems, though, narrowing down the field to three, and so I opted for a compromise of using four individuals.

After this series of preliminary dialogs with the ten individuals, I had accomplished a number of things. First, I had clarified my own concerns in the inquiry by explaining to these individuals what I hoped to accomplish through my dialogs with them. Secondly, I had established a common ground of concern from which we could at least begin our sessions. Thirdly, some of these individuals in these preliminary conversations were instrumental in pointing out to me certain issues and dimensions about the teacher in the school which they felt I needed to incorporate in my dialogs. Fourthly, I became aware that even though I stated that the dialogs would be informal and unstructured (and to a large extent they were--a fact that made the interpretive process a complex and often frustrating experience), I knew that there were a number of general themes I considered important which I wanted to probe in the dialogs. Fifthly, I had begun to develop an attitude, a format, and a general "modus operandi" which would be useful in later dialogs. Sixthly, I had touched base with some teachers with whom I seldom interacted and this opened the door for a series of informal chats in the intervening time from which I gathered valuable insights and on which many of my subsequent ideas are founded. Finally, I was as convinced as I felt I could be of their sincerity and their desire to cooperate in my endeavor. It was reassuring to see that their interest had not waned in the months between the

initial contact and the first of the actual dialog sessions. It was important to me that they shared my belief that this endeavor was significant to all of us as teachers; I did not want them to participate otherwise.

I wanted these four people to get a feel for what I wanted to do, to understand not only the What and How but also the Why of my inquiry. After the preliminary session I am not sure how much they understood, but I was sure that they at least had an intuitive grasp of it. They understood enough to want to be heard; they had something to say which was important to them and the dialogs would provide the forum--something many of them did not find frequently as I was to discover later after the sessions.

Above all, I did not want this inquiry to be viewed in the same light with so many other studies that teachers are regularly asked, requested, or required to participate in. Having been a subject of many of these, I am fully aware of my own attitude and the attitude of many teachers toward them. Generally, these studies are viewed as one more task and compliance becomes automatic; the path of least resistance involving little or no thought on their part. During these preliminary sessions I became almost paranoid at times in conveying my message that "my study is not like other studies you might have participated in." I was reassured by some of these individuals that they were aware of the difference and that they would not have agreed to participate

otherwise. This satisfied me and eventually I accepted the full sense of conviction and commitment with which these four individuals entered into my inquiry and brought it to life. I was now ready to move into the actual dialog sessions with each individual.

Dialogical Framework

Each individual session consisted of a four-stage framework. There was an initial dialog that was taped and which lasted an average of about one and one-half hours (in fact one lasted only one hour while one went over two hours). I then transcribed the material taped verbatim. The second stage consisted of my writing an interpretive account of the dialog session (these can be found in the next chapter). The third stage was a critique of this narrative interpretation by the participant. This was done in the form of an oral feedback and/or a written reaction. Following their reaction, there was a concluding dialog session (some taped, some not) which lasted about an hour (except for one that developed into the meaty substance of a full evening's conversation and in which scholarly concerns eventually gave way to informal bull sessions). This concluding session as it turned out generated many more issues and, as expected, asked more questions than it answered. There was an interval of about two weeks between the initial dialog session and completion of my interpretive narrative; there was an additional interval of about a week

to ten days between this and their reaction to it, and finally there was a gap of anywhere from three days to three weeks between this phase and the final dialog session. Each individual session was scheduled at the mutual convenience of both parties and except for one of the initial dialog sessions, none were conducted at school or during school hours (the one exception took place during the afternoon of one of the work days). From the preliminary sessions to the concluding dialogs (some participants--two of them--stay in pretty regular touch and expressed an interest in continuing dialogs; since the formal conclusion of my inquiry sessions, I have had one other session [not taped] with one of these individuals) I have logged a minimum of 25 hours with each participant spent either in informal contacts, dialogs, transcription, or interpretation of material (close to 40 hours with my "long-winded friend"). This is exclusive of any extra time that I have not tried to account for and exclusive of my unexpected daily reflections on them that became a major portion of my life.

Length of time alone, of course, is not a reflection of thoroughness; however, a certain amount of contact is a necessary--though not a sufficient--condition, to probe beneath the obvious. The time spent on the sessions is only one indication, how it was spent is another. At this point I want to provide a brief profile on each of the participants and to elaborate further on the four-stage procedure I have just explained.

Participants: A Profile

As I stated earlier, I used four individual teachers in this inquiry. Initially, I had contacted ten prospective participants and had a preliminary session with each concerning the nature of my inquiry. I was personally acquainted with all ten and professionally I was closely acquainted with eight of them. All but one taught in high school, and I had taught with all of these in the same school for at least one year. Most of them I had known throughout my eleven-year tenure in the school. The ten represented a variety of age groups, disciplines, and teaching styles. They were not randomly or arbitrarily asked to participate in the study. My major criteria for asking them were that I felt they had integrity as teachers, that they were good teachers, that I liked them, knew them, and respected them and that I sensed they felt the same toward me. In addition I felt they had something to say and that they would want to be in the study and would profit from the experience of involvement. Eventually I selected four participants. I want to tell you a little about each and to define our relationship prior to the inquiry.

Joe is 52 and has been teaching for about 24 years. His field is art and in addition to being a teacher, he is an artist, or better yet, an aestheticist; i.e., a connoisseur, critic, and believer in the artistic quest. He is very learned in many areas and talks like a psychologist

by avocation. I wanted Joe because I have known him for many years and I wanted a critic in this study. I felt he would not leave many stones unturned and I was right. Joe is one of the few real individuals whom I have known in the schools.

Jack is about 46 and has been teaching for 19 years. He is a chemistry and physics teacher and embodies what I think is the spirit of the scientific search for laws and order. He is a careful, rational, systematic inquirer. I have known him for eleven years personally and professionally and hold him in the highest regard as a friend and a teacher. I wanted him in the study because I felt he represented the scholarly concerns of academic excellence. In addition, because of recent conversations with him, I have known that he has experienced much anxiety both in his personal and professional life, and that he has opened himself to new ways of looking, not so much to change his ways but "to better understand where they are coming from." He is one of the most dedicated teachers I know. Science is his life, at least his school-life.

Charles is about 33. He taught for four years and has been out of teaching for about five years. His field is English and his interests include art, music, and theatre. He represents one of those individuals who loves teaching as a craft, but cannot seem to function in the institutional setting on which teaching is rooted. I wanted

him in the study because I wanted to know the perspective of an ex-teacher who looks from outside in. It proved to be a distinctively different view. For Charles, the personal rewards were not enough to counteract the institutional and collegial pressures he felt in the job.

Kathy is 31. This is her second year of teaching. She is an English teacher who specializes in teaching "the basics" and who enjoys this task. She loves literature, but above all she prizes the relationships she establishes with her students. She is an old neophyte (as neophytes go) with a lot of other work experience and vantage points from which she looks at her self as a teacher. She claims "she became a teacher in retaliation." Last year she experienced a lot of institutional pressures for a variety of reasons and came close to calling it quits; this year she is more reassured and self-confident. I asked her to be in the study because I wanted the views of a beginning teacher, and I had shared in her experiences of the year before when she felt torn between loyalties to the students, adherence to school rules, and maintaining her own personal standards. Kathy has truly experienced the pains of dedication in her two years of teaching and wonders how long she can remain a viable teacher with the demands the job places on her.

Initial Dialogs

There were several general areas that I attempted to explore in each dialog session, not because I was hoping for

certain specific information, but because I felt that certain general dimensions would provide some appropriate common denominators to frame the four initial dialog sessions. This, in turn, would facilitate an inter-dialectic (mediated by me, of course) among the four participants. I did not want to push these issues, however, for I felt that this would detract from the openness I was striving to create and from the authenticity of the participant-perspective I wanted to establish. By and large, these issues came up naturally in and of themselves and unless I completely deceived myself, I never felt I had to arbitrarily and externally superimpose any of them. Part of the reason for wanting to articulate this dialectic among dialogs is the fact that my four teachers seemed so very different in such respects as age, length and type of experience, biographical profile, subject matter, self-views, and goals. I felt that some significant common themes pertinent to their respective "teacherness" were bound to exist and I felt duty-bound to tap them. Another reason, I guess, was my own desire for a certain order that would enhance my interpretive task and precipitate some insightful "eureka experiences." Again, I must reiterate that I had to balance this concern with a constant alertness to any attempts that could undermine the genuineness and integrity of the substance.

These general areas included a biographical profile; a personal interpretation of self vis-à-vis the school; the role of the teacher, the school, and education; the nature of teaching and subject matter taught; the interpersonal domain in the school; personal interests and concerns; and general outlook on the world outside the school. Each of the participants reacted to all of these general areas and resonated some common themes. To a lesser or greater degree each of these areas had something to say to them individually (see Interpretive Narratives in the next chapter).

In the dialogs I was clearly an involved participant-observer. Unlike many traditional experimental settings, I made no attempt to create the single-blind or double-blind effect that keeps the participant or the researcher, or both, unaware of where each other's stance is in relation to the other and to the nature of the experiment. Honesty and openness were the cornerstones upon which the dialogs were built and, in every instance, I communicated that. In this light, there were no hidden agendas, confidentiality was assured, questions of concern were asked directly, and discussion was always explicit. Needless to say, I could not honestly claim to be the neutral observer or detached researcher. How could I pretend to be distanced in a dialog which I had initiated and which obviously meant a great deal to me? If I had pretended to play this role, I feel sure

that the real issues we confronted might have been missed or, at least, not sufficiently probed. It was important to convey to the participants that I was not after any certain kinds of answers or types of teachers. The process of discussing issues and raising consciousness was the important thing.

If I had been a detached researcher, then I would not have had dialogs, I would have simply conducted formal interviews. The former requires my presence as an involved participant and even though the focus is on the participant, I still had to give of myself in a sharing process. An interview would have been a more clear-cut format as prespecified questions would be answered in order to locate the participant as part of a larger sample at some point of a quantifiable dimension. The interview would not have required, in fact it would have prevented my presenting my own biases as these would contaminate the responses of the participant. Of course, I could have also contaminated the dialogs under the guises of interpretive inquiry had I not remained constantly aware of this need to balance the perspectives of involvement and detachment.

Interpretive Narratives--Point of View

The verbatim transcript of each dialog proved to be more than I could manage as I attempted some kind of disciplined, systematic inquiry. The very process of interpretation, in fact, became a selective process in which I

distilled the major ideas, themes and issues. My doing this often required that I look behind what I felt was said to what I felt was meant; however, fortunately for me the participants generally were open enough with me and with themselves to "call a spade a spade," and with few exceptions, I was not called upon to engage in psychodynamic interpretation. Any interpretive difficulties were more the product of simple confusion on my part and not so much of hidden agendas creeping under the surface. This process required me to be sensitive, probing, and reflective as I had to balance the perspective of the involved participant with that of the distanced critic. This issue of the perspective taken is one that warrants further consideration at this point.

In the interpretive narratives I adopted the perspective of the distanced critic as I reacted to the dialogs. In this capacity I became a distanced critic to my own participant role as well as to the participant role of the other party to the dialog. In reading the interpretive narratives, the reader may find that suddenly there seems to be a shift in perspective. One perspective used is that of the participant; i.e., what he or she said about something; another perspective is that of me as a participant-interpreter; i.e., what I interpret him or her as saying. The third perspective is my point-of-view post facto as I have a chance to react as a distanced critic to the two

points-of-view expressed in the dialog; i.e., what I now say about what he/she or I said earlier. Generally, this third point-of-view is more of a framework than the essence of the content of the four interpretive narratives. These shifts in point-of-view were mentioned earlier in this chapter. Because they are important in understanding what is being said, I feel that they warrant further clarification.

A point-of-view is both a physical vantage point and a personal way of perceiving events. It expresses the complex relationship between a speaker and his subject and between a speaker and his listener. Thus develops the notion of trinity between "I", "you" and "he" as the relation shifts between transmitter, receiver, and message. This trinity is a unity, and change in one entails change in others so that as the distance of time and space increases, so does the message of thought and feeling that is conveyed. These interpretive narratives are literary accounts of events and shifts in points-of-view alter perspectives. Plot, character, theme, and style are all affected by points-of-view (Moffett & McElheny, 1966, p.xii).

My perspective as a distanced critic through which I frame the interpretive narratives resembles the point-of-view of the detached autobiographer:

. . . the speaker tells about what happened to him in the past. Now he is in a frame of mind that has changed greatly since the time he underwent the experience he describes, a frame of mind that may even be a

result of what he has learned from the experience . . . By one means or another, but ultimately always by the passage of time, the speaker has arrived at the understanding of his experience he must have in order to discuss it with a neutral, watchful audience. (Moffett & McElheney, 1966, p. 211)

This perspective however distant, however reflective, however neutral, is still my personal point-of-view and I wanted to check it against the participant's own perceptions.

The next stage of the inquiry allowed the participant to take the vantage point of the distanced critic as he reacted to my interpretation vis-à-vis his perceptions of the dialog. Each participant was asked to read my interpretation, to reflect on it, and to react to it as each saw fit. After about a week to ten days, I started getting individual reactions. Some were oral and some written; mostly I received a combination of both from each participant. A question that arose here from two of the participants had to do with what they were to do specifically. Generally I indicated to them to react to my interpretation and to correct any instances where they felt I had missed the point or misinterpreted what transpired. All of the participants but one made marginal notes or comments. One wrote a rather lengthy reaction to a couple of points we had discussed and which, he felt, I had not quite grasped in my interpretation. These particular points turned out to be the subject of a considerable number of lengthy discussions that were to follow. In fact, at the conclusion of

my formal inquiry I was already looking at two notions which had not previously occurred to me.

Generally, the participants indicated that the interpretive narratives had been helpful to them. Each asked for a copy that he/she could keep. One of the participants expressed a mixture of challenge and apprehension at "seeing herself in print." Another indicated that the dialog and subsequent reaction had provided a medium for him to talk about things "which he thought a lot about but never said because nobody seemed interested." A third participant was not quite sure that anything of value would come out of it, but that the intellectual exercise was fun and his hope was that I could use what I got from him. He was very concerned with providing "the kind of information that I needed in my study." He was very open and perhaps, for this reason, revealed himself in some very sensitive areas that he seldom shared.

After I had an opportunity to obtain a reaction to the interpretive narratives from the four participants, I scheduled one final dialog session with each of them. In these final sessions I hoped to underscore some general themes, provide a sense of time perspective, plot some possible directions, and generally "wrap things up."

Final Dialogs

I wanted the final dialogs to give me some pretty clear pictures of what had transpired; however, I felt all along

that this would hardly be possible given the nature of my inquiry. What I encountered was a complex human reality that necessitated more interpretation than explanation and more open-ended inquiry than categorical prescription. This, of course, is the value premise on which I had based the rationale for this inquiry.

In the final dialogs most participants expressed a sense of personal accomplishment. They had viewed their involvement as a growth experience and a rewarding search. There was a general feeling that no problems had been solved and one of them indicated that "after all is said and done, tomorrow will still come and we will do what we have to do." One of the participants told me that she now realized that "she now felt that she could not possibly be a teacher for very long." Another stated that perhaps more than anything else this experience had made him more aware of "how much he needed the students and how important these relationships were for him as a teacher." The participant who had left teaching five years before indicated that this experience had provided a new perspective to his teaching experience and realized "how much he still loved teaching, but how unlikely it would be that he would ever want to teach again." There were some probing questions as some participants expressed "and now, What?" "Where do we go from here?" I threw the questions back at them because at this point I really did not know what to say.

The final dialogs were very informal and only two of them were taped. One of the participants after about an hour of taping finally offered me a beer and asked me to "turn the damn thing off." At this point, I knew the tape recorder had outlived its usefulness. I made no obvious attempts to dwell on the general themes we had identified and reacted to in the interpretive phase. The atmosphere was more relaxed as we both felt the agenda had been successfully completed and could now take a more leisurely look backwards and forward.

In this final phase of the inquiry I felt that the participants were more eager to talk about the overall experience than about the substance. I sensed that they felt they had already spoken their piece and did not wish to belabor the point. The final dialogs became the forum for the participants to react to the whole procedure in which they had been involved. There was a genuine concern from one as to whether any "significant information" about teachers could be gathered in this manner. There was also a suggestion for a joint session with me and all four participants present. Apparently there was a certain amount of interest and curiosity in sharing what had come out of the dialogs. Generally their mood was one of acceptance rather than one of critical reflection as they were ready to end it and move to something else. This was true of all participants except one with whom the final dialog was a

five hour session (on a potpourri of issues and topics), and who expressed an interest in continuing our dialogs.

At this point, I want to underscore that these participants were willing volunteers in this inquiry, and considering the degree of personal involvement in the inquiry, they would be likely to value what had taken place. It would make little sense for them to have been so involved and, at the same time, to dismiss their involvement as inconsequential or trivial. This was their inquiry inasmuch as it revolved around their perceptions and reflections as teachers. I believe that, to some extent, they all shared this general feeling.

This was the formal end of the dialog sessions. At this point, I too wanted to get away, to leave it alone before I could reflect on it again from another vantage point. I was now certain that there was no way to end it and that all I could do was to abandon it . . . for the time being. I now needed to obtain a sense of closure about the whole experience. My findings extracted from my experiences with the four participants are presented in greater detail in the case studies that follow in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV
INTERPRETIVE NARRATIVES OF CASE STUDIES

Joe

Joe is 50 years old and has been teaching over 20 years in the public schools. He is an art teacher and an artist. He believes he is a good artist but he says he no longer does art work. Doing so is a risk, makes him too vulnerable and he places a high value on survival at this point in his life. I am not sure what he means by survival, but this notion kept recurring in our dialog sessions. I think survival refers to some sort of adaptability; of fitting into a social setting of which he sees himself as an unavoidable element. Perhaps this notion will be further clarified in the course of this interpretive summary.

Joe describes himself as a product of the system. He received a traditional Roman Catholic education in a parochial school in his hometown of Philadelphia. These values are still with him. Because of family problems in his youth, he often ran away from home. Eventually he joined the Marines (underage) and went to China during World War II. He never finished high school but was able to obtain an equivalent degree through a competency examination. In his young days his hopes and aspirations had been

first toward the priesthood and later toward medicine. He tells me he loved science as a youngster and had his own lab at home. Well, I wondered, why art?

After the service he found a sympathetic older woman who noticed his interest and talent in art and became his patron. She sponsored him and suggested that he apply to the Temple University Art School. He was accepted. His career at Temple took place in two installments. He was asked to leave after the first two years because of his irrepressible rebelliousness and his drinking habits. At this time, he says, he learned how to play the game. He came back "did what he was supposed to do," was taken on as the Dean's protégé, and from then on it was "smooth sailing all the way."

Art students then were encouraged to get two degrees in a five-year program: one in art and one in teaching and liberal arts. Later he received his master's degree.

Joe has been an art director of a city school district in New Jersey, he has worked under a grant sponsorship at the National Gallery of Art, and has lived and worked the life of a professional artist in Italy. He now teaches art in a public senior high school. Life was rough for Joe both financially and emotionally. I gather that things are better now than they have ever been. I'm not sure. He admits he is more cautious. About his own personal search in his life he said:

I don't think I really am searching anymore . . . I think I am playing everything by ear . . . no, I don't think I've found it. I don't think I have the courage any longer to go after it--if there is such a thing. I used to think that I was very infallible . . . with age you realize that you no longer can run as fast as the wolf, so you learn to be more foxy, more clever; you can't have both . . . you can't go around chasing ideal concepts like you did when you were young. I don't know anymore what is really tangible for me.

I wondered who the wolf was. At this point we talked about society, about school, about "fitting in." Joe seems to dichotomize himself from the other side which he sees as an impersonal, arbitrary ruling body. I get conflicting messages at this point. Part of Joe reflects a passive alienation from that impersonal "it." He says: "I think I fit more in the medieval period, in a chevalier type of attitude . . . the code of behavior is established by the middle and wealthy classes. It is an honorable code . . . when you fight and lose you know to whom you lost." This is not like the present technological system which lacks any sense of humanity.

Another part of Joe considers himself a foe of the system. "I think they feel I'm a threat . . . I make them nervous . . . It is something that they don't understand, that they can't grasp (laughter). I know it sounds sort of paranoid when you start using 'they' and all . . ." He very much feels the strain, but another side of him also senses the alternatives. To this he says: "I either retaliate and operate back to them in the same way, or I play the game and

keep intact what I feel is most important. For this, I go back to the age of chivalry and dwell on the ideals, on symbolism, on what is really important." What is really important? Can you play the game and still keep that personal meaning intact?

I was interested in how Joe integrated these two aspects of his life. He readily admitted that he was part of the system and that ultimately he would comply no matter what he said. He does not want to be humiliated, censured by the system. He used the metaphor of not wanting to be the sacrificial lamb in one of their rituals. The pains of belonging were emphasized in his statement that "the system must mean something to me, if I'm reacting that way to it . . . so I'm a prisoner of all those things too . . . I guess I like to drive my big car too . . ." I asked him if he had to be a part or if maybe he really wanted to be part of the system. His response was indicative of the pragmatic Joe: "I think mostly I copped out (laughter). I realize that even if I pursued any different directions, I would lose more than I would gain . . ." This attitude seemed to me to be somewhat stoic, resigned; accepting but not quite convinced of the inevitability of such reality.

I asked Joe about art and about teaching art. From his reaction, I believe that he is making a distinction between art as a prespecified format of procedure and

outcomes that is taught and can be taught by anyone, and ART, which defies description, prescription, and "packaging," and which ultimately comes about through "self-initiated prayers toward finding the eye of God." ART cannot be taught, it must be perceived, found. It is not a product but a process; a never-ending search for the Holy Grail. The latter definition tells me that for Joe any sense of artistic creativity and of aesthetic experience can only be accomplished when the individual is capable of self-transcendence. He emphasizes that this search must be inherently painful or there would be no joy or satisfaction in it.

He sees himself as teaching technical aspects of art. He sees little evidence of any good art, of any really creative minds. The reason is the incompatibility of the individual values of art and the collective values of the masses. This has degenerated into a democratic notion of art for the masses and this amounts to little more than emphasis on form and technique; i.e., "art by the numbers." He hopes to inspire those creative talents who are willing to take a risk, to pray their own prayers. These are not many because the schools make sure that the prayers are provided. This keeps them, as individuals, from being able to relate to and describe their world through the artistic medium. Most students want to do "their thing," but they

lack their own individual tools, they are too dependent on the fact that we provide the tools. "Their thing" often lacks any substance.

I asked him to tell me more about his notions of ART. He first emphasized what it is not. ART is not embellishment, it is not therapy, it is not simply mastery of technique, it is not self-enhancement, it is not a product of any kind. He equates ART with an elusive, never-ending search and for this perhaps it is difficult for students to accept, yet for Joe it is these very students who are the hope for ART--for, in the search for truth, they are perhaps the least contaminated, the purest of artists, where the potential resides. The inherent contradiction lies in the fact that the more one tries to direct the search from outside, the more disconnected it becomes from what it's all about. He experiences this approach-avoidance dualism so characteristic of teachers who feel the need to intervene, to arouse others to action rather than merely mechanical behavior, but who also know that each individual must be the author of his own search.

How do these notions reflect themselves in his teaching? I found that Joe was not very pretentious about what he was accomplishing with his classes. Ultimately his evaluations and criticisms rest on how the individual student has enhanced his perceptions of his environment. He sees himself as a critic to his students; one who cannot

enhance their search, but who can encourage them to continue the search. Some of the students react to this by engaging in a search, others do not understand it, many are frightened by it, and some he says think "I'm a kooky son of a bitch." He is in touch with these reactions and uses them to devise alternatives within the class. He is, in effect, capable of manipulating their interests in this manner and create a smoother-flowing class atmosphere; perhaps not so much for their sake, but for his.

Joe is interested in people; in individuals. Art emanates from the individual; not that the self is the end-state, but that it is the center and beginning. The self-perceptions of the artist must include other people. It is at this point of people meeting people that the search develops. His thing is people, without people there is nothing, there is no art. People are a necessary condition for art to exist, but there must be an active, purposeful search on the part of each individual. Art is an individual, never a collective endeavor. This is a very important connection in Joe's life, for it seems to bridge the realms of Joe the individual, Joe the artist, and Joe the teacher. Joe has a need for his students, the good ones and the bad ones; all of them, in fact. He realizes that he needs strokes like everybody else, and he acknowledges that it is important for him to be appreciated by the students and to know that sometimes he has made a difference. Sometimes

he needs to feel that way to justify his existence.

Teaching is a kind of insanity, I've been told that I should get out because it's killing me. I need it though, the students, not the system. It's getting more difficult because the students don't want that kind of personal exchange either. It's much easier to cop out by being actually indifferent to the whole matter.

He cannot conceive himself as an artist or a teacher of art when he is removed from other people. Art requires commitment and personal involvement because, he believes,

the artist must breathe life into his creation. Anybody can make pictures but not everybody can make art, just like any man can get a woman pregnant, but not every man can be a lover and a father; these require the personal commitment that art demands of the artist."

I wondered at this point if this was also demanded of the teacher. It was. Joe's remarks, which he labeled messianic in nature, equated teaching with an inevitable sacrifice where you must make yourself vulnerable to the students. You must make them reach up to you while realizing that in the process they might want to bring you down. To survive as a teacher you must know when to remove yourself. Then you can move up to another level and again offer yourself.

I asked Joe how the artistic-aesthetic experience and the artist fit in our present system; in society-at-large and in the school which Joe sees as a reflection of the former. His answer was simple: "through a divine system of rationalization." Our priorities, he says, are obvious: the multi-million dollar computer, the new school gymnasium, the football games. Those things can be measured, you always

know when the teams win and lose; they are tangible and, in this sense, real. This is our sense of values and priorities, our unquestioned reality. He equates this mechanistic orientation to the equivalent of an emotional hara-kiri where the culture is afraid of passion, where it disconnects itself from feelings. The messages are impersonal, the targets are the masses and not the individual, the mythical average is ruler supreme. A consequence of this is an avoidance of any sense of personal responsibility-- in schools computers average grades, calculators add for us, and artificial sexual machines enhance our natural pleasures. It's as if people are one step removed from the real reality which lies within and to which we have been desensitized. Security at what price? There is no great art today because there is no involvement. The pyramids and the great cathedrals involved a lot of hard work, dedication, individual commitment. Today they can't be built because the stones would be moved by truck and rail. It's not the same. The Mona Lisa is not the Mona Lisa anymore, the camera has distorted our concept of appreciation by making it so available; so common. We have so much color that we don't see color anymore. We can't hear the music, so we turn it louder. Drugs bring us new stimulations. Technology is like a false god, it promises everything but delivers nothing. Form and not substance is the key. We avoid involvement because we see ourselves through

somebody else and we don't like what we see. It's easier not to look. So, we let the machines run the show.

The artist, he says, does not really count in this reality. He is only a token of things past. "He is more like the violin than the violinist. Society plays across his strings and he resonates the tunes that they want to hear." This is analogous, he says, to the teacher punching out the green grade cards. The punch represents an individual endeavor over a nine-week period. It all comes down to the letter grade and the concern is not with what brought about that letter grade as much as it is with the consequences of it. One green card follows another and eventually they all lead to the credit card; that's the mark of success in the system!

The school amplifies the same messages: collectivize, strive for efficiency and uniformity, follow procedure. How does Joe feel as the dialog between him and the institution is played out? One thing seems certain (to me) from what he said: the depersonalizing and disconnecting effects of the system run counter to the artistic search and to the development of any aesthetic consciousness. In this sense, the schools are undermining the very experiences they are claiming to advocate. Joe's subtle disregard and joking attitude of "O. K., sure, I'll do it," becomes ways of coping, of survival. In this manner, he can assert himself by rejecting the substance, if not the ritual of

what is demanded. This, seems to me, would provide a measure of freedom from the pervasiveness of the institutional school reality; a respite from everydayness.

He does, however, play the game more than he would like to and even though he rationalizes this (too old, no alternative, do what you can, etc.), I feel that he is angry for complying. He did state that: "I feel humiliated to sit here and play the game. I don't have the guts not to and that is painful to me. I blow my own horn, but I hate to resort to that kind of stroking to survive." This is a very real and human Joe. It is in this area that he manifests those swift shifts of attitudes as he fights, accepts, rationalizes, denies, and withdraws. Each stance must serve a different purpose, but all, I feel, provide him with a handle with which to define some domain of personal meaning vis-à-vis the system.

The artistic-aesthetic realm is Joe's ultimate haven; it is the last bastion of his own identity in the school which the system cannot invade and violate. He clearly denies that the system's requirements of semester plans, behavioral objectives and other programmatic concerns of art constructions, are of any relevance to the artistic quest. In this sense, he can comply without compromising his personal integrity, without diluting the nature of art. In this manner if and when he fails, the system has failed, but not art, not Joe the artist, for they have not been

tested. He does not dispute the effectiveness of the answers, instead he denies the worth of the questions asked as having anything to do with art. I think Joe effectively disconnects his self-views as an artist from his self-views as a teacher in the system. He admitted to having frequently disconnected himself as an artist but not knowing whether the purpose was to create or simply to escape. It is clear that in the context of the system Joe-the-artist and Joe-the-teacher do not always go hand-in-hand. The teacher has the security and can play games, the artist has the freedom and the vulnerability. It's as he said earlier: you either outrun the wolf or outfox him--not both.

In one of his many rich metaphors Joe used the terms nude and naked to distinguish between being in a costume (nude) and being fully exposed and vulnerable (naked). He says you can be a nude artist and paint for Penthouse magazine and make money, or you can be a naked artist. Where does being a naked artist take you? At this point he smiled and mentioned Vincent Van Gogh. Like Van Gogh, I think Joe is feeling the agony of the search.

Kathy

Kathy is young, but not so young for a second-year teacher. She disliked high school and said that perhaps she became a teacher in retaliation. In high school she was a rebel, a nonconformist with many unpopular causes.

She was pro-integration at an unpopular time, she wore black leather boots and a black turtleneck sweater when everybody else wore weejuns. To top it all, she says, she always carried around a copy of James Baldwin's Another Country. She also rebelled because rebelling was fun; a way to let out her anger--an anger that went deeper than school to her family who tried hard to mold her into what they wanted her to be. She says she was stifled, but she didn't want to get into that part of her life.

College at UNC-G was an eleven-year experience for the Greensboro native. In for a year and a half as a drama major, an experience which she hated; two years off in a variety of jobs, back to college for another year stint; the decision that she wasn't ready for college; and a four-year interval in which she lived in Philadelphia as a "jill-of-all-trades." She worked many boring nine-to-five jobs and her main reason to return to school was that even school would be more exciting than her routine existence and the dull people she worked with. Back to college it was where her English professor stimulated her and rekindled her old passion for English literature. Soon she changed her major from anthropology to English and decided to get a teaching certificate "while she was at it." She was warned that after student-teaching she would never again want to teach.

Student teaching was exciting and challenging, and new. She loved it and decided she wanted to become a teacher--at last her true calling! She had subbed for a year when opportunity rang as unemployment "was running out." In this round-about way she was anointed into the teaching profession. Her first job? Teaching the so-called "basics" in English in a (city) public senior high school. She was told she would teach a lot "of semi-literate fucked-up kids" and she found this to be an accurate assessment. What a first year! The kids? She loved them. Her teaching? She's not quite sure, her success is measured in inches. Her hopes? To make some significant contribution; a positive influence and input. Her fears? The apprehension and feeling that the confinement and pressures of teaching will get her down; that it too might become routine and no longer a challenge with any meaning. Her plans? Uncertain, maybe a stint as a bartender with enough free time to do what she enjoys doing. Her reality? She likes people, especially kids fifteen to eighteen and she loves literature. Nothing is as inspiring as a good class discussion.

Teaching is hard work and she confesses to having lost her work-ethic (assuming she had one) when her tonsils were removed. She just doesn't know how long teaching will last.

This is Kathy's second year. She is very proud of having survived her first year and she admits feeling much more sure of herself but still learning. Kathy is living the

paradox of the teacher who is personally and individually concerned about the well-being of her students, but who also feels the need and duty to impose a sense of self-discipline, to impart knowledge, to evaluate, to punish, and to fail. Her students are real people to her, they come to her with problems, they talk about what is going on in their lives. She listens and gives support and shows them she really is concerned. She is and must be a friend, a listener, and a counselor to her students. On the other hand, she is very aware that school is a pretty meaningless experience to most of her students. What they do is enough to get by, not to really do it well. They are so immature and childish, so used to getting their way, so much in need of attention and love at any cost. They require so much time that little can be done to improve academic skills. She experiences the frustration of wanting to share her excitement with her students; to want them to succeed while at the same time wondering what she can do to reach them; to make a difference. It hurts her to accept the fact that her teaching situation is a contrived reality for her students, that academically all she can hope to do is to teach some job skills in a manner akin to a factory assembly line. She wonders though: "Who would have them if we didn't have them?"

Kathy is also an imparter of knowledge. She is quick to admit, however, that this knowledge goes beyond the subject matter knowledge to the notions of "the real world."

In this sense she feels she is more of a source of wisdom and experience. This role is exercised the most in her one literature class with "average" students. This course is a thematic course in which man and society are the parameters and anything goes. It is in this type of course that the romantic part of her bursts forth. Her class discussions are her *raison d'être* but she is apprehensive about her unstructuredness, and she has periodic bouts with super-ego messages that tell her that she should be more formal, more traditional, more strict, more demanding, to have more answers and fewer questions. In her first year, she spent a lot of time comparing herself to others. This year she remains self-critical but more acceptant of her *modus operandi*. She contrasts the joys of teaching an enjoyable work of literature with teaching students to read and write above sixth-grade level; not much aesthetic rewards and inherent challenge in the latter. It was hard for her to realize that in high school she would be teaching kids to read and write. But there is too the joy of seeing these very slow students accomplish something new.

Teaching is a momentary experience for Kathy--elated one moment and devastated the next. The elation and devastation always filter down to experiences with students. Teaching rests on the quality of the relationships between teacher and student. It ultimately comes down to people. The system is interested in quantity, in mass processing a

a product for society, the numbers and impersonal averages are the key, the individuals are secondary unless for some reason they become outstanding. Kathy mentioned that she had considered becoming a guidance counselor instead of a teacher, except that they did not get to see the students as much as she did, they didn't get the real rapport of day-in day-out encounters. The counselors only saw the outstanding individuals--the superior scholars and athletes in search of scholarships and recognition, and the problem ones, the trouble-makers who were on the way out. The other individuals? They were just part of the collective mass, the hypothetical average student.

Teaching, she says, occurs in spots, given the right combination of human and situational elements. Education cannot be made synonymous with the system. This issue of the nature of education is a dilemma that Kathy confronts and for which she has no real answers. She does mention that it should certainly transcend simple training for a meaningful vocation or profession to include such things as appreciation of the fine things in life (art, music), and a sense of history and culture, and the appreciation of the process of learning as something exciting, as a way of life. This is the idealistic Kathy who fantasizes the ideal educational experience as a small, intimate group of teachers and students aboard a jet plane traveling all over the world and learning by living the history, the culture,

the people, the literature. She accepts and, I think, finds desirable the notion that this school is not a part of the real world. It should enrich it but it need not prepare one for living in it--another glimpse of Kathy the romantic!

Part of the tension that Kathy experiences is inherent in what she calls the agony of being new. This tension takes the form of implicit and explicit messages for her to conform to certain institutional expectations. She mentions specific incidents relating to advice on proper dress, maintaining a proper distance from the students, and exhibiting professionalism by meeting deadlines and being an efficient record keeper. She confesses to having been intimidated by superiors while knowing full well that the compliance that was expected of her was not demanded of veteran teachers who had established themselves in the school. I guess maybe it was a form of ritual initiation; a symbolic show of the authority and the power of the institution over its neophyte members. In this context we talked about professionalism. For her, professionalism was an internal thing, a process of growth, a personal pride in what one does and stands for. Instead, she found it to be a stuffy metaphor for compliance that was slapped at people in blanket statements under the guises of cooperation, responsibility, and efficiency of operation. Having survived the first year, she is still uncertain as to where

she stands vis à vis the institution, but she feels more sure and less vulnerable. I guess maybe she has acquired the sense of personal meaning and integrity that only the experience of teaching itself could provide. She made it and that is an important mark of personal worth.

An important rite of passage for Kathy was the time that she blew her cool with a student who had been giving her a rough time in one of her basic classes. Previous referrals to the office, in her opinion, had yielded little results and not much support since she felt as much on trial as the students sent. This time, she told the student to leave, to get out. She was relieved and glad that he had left but also worried that she had not followed proper procedure. She received some unsolicited support from a fellow teacher who narrated a similar experience in a department meeting and after calling the student's parents, things got better. This incident provided no real solutions for she freely admits that few measures last and the students soon tend to forget and to return to their old ways; however it made her very aware of the reality that the uniqueness of each situation, the humanity of it, the unpredictability of human reaction cannot be legislated and prescribed in simple procedure. I sense this was a very big step for Kathy in coming to grips with the multiplicity of roles that she, as a teacher, must play.

I asked Kathy about herself, her classes, her many roles. Her classes she described as ranging from seemingly chaotic to simply boring. Herself she described as "pretty nice, I like me better than I used to, I guess I like me pretty well but I can't get along with me sometimes. I'm warm, friendly, outgoing, pretty intelligent, although not brilliant. I know I have a sense of humor because it gets me in trouble all the time." Then she added, "I see the funny side of a lot of things and I see the funny side of school and kids and a lot of situations. I have a real hard time with people who do not have any humor and that is probably why I can't get along with administrators; they don't have any humor. They always seem so distanced from the students and from the teachers . . ." These she feels are good characteristics of a teacher who must fulfill two basic requirements: like and care for her students as individuals, and be excited about his subject matter (this is often hard) enough to want to communicate it.

There is an inevitable sense of conflict that comes with the territory of teaching. One of the problems centers on the different expectations of the individual teacher held by students, parents, administrators, and other teachers. These stereotypes are always hard to break. In addition, in the classroom the teacher must informally act as (in addition to the major roles of counselor and imparter of knowledge discussed earlier) a substitute

parent-figure, a disciplinarian, a record keeper, and a model citizen. The teacher feels trapped by the pressures for answers and often feels inept and uncaring when forced to admit a simple "I don't know."

Kathy is aware of the dilemmas. How does she fit in the world of the school? She feels very strongly that her first loyalty is to the students but in what capacity? Is she and should she be the evaluator of students? If not is she fulfilling her responsibility to the students? Where does the school world end and the real world begin? The maintenance vs. the educative functions of school? The dichotomy of success and failure? The emphasis placed on competitiveness? She mentions the analogy of school as a factory and wonders if this does not make meaningless the notions of humanity and individual value. I know she is conscious of her limitations and of her contributions and of the ambiguity of never knowing for sure; of the fact that she must operate on faith--a faith in herself and in humanity that transcends any formal institutionalization. She worries about the pressures of teaching, about the fear that things will get old after a while and of the possibility, though remote it might be, of going from the agony of being new into the agony of being old. The latter she describes as the syndrome of false consciousness and token security manifested in giving up, being fed-up with everything, not caring, not liking the kids, the place, and the task; taking

the law of minimum effort; the routine of punching in and out and nothing more. She is not sure. I'm not sure that I know exactly what she means, but I feel, intuitively perhaps, that her concern is one of maintaining a sense of personal meaning, a realm of integrity and authenticity of self; of not being totally and irremediably lost in the impersonal collective of institutional uniformity. I guess maybe it's the need to be vs. the need to belong.

I wondered what would develop? Where it all would lead her? Kathy told me to come back in ten years.

Charles

Charles is 33 years old. He was born and reared in Wilmington, Delaware. He majored in English and earned a teacher's certificate. Charles had a short but varied teaching experience. He taught in two different public school systems in the United States and for one semester in Southampton, England. His total tenure was six years. He is now a very successful and happy member of the real estate profession. He still, however, expresses a love for teaching and a desire to possibly some day return to teaching. I am not sure that he will ever do this, but he has found opportunities for teaching in the form of real-estate courses in a technical institute, and the design and implementation of a training and orientation program for new agents. He is very enthusiastic about this and I feel certain that he derives a great deal of personal satisfaction from it.

For Charles, the role of the salesman and the role of the teacher are not necessarily incompatible--inasmuch as all teaching necessarily involves a certain amount of selling the students the knowledge which you bring to them. Furthermore, in selling he has learned that true selling involves teaching the lay public the benefits of what services and products he has to offer. The metaphors of selling and teaching are very similar in his view. Both also require technical competency and a sense of commitment and dedication. The success of both salesman and teacher hinges on this second factor which he labeled a positive mental attitude. Technical know-how and competency are secondary to the attitude which the salesman/teacher brings into the human situation. Ultimately, he says, it comes down to the human element; curriculum, materials, physical plant are relatively unimportant. He is critical of the emphasis placed by the educational system on the "hardware" and not on the human qualities.

I wanted to get a little deeper into the world of Charles-the-teacher. Charles enjoyed school a great deal. He finished in three and a half years because he had no more money. He didn't want it to be over, but he needed a job. Charles's first teaching job was a very structured one; in fact, his getting the job depended on his ability to bring about a measure of control and orderliness to a school situation that had previously been unstructured and

chaotic. He initially liked this setting and says: "rather than launch into the unknown, I decided to give them the stability that they wanted and that I felt the students needed." Soon, however, Charles began to move away from the confines of a structured curriculum and eventually began "making my own stencils to supplement and eventually replace the books and materials we were using . . . the more I taught, the more liberal and loosely-structured I became, the more comfortable I felt in an unstructured setting . . ."

At this point, he began to realize that he was not a teacher of English any more than any high school teacher is a teacher of subject matter. He saw the role of the teacher as that of a person who inspires young people, one who can excite them about the endeavor of learning. The teacher, in this capacity becomes a cultural agent. I was curious at this notion of cultural transmission and I asked Charles to tell me more about it:

The school's main function is the transfer of culture from one generation to another to create some cultural stability. That's what I like and what I see happening. That's their total function. Create a cultural awareness in the students; to appreciate the culture and to create it as it evolves. This involves understanding ideas of your everyday life; of your reality so that they can survive and have a pleasant and meaningful existence later on; so that they will be prepared emotionally and skill-wise to have a sense of what to expect.

In this light I asked Charles if he saw schools as being a microcosm of society. This should be the goal, but it is not so in reality because of the "cocoon" atmosphere that

prevails in the schools. Schools are not in tune with society or, at least, he says, they were not when he was teaching (four years ago). He admits that he is not really in touch with what is happening now since he sees schools from a different vantage point.

One of the problems of schools is that they are removed (isolated) from the real world. Under the guises of altruism, teachers fail to provide a sense of what the real world outside is all about. He believes that teachers are basically petty, narrow in scope, and insecure financially about their jobs. They cannot be easily fired, and this sense of security tends to breed a refuge for many who teach because they cannot do anything else well--and in teaching, at least, they are sheltered from being evaluated in terms of their performance. Charles has a notion (which I am not certain I fully understand) that whereas in business poor judgment translates into failure and poor performance, this is not true in teaching where nothing really happens because evaluations of competency are generally nothing more than political games designed to "reinforce each other's deceptions and delusions."

The school system, he believes, is a rigid system with its own hidden agenda. Its chief function is to teach those messages that it deems necessary for harmony in the overall functioning. Survival is the main concern and perhaps for this reason, he believes, many good ideas are

glossed over and experimentation is generally not welcomed. This is not realistic and presents a marked dichotomy with what Charles sees as the real world. I guess one of Charles's recurring ideas is this lack of honesty on the part of schools and teachers. This, I think, he attributes to their basic insecurity in a profession that (I feel) has no self-regulatory controls. I'm not sure that Charles would agree with this comment of mine, however, for he feels that one of the problems with the schools is that decisions are made by a ruling elite of educators and not by the local community. National norms and hypothetical means dictate policy and not local concerns. He, as a parent, feels that he has no real input into what is going on in the public schools. The schools have become, he states, "an entity unto itself concerned primarily with its own survival."

I think this comes down to a feeling of alienation from part of society, a part that once was his world and now seems much more remote. His solution would be to have a means of community involvement so that the school curriculum reflects local needs. Numbers he doesn't believe present a problem. I feel that somehow the notion of community to Charles does not imply a small, closely-knit group that shares some sense of social responsibility and commonality of purpose. Instead, it is more akin to the notion that the school should be a mirror of a democratic society-- i.e., majority rule. He confesses to believing in the

concept of mass public education and he readily admits that schools are doing a good job; certainly better than what he sees as the alternative, anarchy and class conflicts. I am not sure what he means at this point, but he does say that he would not advocate shifting to a system "a-la-Summerhill."

I believe that Charles views school as a training ground for society. He is very much against the mentality of institutional dependency that the schools seem to foster in students and teachers alike. In this light he talks about the student in Updike's "A Sense of Shelter," and the fact that he could never break away from the safety and security of not having to face real problems. Schools generally reinforce this nonrealism and most teachers he has known are very unrealistic about who they are and what they do.

Charles admits that teachers and administrators have a really tough job, that they are "the front line of society's problems . . . they are the first ones to catch it and they are expected to find solutions overnight." Maybe some of them claim to do this and this may be part of that unrealism that Charles talks about. I don't really know. I got so many seemingly conflicting messages from Charles about the nature of education, the role of teachers, and the functions of schools, that I wonder if some of the messages came from Charles-the-teacher while others came

from Charles-the-businessman. I do not believe that they are one and the same. I am also not so sure that "all of Charles" wears the costume of the businessman. I am not sure how else to interpret this. Interestingly enough, in his role as critic of the system, Charles is quick to point to maladies and remedies. Some of the maladies he points to seem to be some of the dilemmas of the struggling teacher (liking the kids and wanting to teach, but being overwhelmed by the rituals and demands of the system; being able to establish a meaningful sense of community with a large group of non-academic students, while struggling with one or two individuals in a smaller, academic class who insisted on disrupting the pace of his class) while others clearly reflect the outsider (get good teachers by paying them well, have a committee of a black, a white man, and a woman to interview prospective teachers, have teachers work in something else as a required apprenticeship program, gauge teacher effectiveness by devising ways to monitor motivation and attitude levels of students, reward teachers for the measurable changes they can effect). These and many other of his comments point to solutions to problems that are geared in the framework of a product-oriented society. I know he believes that these changes could be made; from where he stands now, maybe they can. I wonder if Charles-the-teacher would have asked the same kinds of questions. Probably not, but then again his vantage point was different;

he was looking through a different lens; he was then part of the cocoon.

Charles offered four reasons for leaving the teaching profession. One, he had a difficult time dealing with his co-workers. He confessed that he could not handle what he felt were insecure, basically dishonest relationships. The school and his colleagues failed to provide the emotional support and personal setting that he wanted and/or needed at that time. The second reason was financial. Teachers are paid little and holding another job proved too much of an effort. Thirdly, he was tired of playing the game. He felt his job was to teach and he found out that he was expected to fulfill other responsibilities which the system deemed more important. Specifically, he was to be kept because they wanted him to be the yearbook adviser; the alternative would be a transfer, I guess. Finally and perhaps more importantly to Charles is that he was falling into the major pitfall of successful teachers which is that they begin to believe in their own authority, their infallibility. He felt it was beginning to be "The Charles ----- Show" and that he was the featured performer. He was not really honest with himself and began to gloss over the daily events that did not reinforce his ego. He "started experimenting, watching the kids and himself believe all that outrageous stuff and get excited about it." I guess what he means was the uncriticalness that resulted in

the entrancement of form without asking serious questions about the worth of the substance in a world where people reinforce each other's beliefs. I wonder if this scared him because it was unreal or because it might have been real? He fell into the pattern of "making mistakes and looking the other way. Now," he says, "I can see them so clearly. Only a few really good teachers can survive that and remain effective as teachers while being honest with themselves at the end of the day." I do not think he sees many of those around.

I think Charles was committed to teaching. Perhaps the pressures were too many from within and from without. He is a very sensitive individual. He is certainly sensitive to how others see him and how they react to him; on the other hand, he has too much integrity to simply do whatever needs doing for the sake of doing. I think that, in some way, he longs to be a teacher. He openly admits to that but that, I think, is his fantasy valve; his escape into what was and what could have been. He now belongs to a different world and he must see things differently. He too, I guess, wants to survive and to preserve what he values. In this sense he is no more or less altruistic than teachers. I'm not sure if he is any more or less honest with himself, although he says that he is more so now--at least as seen from where he now stands. He is now an outside critic of the system. He points to what he considers the myopic realities of the system and he is concerned about the

teacher from the social viewpoint if not from the perspective of an individual teacher.

As a teacher Charles was successful and he felt that he was. He is competitive and wants to be the best at whatever he does, he wants to like what he does, and to convey that in his professional relationships. He is now successful too. If he were to go back today I would question that he would feel equally successful. I think he would agree with this. He has changed as we all change. The reflections of the Charles-the-outsider today are not the recollections of Charles-the-teacher. The difference, I feel, is not merely a quantitative one as a result of time, but more importantly a qualitative one that reflects a different stance, a shift in world-view. Charles has, in fact, changed lenses and if the former were myopic, the present ones perhaps might suffer from the far-sightedness inherent in any outside view.

Jack

Jack is 50 years old. He is from Charlotte, North Carolina, and teaches chemistry and physics. It is hard for me to interpret my dialog with Jack. He is a quiet, easy-going individual with a pretty clearly defined set of values about what life is all about. In a way he fits my stereotype of the truly dedicated and committed science professor. He is also a down-to-earth individual with

diverse interests and activities that provide other worlds very different from his school world.

I think Jack is dedicated to his teaching because he is dedicated to his field of study (science in general and chemistry and physics in particular). He confesses to always having had a love for science and the certainty as a youngster that science was his true calling. Interestingly enough he confesses that in college he was "a chem major, and a fairly shaky one at that. I loved the subject, but I did not do really well . . . I had trouble with math . . . and got by my senior chemistry course, physical chemistry, by being in the good graces of the professor." After college, there were doubts about applying for a graduate assistantship, a hitch in the service where some teacher-buddies helped influence his decision to become a teacher, and eventually, after his discharge, his first teaching job as a lab instructor at his alma mater. At this time he also took the necessary coursework for teacher certification. Later came graduate work and an M.S. in chemistry. He has been teaching 18 years in the public schools and he admits that he has enjoyed it very much, that he really can't see himself as being anything else but a teacher. What is it about teaching that attracted him?

Jack had a lot of those ideals common to the beginning teacher. He wanted an opportunity to share his excitement and knowledge of chemistry and he confesses that "teaching

is a way for me to tell everybody how great it is. Discoveries, the laboratory way appeal to me, the process of finding things out in an orderly way. I wanted to share that interest." Today, however, he experiences that his doing this is getting harder and harder every day, and he doesn't know how much is due to changes in the students and how much to changes in himself. This, I feel, concerns him. He knows too there are no easy solutions to these dilemmas.

I wanted to find out more about these dilemmas and I asked Jack to elaborate. There has been, in his opinion, a drastic change in the attitude of high school students in the past five to ten years. He believes that "what they seem to want to know is not what I feel I should give them." More specifically he has experienced two major changes in his students. On the one hand, they do not seem as respectful or as willing to accept the teacher's authority and expertise. They are less acceptant and more questioning. The second major change involves the emphasis placed on scholarship. To Jack many students are interested only in the grade, in getting out, in efficiency. There is little evidence of love of knowledge for knowledge's sake. "Students treat school like another job; it's over for them when the day ends . . . at one time students took their books home with them intending to do homework, now they just don't bother . . ."

Jack likes to have good rapport with his students. He believes he relates well to his students but admits that he maintains a certain distance from them. He needs this detachment and he likes that alone-time away from school and students. He is realistic in considering that it is possible that students today verbalize more, that maybe they have more problems and the new role of the teacher needs to be expanded from the traditional role of teacher of subject matter. I feel that Jack sees himself primarily as a subject-oriented teacher as opposed to a student-oriented teacher or a school-oriented teacher. I certainly tend to view him as such from my vantage point as a fellow-teacher. I'm not sure that he would be very effective in the role of "teacher-as-personal-counselor" to his students. He certainly does not claim to be a "Jack-of-all-Trades."

Another important aspect of Jack's school life is his relationship with many of his academically superior students, those with whom he can share his interest in and enthusiasm for the sciences and nature. He has been adviser for the chemistry club as well as the outing club and in this capacity he has experienced many meaningful out-of-class relationships. Most of these students have been among the top students in the school and possibly shared in the joys of scholarship. It is interesting that today Jack no longer feels as close to these outstanding students. Now they do not seem, to him, as being truly dedicated to the scientific

endeavor. They are involved in many other things and have many more pragmatic concerns. "They seem outstanding still," he says, "but in a different sort of way. For them, too, the grade is more important than the knowledge derived."

Most changes within the school structure to Jack seem to point toward the de-emphasis of scholarship. Self-discipline is lacking and any efforts to implement it results in stiff resistance from students. It appears to me that Jack might also feel that, in perhaps more subtle ways, the school structure, the curriculum, and administrative policy tend to undermine rather than to reinforce the quest for scholarship. It's as if the battle line had been drawn and then it was up to the individual teacher to do what he could to maintain his standards. Jack is certainly engaged in this battle.

Compromise has been the solution. What else can be done when whole classes passively or actively refused to comply? Fail them all? How much does one need to dilute one's standards of excellence until they no longer have any meaning? How flexible can one be? Jack asks himself these and other questions and I don't believe he has answered them. On the other hand, he has not turned his back on them either. This very real state of tension is with him.

I know that Jack feels that regardless of how flexible and adaptive he is, he will always have to do something which he knows and believes is right; he cannot delude

himself on that point; as he says: "I just can't go bending around like a rubber band, so I still have a struggle every year . . ." It is ultimately a question of giving in in order to survive in the system, but how much to give in and still be able to live with yourself? In this paradox lies the essence of the statement Jack made that teaching is getting harder and harder; i.e., more and more compromises. I personally don't see Jack as being very adaptive and I know that he is too committed to his principles and beliefs to merely "blow with the winds of change." Unlike many of his co-workers, Jack is not merely content to punch in and out, to comply with the form and to let the substance go where it may; he has too much personal integrity (and perhaps stubbornness) for that.

Jack has developed his own coping mechanisms to function as an individual in the institutional context of the school. He feels antagonized by what he feels are nit-picking, trivial demands which the system places on him as a teacher. He senses the pressures for the teachers to go through the motions without any real concern for the significance of what they are asked to do. He is bothered by this emphasis on form devoid of meaning, of blanket statements designed to control and standardize within the system. How does he cope with these attempts? How does he deal with institutional demands and expectations? How does he remain "alive"?

Jack tends to ignore rules and regulations. He evaluates all that he is expected of him, and then he devotes his time and effort to doing well those things which he considers of priority. What are those things? For Jack his main concern is the teaching of his subject matter. This is the handle through which he finds personal meaning. To this he devotes nearly all of his school time. He confesses to not being very organized and wonders (a bit enviously? a bit critically perhaps?) how so many teachers can spend so much time in the lounge instead of planning for their classes. Jack, I know, cannot accept that a teacher would not prepare for, immerse himself in, and put himself into his classes. He didn't say this, but I feel that in Jack's view, the teacher's cardinal sin would be not to teach with the dedication and conviction that any kind of technical-academic knowledge demands.

I would have to consider Jack an academician, his concern with the role of the schools and the functions of education transcend the notion that schools should prepare youngsters to function as effective citizens in society. He says that in his role as subject matter teacher, there's a lot more to what education in the school is all about. He says: "My role is to do more . . . maybe there is a little higher purpose above simply being a good citizen . . . maybe being a scholar or at least appreciating the place that science occupies in this world . . ." This was

the idealistic Jack coming through, the one who could expound at length on the need to know science and philosophy of science in relation to our lives.

We spoke about the schools of today. He fondly remembers the years when schools seemed to have the coherence of a community. He has not felt this in many years. After the transition years of integration and rezoning he expected another sense of school identity, of spirit of community to develop; but instead, the school became more and more an impersonal center for the imparting of knowledge without any sense of purpose and meaning as a center for learning and growth. Today's school is lacking any sense of belongingness. He confesses that he too is guilty of remaining isolated. He can and does work well with others, but generally he does not play their game. He senses sometimes that he should perhaps become more involved and be more of a contributor, but he lacks any sense of personal relationship with his colleagues. He talks about this:

They've learned not to put me on committees because I don't go to the meetings. I don't want to sound self-righteous, but I put all my efforts in the classroom where I think it counts and should count . . . I used to be really involved with the faculty in the sense of community, comraderie, faculty club, dinners, volleyball games, socials . . . today I eat with some teachers in the dining room and I don't know them well enough even to talk to them . . . it's not a racial thing either . . . it's just that this sense of unity has gone and nothing has replaced it.

He indicates that in the absence of a feeling of community, artificial rituals and rites are implemented to provide the

semblance if not the feeling of involvement. This fosters compliance but not commitment, alienation and not participation.

Where is it all leading to for Jack? Is it still worth the struggle? Well, no doubt that Jack is still very much a teacher and that, in the midst of these attempts to "dilute," he still sees himself as a viable force for scholarship and academic excellence. He still has the sense of mission and there is that concern for teaching youngsters to think, to develop a sense of self-discipline and a pride in academic accomplishment. To him the challenge is there along with the doubts and the anxieties inherent in a school world that no longer seems in line with his own. He worries about how effective and viable he is and can remain as a teacher. He summarized his feelings at the conclusion of our session. He said:

It's easier to punch in and out. I hope that before I ever did that, I would have enough sense to get out. Even with the problems, I still see my classes as a challenge, and I still hope that I can instill in them the desire to do the work that I think is important . . . It's tough to simply get out . . . I've thought about it but I never checked to see what else is available. I know it may come to that one day. I like the financial security and I hope that things don't turn sour before I have my time in . . . especially since things have been as tough as they have lately . . . In spite of everything, I like what I have too much and I don't know that I am ready to give it up . . . I'm not ready to take that risk . . .

Jack is an individual committed to his profession. He is a teacher of students, but above all he is a chemistry

and physics teacher. He is dedicated to his subject matter and perhaps even more to teaching it--not simply the knowledge but the awareness, excitement, and personal meaning that he experiences and that can be derived from such an endeavor. The school provides his forum, the students his (hopefully willing and interested) audience, and the subject matter his *raison d'être*. This is the passion and sense of mission lying within a calm and quiet façade. The fires of emotion burn hot even in the rational and orderly world of a scientific mind. I think this is what enables Jack to remain struggling and alive.

CHAPTER V
REFLECTIONS ON THE INQUIRY

The World of Teachers: As Four Teachers See It

The purpose of this study has been to obtain a sense of person of the teacher, and the focus has been on four individual teachers. Because the emphasis has been on the uniquely human side of teaching, it would be inappropriate and unlikely that findings could be summarized in any specific or clear-cut fashion. On the other hand, at this point in the inquiry it is necessary to reflect on what has transpired in order to try to gain more insight into the world of the individual teacher.

In this final chapter I want to reconsider the guiding questions with which I started this inquiry (Who is the teacher? How does he see himself in his school-world? How does he feel?) in light of my experiences with the four individual teachers. There are some general findings that I have extracted from these dialogs and some recommendations which these interpretations (new wisdom) suggest.

I began this study with a basic assumption that there are teachers who remain "alive" in the school as opposed to those who become absorbed by it and lose their own sense of individuality. The former remain viable and alert as teachers while the latter are primarily the ones who simply punch in and out and are content with "doing time." What

makes a teacher remain alive transcends any specific prescriptions such as a certain teaching style, a certain conception of education and schooling, or a certain way of developing rapport with superiors, colleagues, and students. All of these factors are, of course, important, but no single combination of them can insure that the teacher remains individually alive. Remaining alive depends on many factors that are intangible and defy categorization. This indefiniteness notwithstanding, there are certain "common denominators" that seem to characterize those individual teachers who remain alive. The four teachers who were the subjects of this inquiry, I feel, have managed to retain that aliveness. Through our dialogs I have identified some general themes which might help us understand better the process of remaining alive and the uncertainty and apprehension it entails. The subsequent analysis and interpretation of these themes are not intended to be a general profile of "teachers who are alive." Instead, it is a reflection of four individual teachers in light of their struggle to remain alive in the school.

The Individual and the Institution

Remaining alive is not a resultant static condition, but a dynamic state; i.e., one manages and struggles to remain alive as opposed to attaining it and remaining alive. Characteristic of this struggle is a state of tension present within the individual. Each of the participants

in this study reflected the awareness of this tension in a number of different ways. Generally, the tension was the result of the individual perceiving himself/herself as being in an adversary stance vis-à-vis the school. The school became the embodiment of a large, impersonal institution that exerted certain regulatory and controlling functions on them as part of that organization. The four participants seemed to indicate that the school, as a rule, did not really facilitate their purpose in the school. Paradoxically, they all felt that the school (institutional policy) tended to undermine what they felt was important in education, but they also acknowledged that the school was a necessary mechanism through which they could fulfill their responsibilities. Part of the teachers' tension reflected their resentment toward the organization which defined their roles and of which they felt a part.

Charles's concern for an effective process of socialization in the school runs counter to what he sees as the narrow definitions of curriculum, teacher's role, and over emphasis on academic excellence. He reacts against the "hardware emphasis" placed by the schools (materials, physical plant, technological instruction) that prevents the teacher from being an effective cultural messenger. To Charles, all attempts to package curriculum according to national norms are inappropriate efforts to legislate

education from "the outside," and undermine the sense of local community and weaken the influence of the teacher.

Kathy is a second year teacher and still suffers from what she calls the "agony of being new" although she confesses that this year she feels much more comfortable and sure of herself. Kathy's clashes against the system seem to reflect what she perceives as discrepancies between her ideas of professionalism, and the written rules and unwritten expectations of the school that define professionalism for the teacher. She reacts very strongly to this and feels that under the guises of professionalism, the school is able to extend its domain of control over the teachers. As a first year teacher, she felt she was "fair game" as one of those on whom the school could exercise its power. Her first year she was able to accept this more easily, but this year she feels more capable of drawing boundaries beyond which the legitimacy of institutional control can be questioned. Although she is still concerned about keeping her job, she seems more aware of what she can and cannot do and of the consequences of each. This awareness does not diminish the tension she experiences, but it puts it in a different perspective.

Jack seems to react against the emphasis placed on the socialization functions of the school. He senses that teachers are asked to play roles that dilute or undermine their effectiveness as teachers. His frustrations as a

teacher reflect what he calls the changing times that have resulted in the school not upholding academic excellence as its chief goal. He resents many of the rules and regulations imposed on him as a teacher because they take him away from the important functions of the classroom. A major portion of Jack's adversary stance reflects his reaction against any efforts that detract from the task of classroom instruction of subject matter.

Joe's reaction is more involved than a simple concern for academic excellence. He experiences the tension of being asked to perform an impossible task; i.e., that of mass education. Joe is, I think, an elitist in his view of education. He reacts against any notions that everybody can be taught art; in fact, he is not certain that art (the aesthetic experience) could ever be taught as the schools now define teaching and learning. He acknowledges that all he teaches is technique and resists (in thought if not in deed) what he feels are the school's effort to teach art "by the numbers" and to create the impression that this is teaching the students art. Unlike Jack who seems to know what his role is (or should be), Joe does not seem able to really define his mission as clearly. Like Jack, he resents some of the trivial, time-consuming activities that he is asked to do. Jack seems to be better at quietly ignoring many of these while Joe seems to be more vocal about them; but then Jack is a more reserved individual

than Joe. Each responds to this state of tension in a different way.

A state of tension between the individual and the institution such as I have described is, I feel, a necessary condition to maintain one's aliveness. Viktor Frankl (1959) indicates that "man's search for meaning is a primary force in his life . . . this meaning is unique and specific in that it must and can only be fulfilled by him alone; only then does it achieve a significance that will satisfy his own will-to-meaning" (p. 154). This search, he says, originates in a state of tension and the result is not a final resolution of the tension, but a temporary state of balance. The individual must remain aware if he is to feel the impact of the tension.

Compromise and Adaptability

As important as this state of tension is to remain alive, it is important to adapt to institutional pressures. These four individuals are also very aware of the need for flexibility; i.e., the importance of compromise--not simply to survive, but to maintain one's viability. All four of them agree that it would be impossible to function in the school without adapting and compromising. On the other hand, they all believe that there is a point beyond which compromise is impossible and furthermore, that there are some areas in which they could not compromise at all. I was surprised to see how adaptable these four individuals were and how diverse were their modes of compromise.

Charles left the teaching profession after five years of teaching. He indicates that he was not able to put up with the lack of collegial support, the arbitrariness of school policy, and the fact that his teaching function was secondary to some non-teaching duties which he had been assigned by the administration that year. In addition, he seemed to react to all of this by taking refuge in his classes on his own ego-boosting experience. This, he states, is often the pitfall of successful teachers who get so taken by their charisma in the classroom that they become insensitive to the needs of the students. He sensed that he was losing his effectiveness by "taking himself too seriously" and by being too uncritical as teaching became another unquestionable reality. For Charles, this uncritical attitude toward what he was doing represented his loss of individual aliveness and he chose to leave then and not to risk losing it. He admits to having a low threshold for compromise. Perhaps for that reason, he is still fond of teaching even though he acknowledges that he will probably never go back to it.

Charles was one of those teachers who was always noticeable in school, even in his first year. He had (what I call) saliency in the school. Some teachers seem to have this saliency even though they maintain a relatively low profile in school and professional activities. Some teachers are salient by the fact that they are clearly different,

others stand out almost by omission; i.e., by the fact that they stay conspicuously away from the bustle of the daily routine. In any case, the degree of saliency seems to be a factor in the way each of these teachers adapts and compromises to institutional demands and expectations.

Kathy's saliency her first year was her newness. She was aware that year that neophytes were more likely to be told what to do and how to do it. In addition, her heavy load of "basic courses" generated a number of discipline problems that brought her often in contact with the administration. This year she feels she blends in better and is less vulnerable in that respect.

Jack's saliency is his reputation as a dedicated teacher. He purposely maintains a low profile with a minimum of involvement in school activities outside the classroom. In a quiet way, he ignores many of the rules and regulations that are passed down. He seems to have developed a system so that he is "left alone to teach." Like Kathy, he is aware of the compromises he makes in order to function and yet maintain his personal integrity. Compromise for him is a pragmatic issue; he realizes he must adapt to be viable, but he also acknowledges that what he does must ultimately be what he thinks and believes is right. Kathy, on the other hand, is less able to rationally explain and accept compromises; she seems less able and willing to adapt

in any specified ways. She confesses that teaching is a momentary experience and more emotion- than reason-bound.

It is interesting to note that Kathy and Charles (whom I have considered to be primarily person-oriented) seem to have a more difficult time compromising than Joe and Jack (whom I have considered to be primarily subject matter-oriented). Charles taught for only five years, Kathy confesses that the emotional investment is such that she probably cannot last very long as a teacher without either going insane or becoming insensitive. Joe and Jack have each taught for about twenty years. Perhaps they went through this phase of personal involvement with their students and had to shift to another level of orientation in order to maintain their aliveness. Both Joe and Jack confess that they do not consider themselves as student oriented (in the sense of having close personal rapport with the students). Both of them expressed a need for a certain amount of privacy away from the students and neither is inclined to encourage personal relationships outside of the instructional realm.

Jack's compromise, I feel, represents the most clear-cut form of compromise. He accepts the changing standards as the reality of the times and even though he feels that they are detrimental to the purposes of the school, he claims he still looks forward to "the struggle every year." He seems to enjoy this challenge, perhaps in his own mind there

is a certain degree of scientific curiosity to discovering just how much he can adapt.

Joe, I think has compromised through a very elaborate process of rationalization. He has divorced Joe the teacher from Joe the artist. He has surrendered much in the former, but little if any in the latter. His aliveness centers on his self-view as an artist and as an aesthetic critic. His compromise is a matter of "playing the game" at one level while protecting the integrity of the other domain. On the other hand, he confesses to his reluctance to "letting the artist out" because he then becomes vulnerable. Joe confesses that he is at the stage where he wishes to minimize the risks. In a way it is better to keep the artist protected in a relatively private inner sanctum than to have him compromise with the demands of the school. Joe's compromise seems to reflect two different people who speak two different languages in two very different tones. When Joe the artist comes out, he becomes salient or, as he says, gets in trouble.

Kathy, Joe, and Jack are aware that they need to give in, and each in his/her own way gives in. Charles did the same in his tenure as a teacher. From his present vantage point outside teaching, Charles sees the need for the teacher to compromise in order to meet the needs of mass education (socialization in his view). Kathy sees compromise as being accepted enough not to be singled out and

picked on about trivial matters that, she says, nobody really considers important. Jack and Joe seem to "get by with more"; perhaps, they have been in so long that they have paid their dues. I think that they intuitively know when their professional judgments will be questioned by the system. They act with the authority of teachers who know where they stand vis-à-vis the school. I think this comes largely with a successful teaching experience which both Joe and Jack have. Unlike Kathy and Charles, Jack and Joe have already left their unique marks in ways which may not be viewed as totally desirable by the school, but are nonetheless clearly respected.

The differences between Joe and Jack in the way each adapts to the institution reflect their individual orientations toward teaching. Jack seems to embody the "blacks and whites" of the rational scientific mind and Joe seems more imbued with the "shades of gray" of the artist.

Personal Orientation--Sense of Purpose

In the school world of these four individuals, personal meaning is found in the classroom exchanges, in the individual relationships with students, in the satisfaction of sharing knowledge and skills, in the attainment of academic excellence, and in the satisfaction of introducing the students to new realities. Whatever each individual teacher does, he must find a sense of purpose, a *raison d'être* through which he can remain individually identifiable to himself as he

comes against the system. He/she must remain apart from the system while staying within it in a paradoxical existence. This dualism is characteristic of the tension of aliveness I have been discussing. Each of these individuals finds a sense of purpose that is reflected in his/her primary concern as a teacher. Each seems to hold a personal orientation that embodies his/her conception of teaching, learning, and education, as well as a more general outlook on life. These personal orientations become their vantage points. My dialogs with them were attempts to see them and their world through their individual vantage points.

As I have already mentioned, Kathy and Charles are more person oriented than Jack and Joe who tend to be more oriented toward their subject matter. Both Kathy and Charles indicated a concern with establishing meaningful relationships with their students. For Charles this entailed enhancing his rapport with the class as a group. For Kathy it meant establishing individual relationships that showed the students she really cared for them as persons. The nature of the relationship was not as important to Charles as was the outcome of the relationship; i.e., to inspire and motivate his students. The teacher, in his view, is chiefly a cultural messenger who transmits knowledge that fosters cultural awareness and results in cultural stability. The teacher is an enculturation agent and the school is the proper place for this to take place.

The antithesis of this educational process (open education) to Charles would result in chaos and anarchy. He has a broad democratic view of education and sees the teacher's role as being too narrowly defined by the schools. He feels that teachers teach youngsters and not subject matter and that enculturation and socialization functions far outweigh scholarly concerns through primary and secondary education.

Kathy does not seem to share this concern for mass education. Her focus is more on the individual student; on reaching that one troubled student in the classroom. She wants to make a significant difference in the life of the student and she realizes that she can only reach a few. She places more emphasis on fewer meaningful relationships than on attempting to reach everyone on the surface. She is concerned, however, with maintaining this stance while at the same time not losing all the traditional teacher concerns of discipline, standards of performance, and evaluation. Kathy likes students, and she likes being a helper to them academically and personally.

Jack and Joe are more subject matter oriented in their approach to teaching. They acknowledge that their students are important primarily through the knowledge and insights which they, as teachers, can share. For Jack this translates into the joy of scientific discovery and the challenges of rational exploration with his classes. For Joe it is to

enable the individual student to undertake his elusive search for the aesthetic experience. They both see as their primary responsibility conveying this knowledge and awareness to their students. However, aside from the fact that their respective disciplines are important to each of them, they do not share a vision of their mission as teachers.

Jack's goal is academic excellence and scholarly concerns with a well-defined set of boundaries that tells him what is acceptable and what is not. Joe does not seem to be so readily able to define what he should do as a teacher. If Jack is a dispenser of knowledge and a source of scholarship, Joe is more of a specialist who cannot easily convey his craft. His goal is more to become an agent of change that will trigger the individual to seek his own artistic reality in spite of the confines of the school and the curriculum. He is truly dedicated to those who can engage in this search, but these, he says, are not many. He makes it clear that mass education and art appreciation are incompatible. The ideal setting for Joe would be the medieval apprenticeship where he, like don Juan (Castaneda, 1968) can let the novice uncover a previously hidden world. If Joe the artist is an agent of change and a specialist, then Joe the teacher, I feel, is more of an employee who follows the pace of the institution.

The Interpersonal Dimension

The four teachers also reflected on the feeling of belongingness and sense of community (both personal and professional) in the school.

This concern is expressed by Joe as he talks about modern man's attempt to "disconnect himself from his emotions and from his fellow man." An underlying dimension of his dialogs is his belief that technological-materialistic concerns undermine the sense of community in man and this, he adds, is reflected in the school and in what it values. The school, he says, operates on a consumer-oriented basis of turning out a definable product and, in this framework, the collegial-social support aspect of teaching is minimized because "there is no time to get together." Everybody, he mentions, is too busy doing his own thing.

Jack also expresses a lack of meaningful personal relationships by acknowledging that he would like to be able to have more rapport with his students and colleagues. He confesses, however, that he has trouble in the classroom "trying to be humanistic and, at the same time, demanding enough to force the lazy student out of his sloppy habits."

Kathy and Charles also echo the feeling that professional camaraderie is minimal or nonexistent, but express no major problems establishing and maintaining relationships in the classroom.

The lack of a sense of community in the school as well as the absence of professional-collegial ties were themes resonated by all four participants as they indicated that "professional communication" amounted to little more than institutional messages handed down to the teachers. They considered that this could be due in part to the fact that teachers remain relatively isolated in their own classrooms during the normal course of events. On the other hand, these very same teachers also expressed satisfaction at being left alone. Jack might have accounted for this contradiction when he distinguished between institutional rituals that give the semblance but not the substance of community, and the interpersonal bonds that provide spiritual, social, and professional support. For these four teachers, the school does not seem to foster the latter. In some form each participant manifests a need for significant interpersonal relationships in the school world.

Some Generalizations

Taken collectively, the experiences I have had throughout this inquiry seem to point to new insights I have derived from the inquiry with the four participant teachers as well as from the review of those works that convey a sense of person of the teacher; i.e., primarily the works of Lortie (1975) and Jackson (1968). The nature of this inquiry is such, however, that I cannot presume to make sweeping generalizations about the teacher. My findings,

therefore, are intended to suggest possibilities and not to prescribe categorical conclusions with any degree of finality. With this understanding, I want to share some of these personal insights.

First, there seems to be--as Lortie (1975) indicates-- a general sense of "teacherness" that is perceived by individual teachers and which, in their view, seems to provide a general character or flavor that defines the world of the school and the occupation.

Second, Jackson (1969) states that for most teachers the reality of the school world centers around the classroom. The activities within the classroom seem to provide the teachers with their most immediate reality as most teachers tend to consider what happens there as their own private domain. It is in the classroom that they feel they can "make the difference" and it is there where they tend to find or create personal meaning.

Third, teachers seem to be in a potential adversary stance against the system (institutional demands for conformity) and whether or not they actively experience this tension depends on whether or not they view as problematic the nature of institutional givens.

Fourth, teachers (e.g., the four participants in this inquiry) who seem consciously aware of this tension or dissonance between their individual efforts and institutional efforts seem to take an active dialogical stance through

which they are more likely to see themselves and their world¹ from a variety of vantage points. This is what I have identified as a sense of "aliveness" which allows some teachers to maintain their individual integrity and to remain viable forces in the school. I have distinguished these teachers from those teachers who are not significantly aware of any tension and who are simply "doing time," and whose individual existence in the school is seldom viewed as problematic.

Fifth, the sense of aliveness of the individual teacher seems to hinge around the capacity to develop a personal, redeeming orientation toward education. Maintaining a sense of aliveness appears to be easier for teachers who have a subject matter orientation than for those who dwell more on their personal relationships with students. It appears that defining the expertise in subject matter as the major priority provides the teachers with a buffer to minimize the importance of teacher-student relationships outside the realm of classroom knowledge. Possibly the perimeter of knowledge is less problematic to stake out and defend (i.e., it is more predictable) than the interpersonal one. The four participants in this inquiry provided some clues that revealed a greater degree of vulnerability for those teachers who are person-oriented. Perhaps there are shifts and changes in

emphasis in orientations as the individual teachers struggle to maintain their aliveness.

Sixth, certain paradoxical situations seem to "come with the territory" for teachers who are alive: efforts to be accepting of students while placing demands on them, efforts to intervene in the life of a student while acknowledging the need for the student to make authentic choices, and a need for a feeling of personal-professional community while desiring to be left alone and resenting intrusions into their private domain. All of these reflect the paradox inherent in "being alive" and embody the idea of questioning the very ground upon which one chooses to stand.

Seventh, aliveness seems to be a process and not a product. Teachers who are alive do not simply find themselves alive, but struggle to be so. Inherent in the process is a certain apprehension and uncertainty; however, to quote one of my participants, "without the agony, there would be no joy in the quest."

Methodology

The methodological question has been an important aspect of this study inasmuch as the method chosen enabled me to probe in ways that would not be possible through conventional research techniques. The "inner view of man" which I chose to take in this inquiry allows for a multiplicity of perspectives in the process of interpretation and

understanding as evidenced in my dialogs with the four participants.

Inherent in the dialogical framework of my study is the belief that I could only obtain a sense of person of the individual teacher by attempting to take his unique vantage point and sharing his perceptual world. In my inquiry stance I have acknowledged the impossibility of ever taking the role of another; however, I have also stated the need of approximating it. I have thus attempted to look from within and to take that view back "outside" to my stance as a more distanced, reflective critic. Harvey Cox (1973) summarizes this shift of stances and its impact when he talks about the apprenticeship of Castaneda (1968) learning from the inside the mysteries of the sorcerer's calling:

. . . he could no longer simply study his master-tutor. He had to struggle with him, fight against him, argue with him . . . he also learned to abandon many of the academic prejudices he had brought with him to the relationship. But he did not discard all his previous skills . . . we must use our heads, but we must also be willing to become apprentices to whoever will teach us the lore . . . (p. 146)

The stance of the participant-observer-critic reflects Castaneda's (1968) attempt to view from inside and yet not totally divest oneself of one's own view. The advantage of the participant-observer view from within acquires a new meaning as it is filtered through the distanced perspective of the critic. Unlike a traditional objective stance

(or a claim to such a stance), the participant-observer-critic is not so far removed that he is unable to make any statements of real value. This stance acknowledges the assumption that ultimately "only the man inside knows. His judgments may not be objective; his evaluations may be out of proportion, but this is inevitable" (Frankl, 1959, p. 8).

The Inner View of man allows for a deeper understanding of what human means. To understand man it is necessary to consider "disclosure of possibilities as well as exposition of actualities of human being" (Heschel, 1965, p. 5). In this light, my approach has attempted to look at what is and what can be from the vantage points of individuals. My concern is with the unique individual and not with the predictable average. A traditional inquiry seeking proof rather than understanding could not have preserved the integrity of the individual viewpoint; "it would distort him by disregarding his uniqueness" (p. 38).

I have been able to experience four individual viewpoints on the world of the teacher. I have attempted to share their views by remaining open to their vantage points. Needless to say, in such an open stance, I am aware that I have also shared my views with them. One of the potential dangers of this interpretive approach is that it becomes quite easy to color the perceptions of others through one's own filters. I am certain that to some extent I too have "put words in their mouths" and provided closure where

perhaps there was none. Regardless of the fact that my inquiry approach was unstructured, I was nonetheless bound by the very openness which I wanted to maintain. In order to gain the sense of person I desired, I might not have been completely faithful in every aspect of inquiry and interpretation. I believe that a certain amount of this bias, however, is inevitable inasmuch as it is inherent in our being human.

In defense of my stance, I can acknowledge the care and conscious intent that, I feel, embody the integrity of this inquiry effort. Inasmuch as I have not claimed an objective stance, I can accept the possible distortions that my personal involvement in this study entails. Inasmuch as I am not testing a hypothesis, I do not feel compelled to establish proof or lack of it. Inasmuch as I am not relying on the external validity of procedural constructs, I do not have to sacrifice substance for form. Inasmuch as I do not expect a replication of findings, I do not feel compelled to provide statistical criteria of significance. And, inasmuch as I have adopted the individual and not the average viewpoint, I expect to make no sweeping generalizations.

I do, however, accept the responsibility for giving the reader a sense of direction, for providing guidelines, and for making explicit the basic assumptions from which this inquiry generates. I believe that choosing this

modality of inquiry necessitates the same sense of rigor and discipline that is embodied in any serious research effort. It is the openness and sensitivity of this approach that require the researcher to remain alert to the potential pitfalls of his journey. Unlike the traditional researcher, the interpretive inquirer has no pre-specified criteria of validity, reliability, predictability, control, and proof to judge the adequacy of his research effort. Yet, he too must take responsibility for the worth of his endeavor.

Suggestions for Further Inquiries

The application of interpretive methodologies to the study of the teacher opens up a number of possibilities for further inquiry. In the process of my own inquiry, it seemed that every question asked and every issue explored generated a new dimension of questions and implications. Obviously, I cannot hope to explore (at least with any degree of thoroughness) all the "branches of the road" in this particular endeavor. Nonetheless, there are a number of potential issues which seem to warrant further inquiry. These suggestions, of course, are meant to be illustrative and not exhaustive of all possibilities.

One of these issues concerns the personal orientation of the teacher. It appears that teachers hold qualitatively different personal orientations as they remain alive in the school. Some seem to be subject matter oriented and others person oriented. Are there any other major

identifiable personal orientations (e.g., school oriented, profession oriented)? If so, what human characteristics define these other orientations? Is the teacher's orientation reflected in any way in his perspective outside the school world? Are these orientations fixed or changeable?

Another dimension of inquiry would be to explore the changes in emphasis or shifts of orientations that teachers undergo. What are the implications of these? Is it possible that teachers go through a series of stages throughout their teaching experience? One of my original notions was that teachers might go through some levels that reflect a kind of professional growth. Along this line of inquiry, it might prove insightful to consider notions of teacher developmental stages through some conceptual models of development (e.g., Erikson's psychosocial stages). Are new teachers of the same "kind" as veteran teachers or are differences of degree more prevalent? Are some orientations more likely to survive than others? This last question opens up the area of why some teachers seem to have a longer "alive-span" than others in the system. What do we know about those who do not make it? About those who just "do time"? About those who are marginal?

Another area suggested by this inquiry is the exploration of individual teachers in longitudinal studies. These case studies might involve periodic dialogs with a participant-observer-critic, keeping a detailed log of

inner experiences, and sharing interpretive experiences with fellow teachers. The notion of sharing sessions of this type was alluded to by one of the participants in the inquiry.

Another example of an area that warrants further inquiry is the interpersonal dimension, especially as it pertains to identifying and understanding the nature of relationships between teacher and student in the classroom setting. New insights into how the teacher copes in this important area can enhance our understanding of another "assumed given" of the teacher's world.

I believe that the teacher, to be properly understood, needs to be studied in human terms that transcend knowledge of occupational characteristics, measurement of classroom effectiveness, and comparison of statistical norms. This study has attempted to focus on the uniquely human side of teaching in the firm belief that "teaching is an intensely personal matter" (Combs, 1965, p. 25).

At this point, I hope that the reader has been able to share with the participants and with me in this exploratory venture. Furthermore, I hope he can appreciate the elusiveness, complexity, and subtlety of the teacher's world. It is essential to be aware of the conflict, uncertainty, and ambiguity inherent in being a teacher in order to gain a real understanding of what teaching is all about.

The search has been an uncertain and apprehensive journey for me; however, the experience has had the inimitable quality of a personally meaningful search.

In Retrospect

I have told myself that one of the best dissertations I could ever write would be an account of what went into this work. Over the past two years, I have been funneling and filtering ideas through until I realized that what I really wanted to do was to inquire into an area of my life that was of great personal significance. In a sense, I did not really do this study, I lived it.

This study is ultimately about me. In a very real sense I am the subject as well as the inquirer. I am studying four individual teachers because I am interested in them, in how they see themselves, in how they feel, in what they do, and in who they are as teachers. These are also the same questions that I find myself asking of me as I go about the daily grind of teaching.

Given the limitations inherent in the study, I am certain that it has talked to the participants in a very personal way. It has certainly done that to me; I am not yet sure to what extent because I have had to temper my involvement with the detachment needed to conduct the work.

The discipline of the researcher and the personal involvement of the participant have been illuminating at times; at times frustrating and confusing as I have

wondered repeatedly "what part of me" was saying what and why. A frequent problem was that my thinking and conceptualizing seemed to race far ahead of my writing; i.e., I often found I was ahead of myself and had difficulty looking back.

I believe that ultimately the choice is to do a dissertation that is "out there," or one that is inside of you. I am certain there are peculiarities that characterize each and give it its own unique flavor. For better or for worse I chose to do the one that lies inside, one that I did not need to create, but only to detect. I am glad I made this choice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bacon, Francis. Selections (M. T. McClure, Ed.). New York: Scribner's, 1928.
- Bakan, D. On method. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.
- Becker, H. S. Sociological work. Chicago: Aldine, 1970.
- Becker, H. S., Geer, B., & Hughes, E. C. Making the grade. New York: Wiley, 1968.
- Becker, H. S., Geer, B., Hughes, E. C., & Strauss, A. L. Boys in white. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Berger, P. Invitation to sociology: A humanistic perspective. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co. 1963.
- Berper, P., & Luckman, T. The social construction of reality. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1966.
- Bidwell, C. The school as a formal organization. Handbook of organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.
- Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of education goals, Handbook I: Cognitive domain. New York: McKay, 1956.
- Brody, N., & Oppenheim, P. Methodological differences between behaviorism and phenomenology. Psychological Review, 1967, 74, 330-334.
- Bruyn, S. T. The human perspective in sociology: The methodology of participant observation. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Buber, M. Between man and man. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.
- Castaneda, C. The teachings of don Juan. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1968.
- Castaneda, C. A separate reality. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971.

- Cicourel, A. Method and measurement in sociology. London: Free Press, 1964.
- Combs, A. A perceptual view of the adequate personality. Perceiving, behaving, becoming: A new focus for education. Washington, D. C.: ASCD Yearbook, 1962.
- Combs, A. The personal approach to good teaching. Educational Leadership, 1964, 21, 369-377.
- Combs, A. The professional education of teachers: A perceptual view of teacher preparation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965.
- Combs, A., Avila, D. L., & Purkey, W. W. Helping relationships. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Corwin, R. G. A sociology of education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.
- Cox, H. The seduction of the spirit. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973.
- Delamont, S., & Hamilton, D. Classroom research: A critique and a new approach. In M. Stubbs & S. Delamont (Eds.), Explorations in classroom observation. London: Wiley, 1976.
- Douglas, J. D. Understanding everyday life. San Diego: Aldine, 1970.
- Dreeben, R. On what is learned in school. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.
- Dunkin, M. J., & Biddle, B. J. The study of teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1974.
- Durkheim, E. The rules of sociological method (8th ed.). New York: Free Press, 1950.
- Eisner, E. In D. Hamilton, et al. (Eds.), Beyond the numbers game: A reader in educational evaluation. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1977.
- Flanders, N. C. Interaction analysis in the classroom; A manual for observers. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1960.
- Frankl, V. Man's search for meaning. New York: Pocket Books, 1959.

- Friedheim, E. A. Sociological theory in research and practice. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1976.
- Gage, N. L. Theories of teaching. In E. R. Hilgard, (Ed.), Theories of learning and instruction. N.S.S.E. Yearbook No. 63, Part I. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Gage, N. L. Teacher effectiveness and teacher education: The search for a scientific basis. Palo Alto, CA.: Pacific Books, 1972.
- Giorgi, A. Psychology as a human science: A phenomenologically based approach. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Grace, G. R. Role conflict and the teacher. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.
- Greene, M. Existential encounters and moral education. In M. Levit, (Ed.), Curriculum. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1971.
- Greene, M. Teacher as Stranger. Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth, 1973.
- Greene, M. Curriculum and consciousness. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975.
- Greene, M. The paradoxes of praxis. Unpublished paper. New York: Teachers College of Columbia University, 1977.
- Greene, M. The humanities and the emancipatory possibility. Unpublished paper. New York: Teachers College of Columbia University, 1978.
- Gross, N. Some contributions of sociology to the field of education. In Teachers College Record and Harvard Educational Review (Eds.), Problems and issues in contemporary education. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1968.
- Guilford, J. P. The structure of intellect. Psychological Bulletin, 1956, 53, 267-293.
- Heschel, A. Who is man? Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1965.

- Hiller, J. H. Verbal response indicators of conceptual vagueness. American Educational Research Journal, 1971, 8, 151-161
- Husserl, E. Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology (W. H. B. Gibson, trans). New York: Collier, 1962.
- Jackson, P. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.
- Jackson, P. In D. Hamilton, et al. (Eds.), Beyond the numbers game; a reader in educational evaluation. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1977.
- Jacobs, G. (Ed.), The participant observer: Encounters with social reality. New York: George Braziller, 1970.
- Jersild, A. T. When teachers face themselves. New York: Teachers College Press, 1955.
- Knoblock, P., & Goldstein, A. P. The lonely teacher. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Kounin, J. S. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.
- Lamm, Z. Conflicting theories of instruction. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1976.
- Lieberman, M. Education as a profession. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956.
- Lipe, D., & Jung, S. M. Manipulating incentives to enhance school learning. Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41, 249-280.
- Lofland, J. Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis. Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth, 1971.
- Lortie, D. C. Schoolteacher. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Madge, J. The tools of social science. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1953.

- Marsh, L. G. Being a teacher. New York: Praeger, 1973.
- Mead, M. The school in American culture. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1951.
- Measel, W. W. The relationship between teacher influence and levels of thinking of second grade teachers and pupils. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan, 1967.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. The structure of behavior (A. Fisher, trans.). Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. Phenomenology and the science of man. In J. Edie (Ed.), The primacy of perception. Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1964.
- Misseldine, W. H. Your inner child of the past. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963.
- Moffett, J., & McElheney, K. (Eds.) Points of view. New York: Signet, 1966.
- Nuthall, G., & Snook, I. Contemporary models of teaching. In R. W. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. New York: Rand McNally, 1973.
- Parsons, T. The social system. Glencoe: Free Press, 1951.
- Polanyi, M. The tacit dimension. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1966.
- Psathas, G. (Ed.). Phenomenological sociology: Issues and applications. New York: Wiley, 1973.
- Purkey, W. Self concept and school achievement. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Rosenshine, B. Teaching behaviours and student achievement. London: National Foundation for Educational Research, 1971.
- Ryan, K. (Ed.). Don't smile until Christmas. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of teachers: A research study. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

- Schutz, A. Collected papers I: The problem of social reality (M. Natanson, Ed.). The Hague: Martinus
- Shipman, M. D. The sociology of the school. New York: Humanities Press, 1968.
- Smith, B. O. Toward a theory of teaching. In A. A. Bellack (Ed.), Theory and research in teaching. New York: Teachers College Press, 1963.
- Snow, C. P. The two cultures and the scientific revolution. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1959.
- Snow, C. P. The two cultures and a second look (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1964.
- Spiegelberg, H. The essentials of the phenomenological method. The phenomenological movement: A historical introduction (2nd ed.), Vol. 2. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1965.
- Stubbs, M. Keeping in touch: Some functions of teacher-talk. In M. Stubbs & S. Delamont (Eds.), Explorations in classroom observation. London: Wiley, 1976.
- Taba, H. Teaching strategies and cognitive functioning in elementary school children. San Francisco State College: USOI Cooperative Research Project No. 2404, 1966.
- Waller, W. The sociology of teaching. New York: Wiley, 1932.
- Weber, M. The methodology of the social sciences (E. Shils & H. A. Finch, Eds. and trans.). New York: Free Press, 1949.
- Willis, G. (Ed.). Qualitative evaluation. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1978.
- Worthen, B. R. A study of discovery and expository presentation: Implication for teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 1968, 19, 223-242.
- Young, M. (Ed.). Knowledge and control. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.
- Znaniecki, F. The method of sociology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1934.