

Let's Be Realistic About Flexibility in Teaching

A limited but realistic repertoire of teaching methods will result in better teaching than a multitude of inappropriate ones.

Several educational researchers urge teachers to use a variety of teaching methods (Joyce and Weil 1980, Broudy 1972, Rosenshine 1979, Dunn and Dunn 1978, Brophy and Evertson 1976). They base their beliefs on one or both of two propositions: (1) students ought to achieve a variety of goals and, therefore, need exposure to a range of teaching methods; and (2) since students have individual learning styles, different teaching methods are necessary to attend to their different needs.

Unrealistic Demands

Using many teaching skills effectively in order to meet a range of student needs or objectives is both reasonable and supportable. Unfortunately, it is impossible.

Most teachers cannot employ a large repertoire of methods because of the limits of human ability. To ask teachers to use six or seven methods with equal proficiency is to assign to them machine-like qualities. They know which behaviors suit them and which do not. We must acknowledge human frailty when we suggest how teachers ought to teach.

But asking teachers to use a variety of methods is not merely a technological matter. Methods are not neutral; they carry, and are based on, value positions. For example, while it might seem sensible and wise, it would probably be counterproductive to expect teachers to be proficient in both information-giving techniques and inquiry techniques. To employ both methods, assuming that a teacher could employ them with equal skill, would require the teacher to embrace several conflicting beliefs. Information giving is based on the belief that students are attentive receivers of knowledge and that there is a body of knowledge that all students need to acquire. Inquiry is based on the belief that students are active, motivated persons who create and decide for themselves. By urging teachers to accept and use both information giving and inquiry,

we are asking them to believe that students, by nature, are reactive and docile and that they are active and can decide for themselves. How can one juggle these conflicting beliefs? Could not the confusion lead to the confounding of all methods and, ultimately, to the confusion of students?

Few Compatible Teaching Methods

What, then, should teachers be urged to do?

Teachers ought to use a *few* compatible teaching methods. To identify these few but compatible methods, they need to do two things.

First, teachers must decide which methods are right for them. This is a *value* decision, not a technological one. It is accomplished by clarifying beliefs about basic elements of education that underlie methods. These include at least the nature of students and the nature of knowledge, and probably should include the aims of education and the nature of teachers. After clarifying their beliefs, teachers can then study various methods and select those that are compatible with their teaching values, and therefore are compatible with each other. That is, the teacher can select just those methods that carry similar views of students, knowledge, teachers, and aims. This set of methods provides the behavior that a given teacher could use.

Second, teachers need to choose methods from the "approved list" that they actually will use. This choice is based on an assessment of their own abilities and on the effectiveness of various methods in particular settings. This is a *technology* decision. Presumably, most teachers will be more skillful at using some methods than others. Also, particular students and goals, as well as other factors, such as available resources and time constraints, will dictate which methods are most appropriate. From the set of valued methods, then, teachers should choose those that are most personally suitable and that fit the situation.

In the new film *MIND'S VIEW*, you will

SEE HOW CHILDREN THINK

Clarifying Values and Preferences

The suggestion that teachers use a few compatible methods may result in an image of a consistent but inflexible robot. Not true. Teachers who follow this model alter their behavior, but not beyond the limits of their valued methods. This limited but realistic set of methods can adequately accommodate different learning styles and goals as well as provide excitement and interest in the classroom for both students and teachers.

Teachers are fallible and have individual predilections. Any prescription for teaching that does not start with this concession is destined for failure. A more helpful prescription for teaching than that which urges the use of a wide variety of methods is to use only those valued methods that are most appropriate for the teacher and the setting. Although this is what most teachers do unconsciously, the deliberate clarification of values and preferences may be one of the most powerful actions that can be taken to improve teaching. □

References

- Brophy, J. E., and C. M. Everson. *Learning from Teaching: A Developmental Perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976.
- Broudy, H. S. "Didactics, Heuristics, and Philetics." *Educational Theory* 22 (1972): 251-261.
- Dunn, R., and K. Dunn. *Teaching Students Through Their Individual Learning Styles: A Practical Approach*. Reston Publishing Co.: Reston, Va., 1978.
- Joyce, B., and M. Weil. *Models of Teaching*. 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1980.
- Rosenshine, B. "Content, Time, and Direct Instruction." In *Research on Teaching*, edited by P. L. Peterson and H. J. Walberg. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1979.

John A. Zahorik is professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, P.O. Box 413, Milwaukee, WI 53201.

You watch children in school to make sure they pay attention. You see them struggle with their arithmetic, their reading, their writing. Are they getting it? Do they understand? If only you could see how they think...

Now there is a way to look into those bright minds—through a wonderful new film: *MIND'S VIEW*.

In 43 minutes, *MIND'S VIEW* takes you into the mental world of four normal children, alike in character and capacity, but different in their natural thought processes.

The children themselves will tell you, and show you, how each has a unique way of learning.

You will recognize how effective your teaching can be when you vary techniques to reach the four basic ways children learn.

MIND'S VIEW is based on the well-known *Mind Style*® research of Dr. Anthony F. Gregorc, who discovered the four ways children view and organize the world around them:

Concrete Sequential*
Abstract Sequential*
Abstract Random*
Concrete Random*



There's Nora, the pragmatist, the time keeper, the organizer.

Steve's the theorist, the thinker, the logician.



Dawn is the artist, the psychic, the idealist.

And Sean, the inventor, the competitor, the intuitive leaper.



These children have been captured on film with great sensitivity by Dr. Martha Cray-Andrews, noted consultant in Gifted Education and Mind Styles®. Show *MIND'S VIEW* to a group of teachers and open a door for them into the four worlds they will enter the next time they start a class.

Show it to parents for discussion with the help of a stimulating booklet that comes with the film.

EVERY SCHOOL SYSTEM DESERVES THE RIGHT TO SEE *MIND'S VIEW*—TO SEE HOW CHILDREN THINK. *MIND'S VIEW* is available on video tape and 16mm sound film. For complete ordering information, including prices, send the coupon below to: Gabriel Systems, Inc., P.O. Box 357, 147 Main Street, Maynard, Massachusetts, 01754 (617) 897-6470

*Terms used with the permission of the copyright owner, Anthony F. Gregorc, Ph.D.



Yes, I want to see how children think and learn. Please rush me information on this extraordinary film.

MIND'S VIEW

Name _____

Position _____

Organization _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Mail to:  Gabriel Systems, Inc., P.O. Box 357,
147 Main St., Maynard, MA 01754

Copyright © 1986 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.