

GENDER, PROFESSIONALISM AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION
IN THE UNITED STATES: A POSTMODERN PERSPECTIVE¹

Joan K. Smith
The University of Oklahoma

Introduction

During the last several years, I have spent a considerable amount of time involved in matters that were related to policies and practices for improving teacher preparation at both the state and national levels. Starting in the mid-eighties and continuing to the present, the Oklahoma State legislature has passed laws in an attempt to ensure the quality of its teachers. The most recent has culminated in the creation of an autonomous board—the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation—who has been charged with developing and implementing a more rigorous set of assessments for initial certification. Included in this assessment are three new tests evaluating the general education component, the major subject area test (which is a core of math, science, social studies and literacy for early childhood and elementary majors), a professional education test and a professional portfolio that must begin with the candidate's first professional education course. And as a teacher preparation unit we are also under continuous scrutiny. This new Commission reviews us in partnership with NCATE, the State Regents for Higher Education, and the State Department, and each certification area must submit a curriculum folio to its particular learned society for approval.

At the national level, we continue to work with teachers and other educational professionals through several national organizations. These are: the Holmes Partnership network (an outgrowth of the Holmes Group); AACTE; The Council of Great City Schools and Colleges; and NCTAF (the National Commission on Teaching for America's Future which is a state effort to assess and plan for ways to implement Linda Darling Hammond's recommendations in the Commission's report by the same name).

Today as in the past, society has recognized the contributions research has made to the various disciplines of science, technology, and medicine, but as we come to the end of a century of educational reform,

society has failed to acknowledge the positive effect of research on the profession of teaching.

It occurred to me, as I thought about the Drake lecture, that this issue of teacher professionalism has been a recurring subject in my own research. Many of the themes that I have studied have invoked a variation on this topic. In the research questions that I have asked, from who were Ella Flagg Young and Margaret Haley? to: How has teaching come to be regarded as a semi-profession? I have been searching for answers that would show progress or make the circumstances more understandable. Then, a year or two ago, I became familiar with some of the writings of Michel Foucault, and I began to look at teacher professionalization through a Foucauldian lens—or should I say a prism for his body of work has been produced through a complexity of domains. I do not claim to be a scholar of Foucault, but the interpretations that have come from his research have provided a framework that for me has brought added meaning to aspects of the history of teacher education. I would like to spend most of my time this morning sharing these views with you, but first I will try to lay some groundwork on Foucauldian notions of history.

A Foucauldian Framework

First of all, for those of you who are interested in understanding more about Foucault I would recommend C G Prado's *Starting with Foucault* and Paul Rabinov's *Foucault: A Reader*. What I will attempt to do is to give you a brief sketch of some of the ideas and structures that grew out of his research to form his thought. For him the process starts with the manner in which the inquiry is posed. For example, in this investigation, the question is not "why" but "how" has teacher education—especially elementary preparation—developed differently from other professional preparations, such as medicine or law? Foucault describes this form of inquiry as one that is focused on the human sciences as systems of knowledge. To that end it is archeological because it is

¹A version of this paper was presented as the William E. Drake Lecture at the 1999 meeting of The Educational Foundations Society, a Special Interest Group of the Society of Philosophy and History of Education.

studying the intellectual remains of some part of a past human life and activity with “the goal of understanding the discursive practices that produced those systems of knowledge.” As Prado puts it, through this process Foucault is interested in “exhuming the hidden, the obscure, the marginal, the accidental, the forgotten, the overlooked, the covered-up, the displaced.”¹

His research is also genealogical in that it traces and describes the descendents (older forms) of intellectual discourse and systems of knowledge and their related products of power without looking for causality or regulating principles.² His genealogy does not pretend to search for essences behind historical developments or to demonstrate continuity or evolutionary progress. It does, instead, search out redescrptions of past events and forms of discourse, without asking which ones are right and without claiming to find a new essence of things. The point is to offer other possible explanations or scenarios that include the obscure or forgotten event, so that a more complex, a more relative reality is brought forth.³

By employing these two devices or tools, Foucault has redescrbed many aspects of past Western discursive practices and found different modes by which human beings have been made subjects or, as he puts it, have become objectified. In offering these redescrptions Foucault has become a metaphor maker or what Harold Bloom calls “a strong poet—a thinker who redefines himself or herself in new terms, who invents new metaphors, and so provides a new vocabulary for the rest of us.” And as such he finds himself placed in the company of Plato, Descartes, Einstein and Freud.⁴

The process is achieved in three ways or by three modes of objectification: dividing practices; scientific classification; and subjectification through self-formation. In the first case the subject is manipulated or objectified through a partitioning of an individual or a group from others. This separation is accomplished by using scientific knowledge to mediate and exclude an individual or a group from the dominant structure within that particular social setting. Examples from his research include the isolation of lepers in the middle ages, confinement practices of the poor and insane in seventeenth and eighteenth century Europe, new medical classifications and related practices in early nineteenth century France, and “medicalization and stigmatization of sexual deviance in modern Europe.”⁵

The second mode is scientific classification or the process of inquiry that produces knowledge about the

themes of life, labor, and language reaching the level of a science or pseudo-science. Examples of this mode include the rise and domination of the disciplines of medical sciences as important knowledge bases for regulating human life while, at the same time, being separated from the context of human experiences. In Western societies, medicine regulates the health of people from the pedestal of a scientific discipline. The doctor is the expert who treats various body parts or physiological systems—much as a mechanic does a car—with carefully guarded knowledge that is gained in a special accredited medical program. In this example one can see the interrelatedness between the first and second modes. The process of inquiry that produces this highly valuable knowledge (the second mode) is confined within the disciplinary walls of medical science (the first mode). And in this case, the knowledge it produces is exalted to a level that feeds the social/political machinery for managing people.

The third mode that Foucault describes is self-formation—a process by which the self is “re-formed” through self-examination under the direction of an external authority or expert. Using the medical model once again, it is easy to see how self-formation occurs under the direction of a medical expert. In fact, in this country, the medical expert has been given a sanctified status as the true holder of knowledge and power so that for example, “when the Surgeon-General says ‘smoking is hazardous to your health,’” we pass laws and other policies that govern the way smokers can interact with the rest of society. Or when we lie down on the psychoanalyst’s couch, we allow the expert to use his/her knowledge to mediate our inner feelings about ourselves with the hope that self-improvement or self-awareness will occur.

Finally, we come to the last aspect of a Foucauldian framework, and that is the matter of knowledge and power. The correlation between these two concepts has been the source of some confusion, because of the manner in which Foucault uses them across different contexts. It is probably easiest to describe what the relationship is not, and then see what remains. Power and knowledge are not synonymous, even though he often appears to use them interchangeably; nor does one cause the other. Instead, they enable each other to exist and function in the various contexts as they are exercised over individuals. They share a co-dependency of sorts, so that we don’t find scientific knowledge or truth without “powerful” influences on others. And conversely, we don’t find powerful structures without

scientific or pseudo-scientific knowledge affecting them. In *That Noble Dream*, Historian, Peter Novick has described it this way: [Scientific] "truth" is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to [the] effects of power which it induces and which extend it. A "regime" of truth.⁶ Supporting this view is the work of Richard Westfall who in "Newton and the Fudge Factor," concludes, "Science is a form of competitive and aggressive activity, a contest of man against man that provides knowledge [and its twin, power] as a side product. That side product is its only advantage over football."⁷

The general problematic for Foucault has been the self or the selves in a group. In other words, how has the self (or selves) come to have the particular scientific, psychological, and social meanings and understandings that each holds as an individual member? How is the self or a group of selves managed in a social context? The modes of objectification and the knowledge/power produced are the ways that people are regulated in western societies. The power is a controlling sort that works with its subjects in the same manner that vectors can force directional movement. Prado sums up Foucauldian power as: "the relational environment in which actions take place, or is the sum of influences on actions or what Foucault calls, compartments." Put another way, "It is the conditioning of ongoing actions by the totality of previous and concurrent actions ... a set of actions upon other actions."⁸

With this very sketchy explanation in mind, we might rephrase our question in the following manner: "How have the politics of knowledge and power developed so that teachers are relegated to the status of semi-professionals whose work has been targeted for continuous reform?" The goal of such an investigation, then, is to understand the discursive practices that produced this apparent outcome. Also, it is to redescribe the process by which teachers have become objectified or have been made objects within this particular social setting or context.

Gender and the Historical Roots of Knowledge and Power in Teacher Preparation

The knowledge and power backdrop that encompassed the development of teacher education had its roots in Enlightenment thinking. Feminist historians of science, such as Sandra Harding, have examined the seventeenth century's scientific revolution, when inquiry and the knowledge it produced led to a process

of domination and power. It was advanced by a community of scholars who assumed scientific objectivity as a necessity for producing a truly rational knowledge. This positivistic view of knowledge fit well with the human cognitive structures that were seen as genetically male. As Harding notes male rationality valued "highly his ability to separate himself from others and to make decisions independent of what others think—to develop 'autonomy.'"⁹

The Enlightenment vision did not extend these rational powers to women who, on the other hand, were not thought to be capable of that type of rationality. A rash of scientific, empirically-produced studies were conducted supporting the hypothesis: that women were rationally inferior, being implicated by their intuitive and subjective forms of thought. Those few women who did transcend these boundaries, stepping into this male world of scientific and empirical research were judged as being able "to think like a man."¹⁰

Women may not have been the true bearers of reasoned scientific pursuit, but they were deemed to be the inheritors of teaching. In fact, throughout most of the twentieth century it has been described as "Woman's True Profession." Susan Laird has artfully captured this context in her article, "Teaching And Educational Theory: Can (And Should) This Marriage Be Saved?" In the article she discusses how the work of teachers and educational theorists, has been dichotomized along gender lines. She skillfully describes the gender distinctions and the intellectual implications they produce while noting that these contradictions were not just unfortunate accidents.¹¹

The idea of woman's true profession was popular with some of the founding fathers and common school architects such as Benjamin Rush and Horace Mann. For example, Rush was very supportive of educating women, but not for their intellectual acuity. He believed that girls' education should prepare them for motherhood so that they could instruct their sons in the right values and ethical standards so critical for the citizens of a new republic. Horace Mann saw women as natural mothers. As such they possessed the innate qualities that were crucial in working with the children attending these free, tax-supported, compulsory, and bureaucratic common schools.

Unfortunately, intellectual inferiority went along with this idea, and teaching, especially at the elementary level, was relegated to the status of a quasi-profession. The normal institutions that developed to prepare these teachers suffered from the same stigma of

inferiority, as did the pedagogical knowledge that was imprisoned within their walls.

Dividing Practices and the Development of Normal Schools

Teacher preparation was an important part of the common school crusade and developed in normal schools. The idea that teachers should receive special preparation became popular in Europe when schooling spread to the masses. The term "normal" meant "ordinary" and was used in the sense that the children of the poor should receive an ordinary education giving them instruction in the primary or basic subjects—those of primary concern in order to function in society. The subjects, of course, were the three "R's" of reading, writing, and arithmetic and, perhaps, some trade or occupational training on the side. Young men of the more affluent classes received a secondary education that reached far beyond the three R's. Theirs included collegiate study in the arts and sciences and after that they might even study religion or law. Originally, classes for these two groups of boys were not blended together. Instead they were tracked in different school settings. England's great public (secondary) schools had their beginnings in such a context while free primary or charity schools were opened for the poor. (In this country the social class distinctions for primary and secondary were replaced with developmental, age-related meanings.)

By the end of the eighteenth century men such as Phillip Von Fellenberg at Hofwyl and Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi at Yverdon opened normal schools where those who wanted to devote their careers to teaching the poor could get special preparation in teaching them. At the hands of the "Friends of Education," this notion of mass education went through an American transformation of sorts. Carl Kaestle discusses this change in *Evolution of an Urban School System* and *Pillars of the Republic* and Glenn Smith has developed parts of this theme in "Compel a Barbarous People to Civilitie,"¹² Instead of developing two distinct tracks for children of the poor and affluent classes, "Friends of Education" crusaded for a school "common" to all people. To that end terminology was redefined in the mid-eighteenth century. Public—originally meaning open to those who could afford to pay without regard to geographical location—was redefined to mean free through tax-support. Private, a term that since Roman days had meant a more tutorial form of schooling conducted in a private setting, came to mean schools which charged fees or tuition and room and board.

And, of course, common no longer referred to peasants, commoners, or masses; it referred to the school—a setting "common" to all people where all social classes were mingled. This linguistic transformation was accomplished in the span of about twenty years so that by 1880 the new definitions were solidly in place.

Until 1874, common schooling applied to primary education or the three R's, and it had no age distinction, so the "Friends' platform" called for graded schools and compulsory attendance. After 1874 and the Kalamazoo Case other states experienced similar court rulings and eventually common education was extended to include secondary arts and sciences subjects and commercial and industrial courses for students to at least age sixteen. The rapid development of common high schools was an outgrowth of this legislation. (This is also when the primary and secondary meanings were changed.)

The final pieces of this American transformation came with greater state control of education and the spread of normal school institutions and departments. In "Teacher Preparation: From Common School Training to Professional Education," Courtney Vaughn and I have traced this development of normal training across the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Between 1870 and 1920 normal schools increased from 69 to 326 and state certification systems replaced district/county authority. In addition to normal schools, public high schools developed normal courses of study that were offered in normal departments—a division separate from the college preparatory arts and sciences department. In 1921 no state required college work for elementary preparation, but it was required for secondary teaching. And, beliefs of Benjamin Rush and Horace Mann seemed to become prophetic as women flocked to normal schools to prepare for elementary teaching.¹³

From 1920-1950 normal school education was upgraded in terms of the setting and the type of credential earned—usually a Bachelor of Science in Education instead of a diploma. However, the curriculum was still isolated in teacher's colleges, special departments within liberal arts colleges or special schools and colleges within universities.

In "Male Teachers, Male Roles," Courtney Vaughn and Jeffrey Liles carefully show how the profession also became more and more feminized.¹⁴ Indeed, as Vaughn and others point out:

. . . the image of all women as nurturers and men as managers has encouraged teaching to be seen

largely as a non-intellectual woman's field. Despite the label, significant strides to augment teachers' academic credentials continued. But these changes were influenced by social convention as evidenced by the greater emphasis on the professionalization of administration and secondary [teaching] than on elementary teaching.¹⁵

Today, as Laird and others note, both elementary and secondary levels of teaching have larger numbers of women than men, thereby remaining "woman's true profession."

So what does all of this mean for my premise? Simply this: through our long road to common school education including semantic changes, the training and preparation of its teachers has been isolated from the more academic and professional courses of study. It is true that today we are on university campuses, but teacher training, being implicated by its normal school heritage, is not seen as having the intellectual vitality of a liberal arts and science preparation or the professional rigor of programs in engineering, law, or medicine. With regard to the latter, once medicine had felt the impact of the new biological sciences, their confinement in medical schools also spread, but for different reasons: they were seen as the true developers of the knowledge/power that could really manage and objectify people. And this brings us to Foucault's second mode of objectification.

Scientific Classification and Pedagogical Study

What of the curriculum that was offered behind the doors of normal schools? First of all, was it rigorous and professional enough? And secondly, was the professional component scientific enough? With regard to the first question, I believe the answer is "yes." Normal schools offered a liberal arts content including the latest philosophical and psychological theories. For example, in 1860 a typical normal course of study, such as the one that Ella Flagg Young pursued, was comparable to a college preparatory program. It included algebra, political and physical geography, English literature, general and U. S. history, principles of government or political science, natural and mental philosophy, botany, chemistry, and astronomy. In fact, only 6 percent of the coursework was pedagogical in nature and there was no practice teaching. Nevertheless, upon completing this course of study, Ella did not receive the type of regular high school diploma that would allow her to enter a college or university.¹⁶

Thirty-six years later, Young was pursuing a Ph.D.

at the University of Chicago under the direction of John Dewey, and after evaluating her previous work, President Harper and Professor Dewey had decided that it could substitute for undergraduate work at the bachelor's degree level.¹⁷ The point is that when they looked solely at the academic nature of her work without regard to the department from which it came, the rigor and intellectual or academic vitality emerged. Of course, it was a time when undergraduate preparation for graduate work was still in the process of being standardized, and President Harper had another motive: he wanted to hire her to develop a new normal-type of curriculum that would prepare teachers. (She was not preparing to join the ranks of liberal arts faculty.) It was also more confusing, because by 1898, high schools had closed their normal departments; teacher preparation courses of study were developing almost exclusively in normal schools that were viewed as post-secondary.

By 1907 a post-secondary normal course of study included more pedagogical work (about 30 percent of the curriculum) and practice teaching was a major part of it—about 44 percent of the 30 percent. And it still consisted of a strong core of liberal arts and sciences, and for that reason many were advocating degree-granting status.¹⁸ However, the road to a Bachelor of Arts or Science degree was harder to travel for the typical normal graduate than it was for Ella Flagg Young. One woman graduating from the Illinois State Normal University in the early part of the twentieth century (around 1912) tried to matriculate at the University of Michigan and have her three-year Bachelor of Education degree be evaluated as equivalent to three years of university work. She was barely given one year's worth of academic credit for her normal degree, even though the content and hours of study were very similar to those at the university.

With regard to the second question: Was the professional component scientific enough, I also think the answer is "yes." To demonstrate this, I am going to compare it to the transformation that took place in medical education. During the first two decades of the twentieth century, the study of medicine was revolutionized as the scientific or positivistic paradigm enveloped the curriculum. Prior to this, however, medical practitioners were likened to charlatans whose preparation consisted of eight months of didactic courses culminating in a brief oral examination. And there was no state licensing.¹⁹ Once the paradigm shift occurred, the medical profession became the prototype

for all other professions: i. e., there had to be an exclusive body of knowledge that could be practiced for the benefit of clients.

Pedagogy experienced a similar scientific transformation during that same time period. The point can be illustrated, once again, by examining the circumstances at the University of Chicago when John Dewey and Ella Flagg Young were on the faculty. William James probably said it best in a letter to English philosopher, F. C. S. Schiller when he wrote in 1903, "it appears that under Dewey's inspiration, they have at [the University of] Chicago a flourishing school of radical empiricism of which I for one have been entirely ignorant." He also went on to say that he had been led to neglect their work due to the "lack of 'terseness,' 'crispness,' 'raciness,' ... though I could discern that Dewey himself was laboring with a big freight toward the light."²⁰ Of course, we know that this heavy load of radical empiricism developed into Instrumentalism and gave to education its first impulses toward a science of teaching.

Under Dewey's direction, Young wrote several articles that were part of the University of Chicago's decennial publications to which James referred. One entitled, "Ethics in the Schools" addressed issues related to classroom discipline, warning of the dangers of current practices: teachers being too concerned with obedience and not understanding individual patterns of children; and too much sarcasm and punishment at the expense of rewards. For our purposes, however, the most significant piece was her article, "Scientific Method in Education." Here she argued that:

Educational method to be of worth should be [the] scientific method applied to the art of teaching. The method of the teacher is simply an attitude of mind like that of the scientist. There are two elements involved, the learning mind and the subject-matter or environment. To have an intimate acquaintance with each, to appreciate the expectant longing of mind, to interpret its responses to stimuli, to form valid conceptions of the activity and assimilating power of each child in the environment made by the subject, is to have a great art. It is to have the method of science applied to education. This means that the teacher should have a method applicable to every subject, in every division of the school, beginning with the kindergarten and extending through the graduate school. A distinct method for every subject is not necessary any more than a special scientific method for each branch of science

would be necessary. Whatever be the subject one is teaching, the aim is identical with that of all other subjects taught: to determine how the mind is working with the material in its environment, what nourishment it is selecting and assimilating.²¹

She went on to explain that "The teacher with the grasp of the subject-matter and knowledge of the laws that underlie mental activity and growth has ... this end in view: to keep track of the way in which different minds in the class act upon the stimuli presented."²²

While the some of the language and the labels are part of the times and sound quaint to us today, the concepts are certainly familiar: identifying and understanding children's differences and instructing them so that all learn. Here, in Progressivism, we have a constructivist-type of scientific base in the first decade of the twentieth century, so the obvious question is, "Why has it taken most of the century to claim it for education?" Certainly developments in psychology as a newly emerging discipline with its ultimate reliance on a behavioristic form of empiricism, affected the field of education. And I have argued elsewhere how political circumstances at the University of Chicago, resulting in the resignation of both Dewey and Young, dampened the flame of this new scientific pedagogy.²³ However, I do not think that gives us the whole story. Here are a couple of pieces that I think are missing. First, much of Young's work was buried in the plethora of other philosophical works written mostly by men who had little knowledge of how the principles might be applied in classrooms. Second, although Dewey went on to become world renown for his instrumentalist form of pragmatism, he was seen more as a philosopher, and he did not have the benefit of Young's schooling experiences. He alluded to this in several comments about her. He told one of her former students,

More times than I could well say I didn't see the meaning or force of some favorite conception of my own till Mrs. Young had given it back to me.... She gave me credit for seeing all of the bearings and implication which *she* with her experience and outlook got out of what I said. As a student ... her chief mark was the ineradicable tendency to test all philosophic formulations by restatement of them in terms of experience—and this [was] not the conventional 'experience' of philosophy, but a very definite experience of what the doctrine would mean if attempted in practice—the difference it would actually make in the way of looking at other things than just philosophy. She had by

temperament and training the gist of a concrete empirical pragmatism with reference to philosophical conceptions before the doctrine was ever formulated in print.²⁴

He also told his editor, Max Eastman, that "I would come to her with these abstract ideas of mine and she would tell me what they meant."²⁵

Dewey and Young went their separate ways when they left the University of Chicago in 1904—Dewey to Columbia University and Young to the Chicago Normal School. They never collaborated again, although Young did a book review of *Democracy and Education*. Her ideas blossomed at the Normal where students talked about the positive effect her leadership had on the curriculum, students and environment in general. But she did not get the credit for spreading any of her scholarship. Her published works never reached the philosophical or psychological circles where knowledge/power was being sanctified. Instead, many of the ideas were diffused throughout the country's normal programs in the writings of Dewey, Kilpatrick, James and other pragmatists. The teaching force sat at the feet of the male educational experts, and the credit that Dewey gave Young remained buried. Nevertheless, this new science did become the new ethic by which teachers conducted themselves in these early decades of the twentieth century.²⁶

Self-Formation and The Teaching Profession

This brings us to the third and last mode of Foucauldian objectification. The opportunity to learn and practice this new educational ethic in the early twentieth century was made easier by the growth and development of teachers' organizations. As early as 1900 Chicago had witnessed the formation of a predominantly elementary women's teachers' union—the Chicago Teachers Federation—CTF. Under the direction of Margaret A. Haley, a former teacher and strong proponent of Ella Flagg Young, the CTF had organized for salary schedules, a pension plan and better working conditions, and had made Young's dissertation, *Isolation in the Schools* into their "Bible." (Haley had known Young when she was the Assistant Superintendent in her district and had been personally influenced by her democratic ideas. Haley and the CTF were strong supporters of Young's appointment to the superintendency of Chicago's schools in 1909.) The group also read and listened to authorities such as John Dewey, William James and Maria Montessori and reformers such as Jane Addams, and Susan B. Anthony.

By 1916 teachers had organized themselves on a national level with the formation of the AFT. Haley also had been instrumental in organizing teachers nationally, admonishing them to take charge of their professional lives, and subscribe to the philosophical ideals of a scientific pragmatism for transforming their classrooms. Under the direction of Dewey and other leaders of the Progressive Education Association (PEA) the AFT became the professional forum for the new ethic, the blueprint for building teachers into true autonomous professionals lives and their classrooms into progressive environments that demonstrated more effective approaches to the teaching/learning process. Long after the PEA withered under the threatening force of those who labeled it communistic, Dewey remained their incomparable leader even after his death in 1952.

Conclusion

The development of common schooling and teacher preparation experienced a transformation during the period that has come to be known as the Progressive Era in late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Its spread paralleled the rise of rational and positivistic sciences. With roots in Enlightenment thinking these sciences were redefining the knowledge that was worth studying, that held the power. The professions of medicine and engineering along with teaching—especially at the elementary level—were the receptors of this new knowledge. While medical professionals went on to claim it as being critical to the health of its citizens, "educational professionals—whose majority were women—studied the new tenets behind the walls of normal institutions and were relegated to a semi-professional status, with a growing body of knowledge that was held in little regard."²⁷

Why did none of this work for education as it did for medicine? Certainly, the Depression and the stigma of Communism applied to the PEA were handicaps, but I think the other archeological artifacts that I have "re-presented" in this paper contributed to the ranking. By applying Foucault's modes of objectification in a "re-description" it becomes more apparent how the status of educational professionals was diminished. Digging up remnants of normal school accounts and examining their gender-related confinement or isolation, sheds light on the manner in which the profession—especially at the elementary level—developed. Removed from the mainstream of intellectual power as it prepared women teachers, this

archeological dig helps to explain how the scientific base for teaching was ignored by the public who continued to call for educational improvements. It helps to explain how the scientific curricular advancements that Young had hailed were devalued for their benefits to instructional practice, thereby leaving teaching and teacher preparation as targets of continuous reform across most of this century. As recently as ten years ago, David Berliner played the song again when he said, "We are on the threshold of creating a truly scientific basis for the art of teaching that will be acceptable to the general public as a truly specialized knowledge."²⁸

But here we are exiting the century under the same reform mode as we entered: that we cannot reach all children with our approaches to teaching and learning. In Young's day it was a call to remove the "fads and frills" of vocational preparation and fine arts and return to the three "R's"; in the middle of the century it was a call to return to basics; today it is the need to stress the "core" subjects – especially reading. (Sometimes it seems that we are so busy dodging the continuous rounds of reform bullets that we don't have time to increase the paltry salaries schedules and improve inferior working conditions that continue to haunt common education.)

As an historian, I have noticed that others are involved in archeology. Certainly, in the last twenty years, we have exhumed many artifacts related to gender, teaching and educational professionalism. Feminist scholars, such as Lorraine Code, have engaged in Foucauldian "re-descriptions" that compete with the mainstream conventional wisdom. In *What Can She Know?* Code argues against "Institutional disciplines that produce knowledge about women ... [finding] women inferior ... and incapable of having knowledge of the best and most rational kind."²⁹ When that woman is an elementary school teacher, she suffers from an added blight that takes away her right to professional autonomy and equality.

My optimism, however, comes from these archeological findings and from the fact that we are adding to the historical record. If Horace Mann and the "Friends of Education" can transform word meanings in a brief period of time, then perhaps the work that has been uncovered over these past twenty years by educational scholars will reclaim our lost intellectual heritage. Perhaps, they will continue to add to the record, re-describe as Foucault suggests, so that in twenty-first century, the educational legacy of women and teaching will become a valued part of the historical record instead of remaining buried in our normal school past.

ENDNOTES

1 C. G. Prado, *Starting With Foucault*, (Boulder, CO.: Westview Press, 1995), 25-26.

2 Ibid., 24-25; 24.

3 Ibid., 48.

4 Ibid., 49.

5 Paul Rabinov, Ed., *The Foucault Reader*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984), 8.

6 Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream*, (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1992), 536.

7 Ibid., 537, citing Richard Westfall, "Newton and the Fudge Factor."

8 Prado, 66-67.

9 Sandra Harding, "Is Gender a Valuable in Conceptions of Male Rationality? A Survey of Issues," *Dialectica* 36(1982): 235-36 as cited in Novick, 495.

10 Sandra Harding and Jean F. O'Barr, eds. *Sex and Scientific Inquiry*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 292.

11 Susan Laird, "Teaching and Educational Theory: Can (And Should This Marriage Be Saved?)" *Educational Studies* 29(Summer 1998): 131-151.

JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY AND HISTORY OF EDUCATION

- 12 Carl Kaestle, *Evolution of an Urban School System*, (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), and *Pillars of the Republic*, (N.Y.: Hilland Wang 1983); and L. Glenn Smith, "Compel a Barbarous People to Civilities," *Conference Papers for the 8th Session of the International Standing Conference on the History of Education*, ed. Giovanna Genovese (Parma: Universita de Parma, 1986).
- 13 Courtney Vaughn and Joan K. Smith, "Teacher Preparation: From Common School Training to Professional Education," *Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society* 24(1997): 114-119.
- 14 Courtney Vaughn and Jeffrey Liles, "Male Teachers, Male Roles: The Progressive Era Through the Depression in Pioneer Oklahoma," *Great Plains Quarterly*, 11(1991): 234-48.
- 15 Al Patrick, Robert L. Griswold, and Courtney Vaughn-Roberson, "Domestic Ideology and the Teaching Profession: A Case Study from Oklahoma, 1930-1983," *Issues In Education*, 3(1985): 139-57.
- 16 Joan K. Smith, *Ella Flagg Young: Portrait of a Leader* (Ames Iowa: Educational Studies Press/Iowa State University Research Foundation, 1979), 18.
- 17 *Ibid.*, 64-65.
- 18 Joan K. Smith and Courtney Vaughn, "Teacher Preparation in the United States," unpublished paper, 17-21.
- 19 J. K. Smith and L. G. Smith, *Education Today: The Foundations of a Profession* (New York: St. Martins Press, 1994), 13. Citing Abraham Flexnor, *Medical Education in the United States and Canada*, and George Stevens, *Structure of American Medical Practice, 1875-1941*.
- 20 J. K. Smith, *Ella Flagg Young*, 74.
- 21 Ella Flagg Young, "Scientific Method in Education," as cited in Smith, *Ibid.*, 148.
- 22 *Ibid.*
- 23 Joan K. Smith and Millicent Drower. "From Pedagogy to Education: The Struggle to Develop the Science of Teaching at the University of Chicago, 1896-1904," *Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society*, 22(1995): 81-85.
- 24 J.K. Smith, *Ella Flagg Young*, 107. See also Smith, "The Influence of Ella Flagg Young on John Dewey's Educational Thought," *Review Journal of Philosophy and Social Science*, 2(1977): 143-154.
- 25 Max Eastman, *Heroes I have Known*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1942), 300.
- 26 J. K. Smith, "Enlightenment Values of Reason and Science and the Professional Rights of Elementary Women Teachers in America: A Postmodern Perspective," in *Enlightenment Values and Postmodern Criticism* in press.
- 27 *Ibid.*
- 28 David C. Berliner, "Knowledge Is Power," *Equity and Excellence*, 24 (Winter 1989) 2:6.
- 29 Lorraine Code, *What Can She Know?* (Ithaca N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991), ix-x.