

THE DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AND STRATEGIES FOR RESISTANCE

JESSE GOODMAN, *Indiana University*

During the last decade, concern over teachers' accountability has increased in the United States. Dozens of national and state reports have advocated tighter control over what happens in our nation's classrooms.¹ In response to this concern, several educators² have promoted and schools³ have adopted the use of prepackaged instructional programs as the basis for classroom curriculum. Although the programs were implemented in the name of improving instruction, some educators have questioned this development.⁴ Instead

¹See Stanley Aronowitz and Henry Giroux, *Education Under Siege* (South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey, 1985), K. Patricia Cross, "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports," *Pbi Delta Kappan* 66 (November 1984): 167-172; Terrence E. Deal, "Searching for the Wizard: The Quest for Excellence in Education," *Issues in Education* 2 (Summer 1984): 56-67; Svi Shapiro, "Choosing Our Educational Legacy. Disempowerment or Emancipation?" *Issues in Education* 2 (Summer 1984): 11-22; Charles A. Tesconi, "Additive Reform and the Retreat from Purpose," *Educational Studies* 15 (Spring 1984): 1-10; Arthur Wise, *Legislated Learning: The Bureaucratization of the American Classroom* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979).

²Jere Brophy, "Classroom Organization and Management," *Elementary School Journal* 83 (March 1983): 265-285; Ronald Edmonds, "The Context of Teaching and Learning, School Effects and Teacher Effects," in *Essential Knowledge for Beginning Educators*, ed. David Smith (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1983), pp. 76-79; Thomas Good, "Recent Classroom Research Implications for Teacher Education," in *Essential Knowledge for Beginning Educators*, ed. David Smith (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1983), pp. 55-64; Barak Rosenshine, "Teaching Functions in Instructional Programs," *Elementary School Journal* 83 (March 1983): 335-351; Robert Soar and Ruth Soar, "Context Effects in the Teaching-Learning Process," in *Essential Knowledge for Beginning Educators*, ed. David Smith (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1983), pp. 67-75.

³Robert Bullough, Stanley Goldstein, and Ladd Holt, *Human Interests in the Curriculum Teaching and Learning in a Technological Society* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1984); Dennis Carlson, "Updating Individualism and the Work Ethic: Corporate Logic in the Classroom," *Curriculum Inquiry* 12 (Summer 1982): 125-160; Andrew Gitlin, "School Structure and Teachers' Work," in *Ideology and Practice in Schooling*, ed. Michael Apple and Lois Weis (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983), pp. 193-212.

⁴Gerald Duffy, Laura Roehler, and Joyce Putnam, "Putting the Teacher in Control. Basal Reading Textbooks and Instructional Decision Making," *Elementary School Journal* 87 (January 1987): 359-366; Jack Frymier, "Bureaucracy and the Neutering of Teachers," *Pbi Delta Kappan* 69 (September 1987): 9-14; Jesse Goodman, "Field Based Experience: A Study of Social Control and Student Teachers' Response to Institutional Constraints," *Journal of Education for Teaching*

of increasing the quality of instruction in classrooms, these critics suggest, teachers are becoming disenfranchised from their own occupation.

The movement to disenfranchise teachers is not a recent phenomenon, nor is it simply the result of calls for accountability and competency. Because of the limited analysis, we have not developed a comprehensive response to this phenomenon. To address this concern, this article analyzes the disenfranchisement of elementary teachers in the United States and outlines several strategies for those individuals interested in resisting this trend in education. While secondary school teachers are also victims of the process, the disenfranchisement of elementary teachers has been particularly strong, since the use of prepackaged instructional programs has become nearly universal in U.S. elementary schools. First, this article portrays the experience of becoming disenfranchised through two illustrative examples. Second, it uses two perspectives (critical theory and feminism) to provide insight into this phenomenon. Finally, and most important, this article outlines possible actions that policy makers, teachers, school administrators, teacher educators, and researchers interested in reversing the movement to disenfranchise our nation's elementary school teachers can take.

THE DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF TEACHERS. TWO ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

The disenfranchisement of teachers occurs when the conceptualization of instruction and the curriculum is separated from those who actually teach. That is, decisions about what should be taught, why it should be taught, and how it should be taught are made without (or with limited) input from the classroom teacher. As a result, teachers have little sense of ownership of their daily work or professional craft. Nearly four-fifths of the states have legislated some form of statewide competency testing. As Frymier points out, initial state "legislation is already stifling teachers and stymying activities at the local level."¹¹ In the states that have not yet developed universal tests, the school systems are placing increased value on districtwide standardized tests. These tests are almost totally limited to utilitarian reading, math, and grammar "skills." Many schools have adopted instructional programs specifically designed to raise pupils' scores on these standardized tests. The programs come complete with specified learning objectives, step-by-step instructional procedures

11 (January 1985) 26-49; Miles Myers, "When Research Does Not Help Teachers," *American Educator* 10 (No. 2, 1986): 18-46; Patrick Shannon, "Commercial Reading Materials, a Technological Ideology, and the Deskilling of Teachers," *Elementary School Journal* 87 (January 1987) 307-329; Arthur Wise, *Legislated Learning. The Bureaucratization of the American Classroom* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979); Arthur Woodward, "Over-Programmed Materials. Taking the Teacher Out of Teaching," *American Educator* 10 (No. 1, 1986) 22-25.

¹² Jack Frymier, "State-Legislated Curriculum: Why Be Concerned?" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 1987).

(usually dominated by worksheets and drills), and quantitative exams to measure exactly what pupils learn.

Duffy and others state, "Because teachers know that they must teach to the test, that they must follow the basal textbook sequence, and that they must adhere to procedures established by superiors, they conclude that they are not supposed to be decision makers."⁶ Instead of viewing teachers as reflective practitioners who are capable of establishing relevant and meaningful curricular goals, developing original and stimulating content, and designing thoughtful instructional strategies based on intimate knowledge of their own and their pupils' interests and needs, these instructional programs limit teachers to a managerial role. Teachers are encouraged to become educational technicians who merely coordinate the day's work (e.g., schedule time for each subject and ability group, plan seatwork to keep children busy, discipline pupils to keep them on task, maintain pupils' records) to ensure that pupils "get through the material" on time.⁷ Inservice education often focuses on helping teachers become more efficient at managing these programs. Teachers are judged by how smoothly they move their pupils through the programs and on how well their pupils do on either statewide or districtwide standardized tests. As teachers are socialized into the norms of their occupation, they become hesitant to implement innovative approaches to instruction or to introduce more substantive content. Individuals who approach teaching as a reflective, moral, and creative craft often become alienated by the mechanistic work routine of most elementary schools today.⁸

Two encounters that I recently had with teachers illuminate this situation. The first involved a veteran 6th-grade teacher of 12 years with a reputation for being excellent. We had been discussing the work of an early field-experience student who had been placed in her classroom, and at one point, the teacher opened a closet full of topical units that she had conceptualized and developed over the years. These units of study explored many different topics, integrated subject areas, used a variety of resources (e.g., films, slide-shows, children's literature and magazines, music, reference books, photographs, artifacts, field trips, guest speakers), and involved the children in

⁶Gerald Duffy, Laura Roehler, and Joyce Putnam, "Putting the Teacher in Control Basal Reading Textbooks and Instructional Decision Making," *Elementary School Journal* 87 (January 1987): 358

⁷Andrew Gitlin, "School Structure and Teachers' Work," in *Ideology and Practice in Schooling*, ed. Michael Apple and Lois Weis (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983), pp. 193-212; Jesse Goodman, "Field-Based Experience: A Study of Social Control and Student Teachers' Response to Institutional Constraints," *Journal of Education for Teaching* 11 (January 1985): 26-49

⁸Michael Apple, "Curriculum Form and the Logic of Technical Control: The Building of the Passive Individual," in *Ideology and Practice in Schooling*, ed. Michael Apple and Lois Weis (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983); Michael Apple and Kenneth Teitelbaum, "Are Teachers Losing Control of Their Skills and Curriculum?" *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 18 (April-June 1986): 177-184; Kenneth Zeichner, "The Disenfranchisement of Teachers and the Phenomenon of Teacher Stress," *Teacher Education* (in press)

several learning activities, art projects, creative dramatics, social action projects, research reports, group discussions, small-group and individual presentations, and various types of writing experiences. She then explained that she has not been able to use these units for the last few years. In an effort to increase tests scores, teachers in her school are now required to use only the instructional programs provided by the school corporation. During the last year, the district implemented a policy of "curriculum monitoring": The principal of each school regularly checks to see whether the teachers are following the prescribed curriculum according to the prescribed timetable. Unique and original units of study based on the teacher's and pupils' interests are no longer considered appropriate to the school district's goals. Although this teacher has a strong commitment to education and the community where she lives and works, she is upset at these recent developments and feels that they have undermined her ability to make her teaching meaningful for herself and her pupils.

The second example concerns a novice teacher who was an informant for a recent study I conducted on teacher socialization.⁹ In her preparation coursework, she was exposed and became committed to a whole-language approach to teaching reading and language arts. She believed that children learn to read and write by seeing that these activities can be meaningful, imaginative, and enjoyable. She was anxious and hopeful that she would be able to establish an independent reading and writing program in her 1st-grade field placement. She had collected more than 200 children's books for her personal library, developed a series of projects for pupils to do once they finished a given book, established a procedure for individual reading conferences with pupils, and created an evaluation system for improving pupils' work. When she shared her ideas with her cooperating teacher, she was told that she could establish the program, but pupils had to volunteer and could participate only after they completed their daily quota of workbook pages. At first, about half the class participated, and this new teacher was pleased at the results. But she was concerned that the pupils who disliked reading and writing the most never got a chance to participate because they never finished their workbook pages before the end of the day. As the semester continued and she had to assume total responsibility for teaching the standardized curriculum, she discovered that she had no time to hold individual conferences with pupils to hear them read and discuss their books. When she tried to negotiate for more time during the day for the program, she was told that it could not be done. Toward the end of her time in this placement, she had become discouraged about the lack of opportunity for creative teaching in the classroom.

⁹Jesse Goodman, "The Political Tactics and Teaching Strategies of Reflective, Active Preservice Teachers," *Elementary School Journal* (in press)

These examples could be duplicated many times, as others have illustrated.¹⁰ While many teachers want (and a few need) to be told exactly how and what to teach, if thoughtful and creative teachers are not allowed to make meaningful instructional and curricular decisions, then the result will almost certainly be a loss of pride in one's work. After enough time passes, even initial talent and craftsmanship will eventually atrophy. Then, teachers may become permanently disenfranchised.

To fully understand why teachers are becoming disenfranchised from their occupation, we must look beyond the corridors and classrooms of our schools and examine the phenomenon from broader perspectives. Recent writings in critical theory and feminism provide the framework needed to develop comprehensive and realistic strategies for resisting the disenfranchisement of elementary teachers.

THE CRITICAL THEORY PERSPECTIVE

Critical theory calls on us to examine the social and historical context from which a given social phenomenon emerges. Society is a complex web of interconnected institutions, cultural customs and values, and individuals that cannot be fully understood in isolation from each other. Schooling is therefore an integral part of broader forces in society.¹¹ Critical theory also focuses on how these social forces empower or disempower individuals in a given setting.¹² Social institutions and policy are not neutral. To the contrary, in any complex society competing interests struggle to move society in one direction. Public institutions such as schools reflect and contribute to this struggle.¹³ In understanding social life, critical theory brings issues such as social justice, emancipation, and democratic rule into our consciousness.

Given this orientation, critical theory has focused on the "work" of teaching in relation to other occupations in twentieth-century industrial soci-

¹⁰Michael Apple and Kenneth Teitelbaum, "Are Teachers Losing Control of Their Skills and Curriculum?" *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 18 (April-June 1986): 177-184; Gerald Duffy, Laura Roehler, and Joyce Putnam, "Putting the Teacher in Control: Basal Reading Textbooks and Instructional Decision Making," *Elementary School Journal* 87 (January 1987): 359-366; Barbara McEvoy, "Against Our Better Judgment: Three Teachers' Enactment of Mandated Curriculum" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1986).

¹¹Michael Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979); Pierre Bourdieu and Jean Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture* (London: Sage, 1977); Henry Giroux, *Ideology, Culture, and the Process of Schooling* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981); Maxine Greene, *Landscapes of Learning* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1978); Herbert Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986).

¹²Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institution of Social Research, 1923-1950* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1973).

¹³Michael Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979); Henry Giroux, "Theories of Reproduction and Resistance in the New Sociology of Education: A Critical Analysis," *Harvard Educational Review* 53 (August 1983): 257-293; Arthur Wirth, *Productive Work—In Industry and Schools Becoming Persons Again* (Lanham, Md.: University Press, 1983).

ety. At the turn of the century in the United States, the nature of work began to change dramatically. The cottage industries or small craftshops quickly disappeared as urban factories developed and produced new and larger quantities of goods. Individual craftspeople simply could not procure their goods at competitive prices. While a few denounced this progress for turning the individual worker into a mere cog in a big machine, the nation as a whole became mesmerized by the potential productive output of this rapidly growing industrial development. As urbanized industry continued to mushroom, new, more efficient ways to organize labor became necessary.¹⁴

The individual who captured the imagination of most business leaders was Frederick Taylor, who developed an idealized form of bureaucracy known as scientific management. The underlying assumption of his approach was that individuals would sacrifice much in the way of job satisfaction (e.g., determining the pace and scope of one's work) for economic gain. The essence of scientific management was the analysis of a given job (referred to as task analysis) to determine its separate components. These components were then reordered and divided among different workers (if necessary) to create the most efficient and cost-effective arrangement possible.¹⁵ As Mouzelis points out, the individual worker under Taylorism "was conceived as an instrument of production which can be handled as easily as any other tool."¹⁶

It did not take long for educators to jump onto the efficiency bandwagon.¹⁷ Franklin Bobbitt, a professor of educational administration at the University of Chicago, was a strong advocate of using the business techniques of scientific management in the administration of schools. For example, he suggested that schools identify the "proper methods" and determine the "definite qualifications for the various aspects of ... teaching."¹⁸ Special supervisors then would be trained to govern teachers' efficiency in the schools.

As industrial and other institutions grew larger and more complex, more sophisticated and diverse methods of controlling the process of labor had to be introduced. Edwards identifies three mechanisms of control that organizations have employed in their efforts to ensure that individuals follow accepted procedures for maximum productivity. The first form of control is *personal*. A supervisor directly monitors workers' actions. The second form of control is *bureaucratic*: Workers are governed by impersonal rules and regulations.

¹⁴Robert Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1967)

¹⁵Frederick Taylor, *The Principles of Scientific Management* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1911)

¹⁶Nicos Mouzelis, *Organization and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Modern Theories* (Chicago: Aldine, 1967), p. 85.

¹⁷Raymond Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces That Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962); Arthur Wirth, *Productive Work—In Industry and Schools: Becoming Persons Again* (Lanham, Md.: University Press, 1983).

¹⁸Franklin Bobbitt, *The Supervision of City Schools*, Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1913), p. 62.

These rules are enforced through a system of sanctions and rewards. The final form of control is *technical*. Workers' tasks and the evaluation of their efforts are embedded in the physical structure of the workplace, the daily schedule, types of tools required, and the nature of the product produced.¹⁹

Of these three forms of control, the most effective is technical control of the labor process. While unions and other labor organizations have been able to protect workers from unfair bureaucratic regulations or supervisors in many cases, it has been much more difficult to alter a job description, the physical structure of a building, or the tools used in a given occupation. Throughout this century, Taylor's assumption, for the most part, has proved correct. Most workers and their unions have been willing to confine their interests to financial and physical safety concerns rather than focus on issues related to worker autonomy, pride, and self-satisfaction.²⁰

As some educators note, schools have evolved as "loosely coupled systems."²¹ That is, teachers' labor has been designed to minimize the need (or make it possible) for direct supervision by administrators or bureaucratic rules. Thus, schools have had to rely on the use of technical control by adopting standardized instructional programs that determine the type of instruction employed in a classroom, the materials used, and the timing of the daily schedule.²²

This emerging labor process and system of technical control has resulted in the "degradation of labor."²³ Workers in a wide diversity of occupations have consistently lost control over their crafts and depend increasingly on managerial and production demands that are made without their input. This emerging labor process includes the fragmentation of work into discrete

¹⁹Richard Edwards, *Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the 20th Century* (New York: Basic Books, 1979).

²⁰David Montgomery, *Workers' Control in America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Wayne Urban, *Why Teachers Organized* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1982).

²¹Arthur Blumberg, "Teachers, Other Teachers, and Principals: Welds, and Cracks in the Couplings" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980); Karl Weick, "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21 (March 1976): 1-19.

²²Andrew Gitlin, "School Structure and Teachers' Work," in *Ideology and Practice in Schooling*, ed. Michael Apple and Lois Weis (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983), pp. 193-212; Jesse Goodman, "Field-Based Experience: A Study of Social Control and Student Teachers' Response to Institutional Constraints," *Journal of Education for Teaching* 11 (January 1985): 26-49; Barbara McEvoy, "Against Our Better Judgment. Three Teachers' Enactment of Mandated Curriculum" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1986); Kenneth Zeichner and Robert Tabachnick, "The Development of Teacher Perspectives. Social Strategies and Institutional Control in the Socialization of Beginning Teachers," *Journal of Education for Teaching* 11 (January 1985): 1-25.

²³Harry Braverman, *Labor and Monopoly Capital. The Degradation of Work in the 20th Century* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975); Richard Edwards, *Contested Terrain. The Transformation of the Workplace in the 20th Century* (New York: Basic Books, 1979); David Gordon, Richard Edwards, and Michael Reich, *Segmented Work, Divided Workers* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982); Stephen Wood, *The Degradation of Work* (London: Hutchinson, 1982).

activities, restrictions on the range of possible work-related activities, systematic repetition of those activities, and separation of work from the social and ethical responsibility underlying production. Making the leap from other occupations to elementary teaching and learning is not difficult to recognize given the recent, wide scale adoption of commercially produced instructional programs. From this perspective, standardized test scores are the product, pupils are the raw materials from which the product will emerge, teachers are the shop workers, and the instructional programs represent the machinery and time schedule that defines the workers' tasks. Just as industrial workers are often pushed to produce more products with little increase of capital expenditure, so teachers feel increasing pressure to maximize tests scores without a significant reduction in the pupil-teacher ratio. Although the education establishment has been eager to apply an industrial organization to managing school labor in an effort to increase productivity, it has failed to recognize the well-documented, negative effects (e.g., loss of workers' innate talents, loyalty, pride) of this managerial style.²⁴

THE FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE

Recognizing the link between teaching and the general process of labor as it has developed in twentieth-century industrial America is the first step in understanding the real strength behind the movement to disenfranchise our nation's elementary teachers. However, it does not offer a complete analysis. As several educators have recently argued, it is not possible to understand the nature of teachers' work (especially in elementary schools) without addressing the role that patriarchy has played in its development.²⁵ As Barrett's analysis demonstrates, there is no single definition of patriarchy.²⁶ Patriarchy, as used here, refers to a system of thought and subsequent actions that sanctions male authority over women. In society, patriarchy is characterized by particular economic, cultural, and psychological relationships among men of all classes, races, and ethnic groups that formally and informally oppress women (and

²⁴Richard Edwards, *Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the 20th Century* (New York: Basic Books, 1979); David Gordon, Richard Edwards, and Michael Reich, *Segmented Work, Divided Workers* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

²⁵Michael Apple, "Teaching and Women's Work: A Comparative Historical and Ideological Analysis," *Teachers College Record* 86 (Spring 1985): 455-473; Katherine Clarricoates, "The Experience of Patriarchal Schooling," *Interchange* 12 (No. 2-3, 1981): 185-204; Madeleine Grumet, "Pedagogy for Patriarchy: The Feminization of Teaching," *Interchange* 12 (No. 2-3, 1981): 165-184; Patu Lather, "The Absent Presence: Patriarchy, Capitalism, and the Nature of Teacher Work" (paper presented at the Bergamo Curriculum Theory and Practice Annual Conference, Dayton, Ohio, October 1985); Mary O'Brien, "The Commodification of Women: Patriarchal Fetishism in the Sociology of Education," *Interchange* 15 (No. 2, 1984): 43-60; Geoff Tabak and Kathleen Densmore, "Teacher Professionalization and Gender Analysis" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1985).

²⁶Michele Barrett, *Women's Oppression Today* (London: New Left Books, 1980).

men) who do not conform to and reflect a masculine rationality, physical appearance, style of behavior, and set of values.²⁷

At times, this oppression is overt. For example, Barrett demonstrates how women are at a disadvantage in the workplace. First, women's work is *vertically* divided from men. As a group, they receive significantly lower wages and less desirable working conditions than men, even when doing similar jobs. Second, women's work is divided *horizontally*, women are concentrated into particular kinds of work (e.g., clerical workers, nurses, domestic service) rather than others (e.g., doctors, lawyers, managers, business executives).²⁸

At other times, patriarchal oppression is more subtle. For example, interpersonal dynamics in many situations requires the participants to interact according to an unspoken masculine ethos. This ethos tends to reward individuals who are assertive, forceful, and loud. Women (and men) who feel uncomfortable interacting in this way often find themselves "silenced."²⁹ While on the surface everyone appears to have an equal opportunity to participate, interactions based on a masculine ethos, in effect, restrict the input of many female participants. From a feminist perspective, both overt and covert forms of patriarchal oppression have played a significant role in the disenfranchisement of elementary teachers.

Patriarchy controls the lives of women by tracking them into particular types of occupations and then rationalizing these occupations as insignificant compared to male positions in society.³⁰

In every known human society, the male's need for achievement can be recognized. Men may cook or weave or dress dolls or hunt hummingbirds, but if such activities are appropriate occupations for men, then the whole society, men and women alike, votes them as important. When the same occupations are performed by women, they are regarded as less important. In a great number of human societies, men's sureness of their own sex roles is tied up with their right, or ability, to practice some activity that women are not allowed to practice.³¹

²⁷H. Hartmann, "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union," in *Education and the State. Politics, Patriarchy, and Practice—Volume 2*, ed. Roger Dale, Geoff Esland, and Madeline MacDonald (Sussex Falmer Press, 1984), pp 191–210.

²⁸Nancy Barrett, "Women in the Job Market. Occupations, Earnings, and Career Opportunities," in *The Subtle Revolution Women at Work*, ed. Ralph Smith (Washington, D.C. Urban Institute, 1979), pp. 31–61.

²⁹Mary Belenky, Blythe Clinchy, Nancy Goldberger, and Jill Tarule, *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind*, (New York Basic Books, 1986), Dorothy Smith, "A Peculiar Eclipsing: Women's Exclusion from Man's Culture," *Woman's Studies International Quarterly* 1 (No. 3, 1978) 281–295, Dale Spender, *Man Made Language* (London Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980).

³⁰Nancy Barrett, "Women in the Job Market. Occupations, Earnings, and Career Opportunities," in *The Subtle Revolution Women at Work*, ed. Ralph Smith (Washington, D.C. Urban Institute, 1979), pp 31–61, L. Murgatroyd, "Gender and Occupational Stratification," *The Sociological Review* 30 (November 1982): 574–602.

³¹Margaret Mead, *Male and Female* (New York Marrow Publishing, 1949), p 159

The effect of this patriarchal tracking can be seen most clearly in the occupations that have been "feminized" (i.e., transformed from male to female staffing patterns), such as clerical work and teaching.³²

Elsbree's research indicates that during the colonial period, teaching was considered men's work.³³ Most of these men held other jobs (e.g., clergymen, farmers) and taught during the times of the year when they were not busy with their other occupation. Although there was some "superficial appraisal" of one's instruction, the community put the responsibility for educating their children into the "hands of the teacher." When teaching was a man's occupation, "the teacher was perhaps more nearly his own boss . . . than at any subsequent period."³⁴

The reality of teaching as a man's profession did not, however, last long. By the mid-1800s, about 60 percent of the elementary school teachers were women, and by 1930 that figure had grown to 90 percent.³⁵ Several economic, political, and psychological factors contributed to the "feminization" of teaching. (1) calls for compulsory public education and the growth in population that resulted in the need to significantly increase the teaching workforce, (2) added certification requirements, loss of teacher autonomy, and the development of teaching as a full-time position that made teaching less attractive to men, (3) women's struggles to obtain more education and work opportunities outside of sweatshops, factories, and mills, and (4) the belief that women possessed "natural" qualities (e.g., warmth, purity, empathy, piety) for working with children.³⁶

Teaching as an occupation was significantly transformed as a result of this feminization. Because of patriarchy, as women filled the classrooms, teachers' professional status and autonomy diminished. While early propo-

³²Veronica Beechey, "The Sexual Division of Labour and the Labour Process: A Critical Assessment of Braverman," in *The Degradation of Work*, ed. Stephen Wood (London: Hutchinson, 1982), pp. 54-73.

³³Willard Elsbee, *The American Teacher* (New York: American Book, 1939).

³⁴Ibid., p. 71.

³⁵Willard Elsbee, *The American Teacher* (New York: American Book, 1939); Emery Foster, "Statistical Summary of Education, 1929-1930," in *Biennial Survey of Education, 1928-1930—Volume 2* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1932).

³⁶Michael Apple, "Teaching and Women's Work: A Comparative Historical and Ideological Analysis," *Teachers College Record* 86 (Spring 1985): 455-473; Veronica Beechey, "The Sexual Division of Labour and the Labour Process: A Critical Assessment of Braverman," in *The Degradation of Work*, ed. Stephen Wood (London: Hutchinson, 1982), pp. 54-73; Keith Medler, "Woman's High Calling: The Teaching Profession in America," *American Studies* 13 (April 1972): 19-32; John Richardson and Brenda Hatcher, "The Feminization of Public School Teaching: 1870-1920," *Work and Occupations* 10 (February 1983): 81-99; Sheila Rothman, *Women's Proper Place* (New York: Basic Books, 1978); Kathryn Sklar, *Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity* (New York: Norton, 1973); Myra Strober, "Segregation by Gender in Public School Teaching: Toward a General Theory of Occupational Segregation in the Labor Market" (unpublished manuscript, Stanford University); Myra Strober and David Tyack, "Why Do Women Teach and Men Manage? A Report on Research on Schools," *Signs* 5 (Spring 1980): 494-503; B. Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood, 1820-1860," *American Quarterly* 18 (No. 2, 1966): 151-174.

nents (e.g., Catherine Beecher, Horace Mann, Henry Barnard) for increasing the number of women in teaching often referred to women's moral superiority, patience, and nurturing qualities, there was also the belief that women needed to be controlled. The ideal teacher was docile and passive in the face of (male) authority. "If ever I envied mortal being upon earth, it was not the queen with realms belting the globe . . . but it was the devoted, modest female teacher, conscious only of her duties, unconscious of ambition or of earthly rewards."³⁷

Underneath the rhetoric of women as the natural and superior guardians of children was an unspoken belief that these young women could not be trusted in the same way as their previous male colleagues. The leaders of most communities simply did not believe that young, female teachers could make significant decisions regarding their lives, either inside or outside of school. Even as late as the 1920s, it was not uncommon for school boards (composed almost entirely of men) to forbid their women teachers from getting married or dating, staying out past eight in the evening, smoking tobacco or drinking alcohol, wearing bright-colored clothing or less than two petticoats, and dying their hair or wearing makeup.³⁸ Historically, men have taken it for granted that they have the right to dictate how women live, in both their personal and professional lives. While teaching became an "honorable" profession on the surface, the respect given to it fell dramatically, as reflected in the economic value placed on these women "with little concern for earthly reward." As women entered the teaching profession, they were generally hired for one-half or less the salaries of their male counterparts.³⁹

Men who remained in education often left the classroom and entered higher status and higher paying positions. Male educators became building administrators, curriculum writers, and educational researchers. The "work" of educating our children was thus divided into two camps. One group engaged in empirical and conceptual research into the educational process, wrote textbooks and other types of instructional programs, and supervised how education was implemented. This group was almost completely dominated by men. The second group, dominated by women, became the recipient of the former group's efforts and was expected to implement its plans. The gender composition and relationship between these two groups has essentially remained unchanged, serving to keep women relatively powerless and "in their place."⁴⁰

³⁷Horace Mann, "The Female Teacher," *Indiana School Journal* 5 (No. 3, 1860): 85-86

³⁸Michael Apple and Kenneth Teitelbaum, "Are Teachers Losing Control of Their Skills and Curriculum?" *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 18 (April-June 1986): 177-178

³⁹Keith Melder, "Woman's High Calling. The Teaching Profession in America," *American Studies* 13 (April 1972): 19-32

⁴⁰Myra Strober and David Tyack, "Why Do Women Teach and Men Manage? A Report on Research on Schools," *Sigyns* 5 (Spring 1980): 494-503

Women educators' lack of power is clearly reflected in the substance and form of the education found in our schools. As several individuals have noted, in our society there exists a rationality that boys (more than girls) are socialized to embrace.⁴¹ Belenky and others cogently illustrate that this masculine rationality promotes several intellectual and epistemological values: objectivity, order and control, technical and mechanical reasoning, utility, sequential logic, efficiency, the existence of absolute knowledge, the categorization of knowledge and time, and quantitative evaluation. This rationality is pervasive in our society, and it implies a repudiation of an alleged feminine ethos that values intuition, subjectivity, uniqueness, emotions, synthesis, empathy, and understanding.⁴² Since most curriculum and instructional developers have been men, it is not surprising to see the influence of this masculine rationality at work in our elementary schools.

The curricular and instructional programs that have dominated classroom activity have been based primarily on principles of functional efficiency and social control.⁴³ These programs emphasize the study of utilitarian skills over substantive content or artistic talent; the sequential segmentation and memorization of knowledge over synthesis and wholistic understanding, and the standardized, quantitative evaluation of pupils' work over the informed judgment of the teacher.⁴⁴ Although the vast majority of elementary teachers are women, they are expected to ignore the values embedded in a more feminine rationality and, as Grumet suggests, become pedagogues for patriarchy.⁴⁵ Lightfoot captures the essence of this situation in her statement that elementary

⁴¹Warren Farrell, *The Liberated Man* (New York: Random House, 1974), Herb Goldberg, *The Hazards of Being Male* (New York: Signet, 1976), Ruth Hartley, "Sex Role Pressures in the Socialization of the Male Child," *Psychological Reports* 5 (1959) 457-468, Margaret Mead, *Male and Female* (New York: Marrow Publishing, 1949).

⁴²Mary Belenky, Blythe Clinchy, Nancy Goldberger, and Jill Tarule, *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind* (New York: Basic Books, 1986), Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1982); Sandra Harding and Merrill Hintikka, eds., *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science* (Dordrecht, Holland: Reidel, 1983), Marielouise Janssen-Jurreit, *Sexism: The Male Monopoly on History and Thought* (New York: Farrar, 1980); Evelyn Keller, *Reflections on Gender and Science* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1985).

⁴³Barry Franklin, *Building the American Community: The School Curriculum and the Search for Social Control* (London: Falmer Press, 1986).

⁴⁴Michael Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979), Robert Bullough, Stanley Goldstein, and Ladd Holt, *Human Interests in the Curriculum: Teaching and Learning in a Technological Society* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1984), Dennis Carlson, "Updating Individualism and the Work Ethic: Corporate Logic in the Classroom," *Curriculum Inquiry* 12 (Summer 1982): 125-160; Henry Giroux, *Ideology, Culture, and the Process of Schooling* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981), Andrew Gitlin, "School Structure and Teachers' Work," in *Ideology and Practice in Schooling*, ed. Michael Apple and Lois Weis (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983), pp. 193-212, Maxine Greene, *Landscapes of Learning* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1978), Arthur Wirth, *Productive Work—In Industry and Schools: Becoming Persons Again* (Lanham, Md.: University Press, 1983).

⁴⁵Madeleine Grumet, "Pedagogy for Patriarchy: The Feminization of Teaching," *Interchange* 12 (No. 2-3, 1981): 165-184.

teachers "are required to raise children in the service of a dominant group whose values and goals they do not determine [and] to socialize their children to conform to a society that belongs to men."⁴⁶

SUMMARY

The trend to disenfranchise elementary school teachers is significantly more complex than several recent articles would suggest. The work of critical theorists and feminist scholars has provided valuable insights into this phenomenon. The disenfranchisement of teachers has developed in ways similar to other occupations during this century and is part of a broader movement to systematically control and eventually degrade the nature of work and workers. Also, the work of elementary teachers is further degraded because of the feminization of teaching and the system of patriarchy found in our society. Both a technocratic approach to the process of labor and a system of patriarchy undermine the integrity of teaching by treating teachers as little more than automated functionaries.

These social forces essentially rob teachers of significant decision-making power and a sense of ownership of their professional activities and the development of their craft. It is ironic that much of the recent blame for the shortcomings of our present education in this country has fallen on teachers (rather than community leaders, economic funding priorities, cultural values, etc.) who happen to be mostly poorly paid working women with little power in schools or society. While the recent push for teacher competency and accountability has contributed to the disenfranchisement of teachers, this movement merely reflects much more entrenched and powerful forces in our society. However, the purpose of examining these forces is not to discourage those interested in resisting the trend. We are not helpless. Although sweeping alterations of the teaching profession will most likely not occur until society as a whole decides it wants a more substantive education for its children, reasonable strategies can now be carried out to empower our teachers rather than disenfranchise them.

STRATEGIES FOR RESISTANCE

If we are to resist the trend to disenfranchise teachers, several groups of people must become involved. A single individual or even an identifiable group cannot act alone with much success. Policy makers, teachers, administrators, teacher educators, and researchers can play a significant role in empowering teachers.

⁴⁶Sara L. Lightfoot, *Worlds Apart. Relationships Between Families and Schools* (New York: Basic Books, 1978), p. 70

Policy Makers

During the 1970s, people in the United States demanded that major economic projects (e.g., building a road, shopping center, dam) should not be implemented without an environmental impact statement. Before this time, if an individual or corporation wanted to engage in a project, they simply had to disclose their plans and show how the project would promote the economic climate of a particular community. However, as a nation, we now recognize that our environment is intimately interconnected and that a major alteration in one area is bound to significantly affect the surrounding ecosystem. Proposals for major projects must now contain a statement that will reasonably speculate on how the final product will affect the immediate environment. If negative consequences are identified, then the project directors must stipulate how they will minimize or correct these consequences. For example, coal-mining companies must now show how they will restore land that will be stripped-mined before beginning their work.

Several state governments have recently legislated major educational reform programs. For the most part, these programs have been enacted with little concern for the effect they will have, other than raising students' test scores on standardized tests. This relatively narrow focus is similar to the state of affairs regarding economic projects before the 1970s. Policy makers must begin to see schools as ecosystems, since altering one aspect of schooling affects the entire system. We need to bring the same "environmental consciousness" to proposals regarding education as we now have in other areas of our society.

Policy makers interested in resisting the movement to disenfranchise teachers should propose that "teacher impact statements" be required when state governments begin to mandate educational practices and curriculum. These statements should address to what degree a particular reform proposal will encourage teachers to (1) develop a sense of ownership of the instruction that occurs in their class, (2) increase their commitment to the education of their students, (3) experiment with thoughtful instructional strategies, (4) seriously reflect on the value of what is taught to their students, and (5) become involved in thoughtful dialogue on the goals and practices of the education we provide children. In addressing these concerns, teacher impact statements could become a means to empower teachers as creators of their craft and to counteract our society's tendency to ignore the voice of women. As Frymier clearly illustrates, most state legislators simply are not qualified to determine specific educational practices or curriculum, therefore, teachers must be protected from unreasonable state mandates.⁴⁷ Teacher impact statements are a first step in providing this protection.

⁴⁷Jack Frymier, "State-Legislated Curriculum. Why Be Concerned?" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 1987).

Teachers

Both now and in the past, individual teachers have resisted efforts to control their craft through external agencies.⁴⁸ Once they close their doors, individual teachers have found ways to circumvent official dictates and to create more meaningful educational experiences for themselves and their pupils. However, individual action cannot fully address this most recent momentum to disenfranchise teachers. Individual teachers must work collectively and form support groups to discuss and plan actions to protect their professional autonomy and improve the quality of education for their pupils. Also, teachers should carefully consider becoming involved in their professional organizations and push these organizations to defend their talents and decision making powers. Historical examples clearly show how teachers' collective action has improved the quality of education.⁴⁹ While organized struggles often stressed the economic disparity between teachers and other workers, these organizations have, at times, fought to give teachers more control over class size, what they taught, how they taught it, and by whom their teaching should be evaluated. Some teachers have been anything but docile, and today's teachers must remember past struggles and victories.⁵⁰

As part of this collective effort, teachers must connect with other workers. If the disenfranchisement of teachers is part of a larger process that involves the degradation of labor in general, then it would be wise for teachers to form coalitions with other workers—nurses, social workers, and clerical groups—who are experiencing similar transformations of the integrity of their work. Perhaps unions that represent these various workers could hold collaborative meetings to map out appropriate strategies. Since many of these occupations are dominated by women, various women's organizations could also provide a forum for this collaboration. Although organized action may result in putting more pressure on teachers' already overcrowded schedules, it is better than simply complaining about how hard it is to teach creatively because of present working conditions. As Apple and Teitelbaum state, "It may be that in order for teachers to retain a large portion of their autonomy, the prior conditions

⁴⁸Jesse Goodman, "The Political Tactics and Teaching Strategies of Reflective, Active Proservice Teachers," *Elementary School Journal* (in press); Jesse Goodman, "Key Factors in Becoming a Proactive Elementary School Teacher: A Preliminary Study of Selected Novices," *Journal of Education for Teaching* 13 (3, 1987): 207–209; Herbert Kohl, *36 Children* (New York: Signet, 1968); Jonathan Kozol, *Death at an Early Age* (New York: Bantam Books, 1968); Barbara McEvoy, "Against Our Better Judgment: Three Teachers' Enactment of Mandated Curriculum" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1986).

⁴⁹Michael Apple, "Teaching and Women's Work: A Comparative Historical and Ideological Analysis," *Teachers College Record* 86 (Spring 1985): 455–473; William Eaton, *The American Federation of Teachers: 1916–1961* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1975); William Reese, *Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grass-Roots Movements During the Progressive Era* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986)

⁵⁰Wayne Urban, *Why Teachers Organized* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1982)

for that include working hard for democratic alternatives in the larger society."⁵¹

Administrators

Given the public perception that good schooling equals good results on standardized tests, it is unlikely that administrators could completely abandon the use of such tests and the instructional programs designed to increase children's scores. Still, school administrators who are interested and see the value in promoting teacher decision making can make a significant difference.⁵² Not all teachers have to be viewed as possessing the same talents or potential. For example, one school principal (who asked not to be identified) recently told me:

The teachers who have worked in this building have tended to fall into one of three categories. A few teachers have been minimally competent, and I have insisted that these individuals follow our curriculum guidelines carefully. The second category is composed of teachers who are recognizably competent. They are well organized, can express themselves clearly when talking to their children, are able to manage the children's behavior, and are responsive to their students' feelings. However, this group of teachers is not particularly inventive or thoughtful about curriculum or new approaches to instruction. These teachers usually want to follow their teacher's manuals fairly closely and feel uncomfortable moving too far away from the textbook. I usually leave these teachers alone, but through some personal incentives I encourage them to be like the teachers in the third category. This last group of teachers is competent and more. They are actively interested in developing school-based curriculum and experimenting with different approaches to teaching.

One of the most valuable incentives for joining this last group of teachers includes obtaining release time from teaching to develop original units of study. Several times during the year, this principal serves as a substitute so that her teachers can work on curriculum projects. Also, she actively works to secure funds for experimental, school-based programs. For example, this school was one of the first to begin a "silent reading program" in which the entire school (pupils, teachers, and staff) takes 20 minutes each day to read "simply for the pleasure of it." All normal business is suspended until the reading period has ended. She and her teachers have designed an integrated curriculum program for social studies and science and a whole language reading and writing program in her school during the last decade. These programs required significant teacher input and decision making and were not imposed on any teacher who did not wish to participate. The most recent push to increase test scores on standardized tests that measure the memori

⁵¹Michael Apple and Kenneth Teitelbaum, "Are Teachers Losing Control of Their Skills and Curriculum?" *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 18 (April-June 1986): 183

⁵²Laurie Brady, "The Supportiveness of the Principal in School-Based Curriculum Development," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 17 (January-March 1985): 95-97, Joe Nathan, *Free to Teach: Achieving Equity and Excellence in Schools* (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1983)

zation of reading and math "skills" has been met with the development of a school-based, teacher-developed 6-week unit on test taking that focuses on the skills to be covered for a particular grade level. This special unit takes pressure off of those teachers in the third category who choose not to emphasize the district's standardized instructional programs during the regular school year. While this one principal's accomplishments may be unique, they are not impossible to reproduce. School administrators could request funds to provide release time for teachers to share their curriculum development ideas and projects. Getting teachers more involved in doing curriculum work could be promoted as part of a staff-development program.

Greater teacher autonomy does not mean that teachers be given carte blanche to "do their own thing." Clearly, not all teachers are interested in or are capable of developing worthwhile, original curriculum and instructional strategies. Still, instead of requiring all teachers to follow pre-set instructional programs, administrators who want to avoid the disenfranchisement of their teachers could allow (and actively encourage) individuals to propose alternative curriculum ideas and teaching approaches for review by the building principal or curriculum specialist in the district. If a teacher's ideas seem worthwhile, the administrator could offer support, and the teacher could implement them on a trial basis. The teacher must be involved in determining how his practices will be evaluated. For example, if a teacher designs a reading program that emphasizes the use of children's imagination in decoding and their critical analysis of content, but the instrument to evaluate the program emphasizes pupils' rote memorization of a few specific reading subskills, then the program's integrity would be greatly jeopardized. If the teacher does not have input into the evaluation procedure, then his autonomy will be significantly undermined. Helping teachers to become more empowered can be accomplished in a responsible manner, if school administrators choose.

Teacher Educators

As Zeichner notes, teacher preparation has primarily reflected an instrumental orientation. Most programs emphasize and thus limit their curriculum to the mastery of technical skills (e.g., writing behavioral objectives, planning specific types of lessons, conducting skill assessments, learning discipline techniques).⁵⁴ As a result of this orientation, research suggests that most future teachers develop "utilitarian perspectives" toward teaching in which the learning process is separated from its underlying educational, social, and ethical dimensions. These studies suggest that by focusing on questions of how to teach and ignoring underlying questions of why and what to teach, preparation

⁵⁴Kenneth Zeichner, "Alternative Paradigms of Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education* 34 (May-June 1983): 3-9.

programs have encouraged acquiescence and conformity to the existing, managerial role of teachers found in the schools.⁵⁴

Teacher-preparation programs should dramatically redirect their focus. While not ignoring the need for learning specific techniques, the focus of teacher education should be significantly expanded. Coursework, field experiences, and seminars should help preservice teachers develop the habit of reflection. This reflection should go beyond merely thinking about what techniques work best to get the children through their instructional programs on time. Rather, it should help preservice teachers examine the educational, social, and ethical implications and consequences of educational endeavors.⁵⁵ In this sense, teacher preparation should be designed to help future teachers become what Dewey referred to as "students of education," individuals who actively inquire into the complex dynamics of teaching, curriculum, learning, and the relationship between schools and society.⁵⁶

One of the distinctive aspects of empowered teaching is the teacher's ability to develop original, school-based curriculum. Developing unique, thoughtful curriculum is similar to producing a documentary or writing an article. It requires reflection to generate meaningful topics, interest in the subject matter, motivation and skill to research relevant information, energy to discover innovative resources, and creative talent to organize the findings of this work into a challenging form that children can understand and enjoy. Instead of viewing preservice teachers as merely managers of instructional programs, preparation programs should help teachers become creators of curriculum.⁵⁷

⁵⁴John Bartholomew, "Schooling Teachers: The Myth of the Liberal College," in *Explorations in the Politics of School Knowledge*, ed. Geoff Whitty and Michael Young (Driffield, England: Nafferton, 1976), pp. 114–124; Henry Giroux, "Teacher Education and the Ideology of Social Control," *Journal of Education* 162 (Winter 1980): 57–27; Jesse Goodman, "Field-Based Experience: A Study of Social Control and Student Teachers' Responses to Institutional Constraints," *Journal of Education for Teaching* 11 (January 1985): 26–49; Laurence Iannaccone, "Student Teaching: A Transitional Stage in the Making of a Teacher," *Theory Into Practice* 2 (April 1963): 73–80; Thomas Popkewitz, "Teacher Education as Socialization: Ideology or Social Mission?" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979); B. Robert Tabachnick, Thomas Popkewitz, and Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Teacher Education and the Professional Perspectives of Student Teachers," *Interchange* 10 (No. 4, 1979–80): 12–29; B. Robert Tabachnick and Kenneth M. Zeichner, "The Impact of the Student Teaching Experience on the Development of Teacher Perspectives," *Journal of Teacher Education* 35 (November–December 1984): 28–36.

⁵⁵Jesse Goodman, "Reflection and Teacher Education: A Case Study and Theoretical Analysis," *Interchange* 15 (No. 3, 1984): 9–26; Max van Manen, "Linking Ways of Knowing with Ways of Being Practical," *Curriculum Inquiry* 6 (Fall 1977): 205–228; Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Reflective Teaching and Field-Based Experience in Teacher Education," *Interchange* 12 (No. 4, 1981): 1–22.

⁵⁶John Dewey, "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education," in *The Relation of Theory to Practice in the Education of Teachers*, Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1 (Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing, 1904), pp. 9–20.

⁵⁷Kieran Egan, "Teaching as Story-Telling: A Non-Mechanistic Approach to Planning Teaching," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 17 (October–December 1985): 397–406; Jesse Goodman,

Finally, this article lends support to Lather's argument that women's studies curriculum be a central core to teacher preparation. Since the vast majority of elementary teachers are still women, they must become aware of women's historic and current struggles in our society. Lather suggests that this relatively new field of university studies offers potential for fundamentally transforming how we view knowledge, social power, and our roles as social agents.⁵⁸ If we are truly interested in resisting the trend to disenfranchise teachers, we can no longer afford to ignore gender related issues in the education of future teachers.

Researchers

Although critical theorists and feminist scholars have expanded our understanding of the forces at work to disenfranchise teachers, this social-historical research has limitations. As Bowers states, too often educators have overly depended on abstract language systems in developing their theoretical understanding of our social world. This dependence on abstract actors has "prevented them from testing their theory against the phenomenological world of people involved in concrete social and cultural relationships."⁵⁹ Thus, research is needed that will portray and help us understand the *lived experience* of teachers' work as related to the phenomenon of disenfranchisement. For example, this research can potentially provide us with a more comprehensive concept of what it means to say that teachers are disenfranchised. Exactly what rights, powers, or privileges are limited among specific teachers because of the process of disenfranchisement? Do all teachers experience this process in similar ways and to the same degree? Why does it seem that most teachers passively accept the status quo, and why have not more teachers been influenced by critical theory and feminist analyses? Also, to what degree does the larger socio-economic system need to be changed to restore the integrity of teachers' work? Can individual schools in our current system alter the process of labor in ways that empower their teachers? Can patriarchal relations be eliminated in a given school without transforming society at large? If not, what will it take to alter patriarchy in our society?

Descriptive research of specific schools and teachers in our society who are working to alter traditional labor and patriarchal relationships would be particularly helpful in addressing these questions. Studies that portray the working conditions and experience of teachers in societies with significantly

"Teaching Preservice Teachers a Critical Approach to Curriculum Design: A Descriptive Account," *Curriculum Inquiry* 16 (Summer 1986): 179-201, Margaret Yonemura, "Reflections on Teacher Empowerment and Teacher Education," *Harvard Educational Review* 56 (November 1986): 473-480

⁵⁸Patti Lather, "Critical Theory, Curriculum Transformation, and Feminist Mainstreaming," *Journal of Education* 166 (January 1984): 49-62

⁵⁹C. A. Bowers, "The Reproduction of Technological Consciousness: Locating the Ideological Foundations of a Radical Pedagogy," *Teachers College Record* 83 (Summer 1982): 546

different socio-economic systems would also provide insights into these questions. Developing a research program that illuminates the lived experiences of actual teachers, working in real schools, in a diversity of socio-economic contexts, could add significantly to our conceptual understanding of the process of teacher disenfranchisement. Then, we will be able to develop even more useful strategies to resist this trend in our schools.

CONCLUSION

Despite the rhetoric among governmental agencies about creating excellence in education, the recent push for teachers' competency and accountability simply reinforces the already-existing technocratic, male-centered rationality that dominates our educational system. While aimed at improving the quality of instruction of otherwise incompetent teachers, this most recent push will only continue the degradation of the teaching profession as a whole. Many of our best and brightest teachers will continue to leave the classroom, and the education of our children will suffer. Quality teaching needs a foundation of responsible autonomy. Without it, the structure of our children's education will be weak indeed.

In response to this most recent attempt to tightly control teachers' work, we must recognize the importance of meeting this challenge directly. Policy makers, teachers, administrators, teacher educators, and researchers who recognize the importance of teacher decision making need to become more involved in the political process concerning education. State and federal regulations and guidelines have their place, but they must be developed in a manner that does not destroy the craft and thoughtfulness of our teachers. We must be willing to organize and speak out against legislative bills and state department of education regulations when they restrict the creative potential of classroom instruction. Finally, we must resist becoming discouraged, and we must persevere in this latest attempt to simplify the complex experience of education through simplistic notions of effective teaching as reflected in the proper management of instructional programs.

JESSE GOODMAN is Assistant Professor, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405.

Schön, Donald A. *Educating the Reflective Practitioner* San Francisco Jossey-Bass, 1987 355 pp. \$24.95.

A follow-up to Schön's 1983 *The Reflective Practitioner*, this new volume describes a reflective practicum, aided by a coach, through which reflection-in-action is undertaken to educate the practitioner. Examples from architecture, music, psychoanalysis, and teaching make this inquiry-oriented approach an intelligible alternative to current applied-knowledge approaches to the training practicum. Schön's new book is highly suggestive for the inservice supervision of instruction and any preservice practicum for educators.

Copyright © 1988 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.