

Liston, D. P. (1995). Work in Teacher Education: A Current Assessment of U.S. Teacher Education. In N. Shimahara and I. Holowinsky (Eds.), *Teacher Education in Industrialized Nations*. New York: Garland Publishing. Copyright (1995) from *Teacher Education in Industrialized Nations* by D. P. Liston, edited by N. Shimahara & I. Holowinsky. Reproduced by permission of Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

## CHAPTER 3

---

# Work in Teacher Education: A Current Assessment of U.S. Teacher Education

*Daniel P. Liston*

## Introduction

For quite some time I have been struck, bemused, and somewhat depressed by the parallels between my work at home and my work in teacher education.<sup>1</sup> At home my wife, Michele Seipp, (who is also the director of a local library) and I “struggle” to maintain a domestic life that nurtures and cares for our children, keeps the house in working order, prepares food for the table, and creates a setting that we like to call home—both for ourselves and our two young boys (Matthew who is four years old and Ira who is eight). At times Michele and I disagree over who should do what and when. When we get in an ornery mood we tend to pick on each other. I point out that while she “toils” in her flower gardens I tend to the more immediate chores of vacuuming and laundry. She notes that I rarely shop for our children’s clothes or clean the bathrooms. And while our disagreements have never threatened our relationship, they point to the kind of conflict that occurs about and within the “second shift.”<sup>2</sup> For parents working outside the home, the chores and tasks that are required within the home—the domestic labor—frequently become a matter of reserve resources, old habits, and at times moral principles and discord. All too often it is the woman, the mother, who is saddled with the second-shift chores. She is the one who comes home after

work and works again—the second shift. She is the one who attends to the immediate and repetitive chores required by home life and children.

In any and every home someone performs the domestic labor. Just this summer, while gathering with old graduate school friends who now have children and tenure-track academic positions, the conversation frequently turned to the second shift. Few of our friends seemed satisfied with their situation, even though some had created ways to get out from under the societally prescribed gendered roles. What surprised me most was the intensity of the feelings, the gendered nature of the dynamics, and the complexity of the interpersonal interactions. It seems that no matter how hard we try, societally prescribed roles combine with personalities and relationships to help create the lives we lead—both at home and at work. In schools of education<sup>3</sup> somewhat similar dynamics are alive and influencing the education we offer prospective teachers. In schools of education, it seems teacher education represents the domestic labor, the second shift, of institutional life.

When I visit U. S. schools of education, especially research-oriented schools, I am struck by the parallels between the second shift at home and the work required in teacher education. All too often deans and chairs tell me that in their school it is the curriculum and instruction faculty who carry the teacher education load. C and I faculty put in more hours preparing for and teaching larger classes of prospective teachers, making the institutional connections between the university *and* elementary and secondary schools, and focusing on the professional issues of practice. In contrast, faculty in the psychological and social foundations seem less involved in teacher education and more attached and devoted to their disciplinary endeavors. In fact, when “foundations”-oriented faculty are hired in teacher education or professional preparation programs it is frequently feared that they will flee to the foundations division—never to be seen again. In our schools of education it seems that one group (or a few subgroups) tend(s) to perform most of the daily “chores” associated with teacher education. At some institutions, this group is the C and I faculty while at other places this group is made up of “clinical professors” (frequently adjunct faculty

members and/or experienced teachers), graduate students, and C and I faculty. These individuals perform the teacher education chores, chores that tend to be labor intensive and that, for the most part, go unrewarded. These chores fall to those who will, need to, or are required to do them.

And so it seems that in order to understand U.S. teacher education we need to explore the ways in which it may constitute the domestic labor of our institutional lives. In schools of education, especially research-oriented schools, the work of teacher education has an uncanny resemblance to the low-status, labor-intensive work that occurs in the domain of the home—labor that has traditionally been performed by women, focused on children, and relegated to the ontological basement.<sup>4</sup> If progress is going to be made in meeting the challenges of teacher education, these obstacles need to be underscored and understood. And it seems that in order to make progress we need to understand the way in which our educational work—that is, our teaching and the other chores that constitute our school of education lives—structures our activities and affects the education we offer our students, especially our prospective teachers. The domestic labor analogy aids in this understanding for it underscores the distinct types of labor performed, who performs it, and who benefits from its performance.

But, before I can pursue the domestic labor analogy, I need to back up a bit and establish some key assumptions. To say that teacher education is akin to being the domestic labor of our institutional lives is to say that serious problems exist within our schools of education. It is to claim that U.S. schools of education function in ways that do not take teacher education responsibilities seriously, and that they are not structured to confront, in a significant way, the problems or promises of teacher education. It is to claim that a division exists between those who educate teachers and those who educate researchers and that additional gaps and tensions abound.

Before I pursue, with any focus or vigor, the domestic labor analogy, some background work has to be accomplished. First, I need to establish that certain problems exist within U.S. teacher education. While it may seem obvious to claim that problems abound, these claims require substantiation. Therefore,

I first survey and summarize briefly the recent research documenting the obstacles in U.S. teacher education, focusing on qualitative distinctions between work in teacher education and the endeavor of doctoral education. Once I have established that tensions and problems exist in U.S. teacher education, I outline the central explanations proffered for these problems. Here I focus on the recent analyses of John Goodlad (1990), Nona Prestine (1991), Harry Judge (1982), and Milton Schwebel (1985). After reviewing these analyses, I maintain that a more internal institutional and labor-focused examination is needed. I then highlight the prominent features of domestic labor, and delineate connections to teacher education. Once I have portrayed the parallels between teacher education and domestic labor I then raise a number of questions and issues that seem worth pursuing. I examine the moral terrain on which these claims could be examined, and I discuss some of the policy implications of viewing teacher education as domestic labor in an era of drastic downsizing in U.S. higher education.

### The Gaps and the Tensions in U.S. Teacher Education

Gaps and tensions abound in U.S. teacher education, and a variety of scholars have documented them. At the core of these gaps and tensions lies the distinction between research and practice. Schools of education have tended to downplay their role in educational practice and their linkages to the reality of schooling and have focused on a more narrow set of research agendas. In some ways, this tension between research and practice is simply a manifestation of the "natural" movement between thought and action, reflection and practice. But in other ways the distinction has become institutionalized. As such, it divides and separates university sponsored research and doctoral education from public-school-based projects and the preparation of teachers. This division has helped to make teacher education the domestic labor of institutional life. It has created a

"classed" system of labor in schools of education that harms, not engenders, the education of teachers.

In an historical examination of the University of Chicago's School of Education, Woodie White (1982) captures these features of professional life and notes trends that have persisted for the last sixty years. After examining Chicago's School of Education from the years 1909–1929, he summarized his findings in the following manner:

... the University of Chicago study of education had become a fragmented, highly specialized study that seemed more concerned with creating a respectable body of research, establishing specialized roles, and exerting control over mobility in the education profession than in developing a course of study where theory and practice could meet. After years of Dewey's stewardship, Judd and his men reinforced the notion that teaching was an endeavor unworthy of a white man's life work. They sought to achieve professional and academic status by emphasizing scientific training for roles above and beyond the classroom and by discriminating against population groups [women and people of color] that detracted from the dignity of the education profession. The American classroom was no longer the central place of action for the educational professional. Now there were other arenas for the development of new—and some thought more important—careers. (White, 1982, p. 171)

Many of the historical trends White highlighted continue today. In 1982, Harry Judge, a British educator, commented on the state of graduate schools of education (G.S.E.'s). He noted the persistence of the phenomena that White had described and captured more recent manifestations. In his *American Graduate Schools of Education: A View from Abroad*, Judge wrote:

The message in the G.S.E.'s is: Do not prepare teachers or school personnel or educational administrators. No credit will come to us for dealing with schools, which are messy and difficult. We have tried to make them better and failed. Teachers don't want to see us, and don't believe we have anything to say to them. Moreover, the demand is falling, and we can't just go on turning out doctorates in higher education or preparing people to be

superintendents. . . . so let's roll back the frontiers and make education synonymous with whatever we want to do. We are a school of education—not of pedagogy or routine administration. (Judge, 1982, p. 41)

In Judge's account, practice and research are divided within the school of education. Schools are perceived as a locus of headaches and heartaches, not a focus of study or reflection. And in 1990, John Goodlad, commenting on state universities, continued this line of analysis and noted that:

. . . the shocking reality is that many presidents of institutions now preparing teachers measure their institutions' "progress" by the degree to which they have distanced themselves from teacher education in evolving from normal school to teachers' college to state college to state university. Instead of educating future teachers, many professors of education, especially in the most prestigious research universities, only conduct studies of them—if these professors are involved in teacher education at all. (Goodlad, 1990, p. 46)

Notwithstanding the recent emphasis on the professional development school movement and efforts by educators like John Goodlad and others to narrow the gaps between the public school and the university, and between research education and teacher education, those gaps persist and remain quite wide. The authors quoted above (White 1982, Judge 1982, and Goodlad 1990) and others<sup>5</sup> have noted that schools, colleges, and departments of education live amidst numerous institutional gaps and tensions. These gaps tend to create obstacles in the education of teachers in the United States. While teacher education is the central, state mandated, and explicit function of schools of education few institutions embrace it. Instead, research endeavors and research education constitute the incentives and goals of institutional life. There seems to exist an almost unbridgeable gulf between the tasks and purposes of research and the practices and functions of teacher education, as well as between schools of education and the public elementary and secondary schools.

Within schools of education, teacher education is viewed as a low-status, messy, student-centered, and labor-intensive

endeavor; one to be avoided by researchers. Teacher education programs lack coherence, exhibit little continuity, and are uncomfortably connected to elementary and secondary schools. The list could go on and on. Admittedly there are, every so often, those who note the progress and laud the positive features of U.S. teacher education.<sup>6</sup> But the central and overriding tone is one of disgruntled dismay. John Goodlad, a researcher not known for drawing dismal portraits, describes the ethos of many schools of education as akin to a "benumbing frustration . . . a frustration ultimately replaced by benign neglect and ennui" (Goodlad, 1990, p. 151). Now institutional life is rarely fulfilling, rewarding, or aesthetically pleasing. But the pictures that are consistently offered of U.S. teacher education seem to be modern-day versions of either Max Weber's iron cage of bureaucracy or Edvard Munch's *The Scream*. Perhaps a more accurate view of the situation would be a postmodern pastiche of Weber's and Munch's visions.<sup>7</sup>

My comments offered thus far are not intended to capture all teacher education programs, and what I have to say applies more to the "research"-oriented institution than the small liberal arts college or the regional state college. But given that many regional and state institutions desire and struggle for research status, much of what I will say has some bearing on the endeavor of teacher education writ large. As Harry Judge noted:

GSE's [graduate schools of education] exert an influence over attitudes and policies that bears no relationship to their size and number. They are widely respected as representing "the best"; their alumni occupy positions of considerable power; less prestigious schools recruit from them key members of faculty; they seek to exert considerable influence on the national scene. For all these reasons they set the dominant values for all schools of education. . . . (Judge, 1982, p. 45)

Given the existing commentary on teacher education (and having worked in three research universities ambivalently pursuing teacher education), I think the best way to capture the research/practice and university/public school gulf is to describe briefly the activities and engagements of teacher education and contrast that with the work of doctoral education.

These brief descriptive accounts represent a compilation of the existing research literature and my own experience: They are attempts to capture the "best" of these two endeavors in a realistic and fair manner.

But first it might be helpful to see the contrast between these two educational processes juxtaposed in a more condensed manner. In many ways, the contrast between teacher education and research education is connected to conceptions of the "teacher" and the "researcher." And in this arena Arthur Bolster (1983) is quite helpful. According to him, a wide gap exists between the world of teachers and the world of researchers. This gap exists because teachers and researchers utilize distinct and, perhaps, incompatible frameworks. Bolster maintains that researchers and teachers "adopt radically different sets of assumptions about how to conceptualize the teaching process" (Bolster, 1983, p. 298). Furthermore, teachers' knowledge is

... idiographic in origin and therefore particularistic in character; that is, this knowledge derives from the need to comprehend the complexity of a particular context with sufficient accuracy to be able to act efficaciously in it. (Bolster, 1983, p. 298)

In contrast, university researchers' knowledge is

... nomothetic in aim and universalistic in character; that is social scientists seek to establish general principles about classes of human objects. Their aim is not to explain a particular situation in as much depth as possible, but rather to define and demonstrate the systematic operation of principles across like situations. (Bolster, 1983, p. 301)

The sharp contrast that Bolster offered in the early 1980s is muted somewhat by the emergence and prominence of ethnographic examinations of educational phenomena. Ethnographic studies are much more particular in their focus and more concerned with understanding rather than explaining human phenomena. But even recent ethnographic research tends to highlight instances so as to understand the larger and more general picture. Rarely are they motivated by practical conundrums nor are they oriented to solve pedagogical or teacher-based issues. Instead, most ethnographic research is

fueled by concerns that arise from the extant literature and is written for an academic, not a public school teacher, audience. Describing these two ways of thinking serves to foreshadow and highlight distinctions between the education of teachers and that of researchers.

## Teacher Education and Research Education in a Research Context: Two Accounts

### *Teaching Teachers*

Teaching prospective teachers is not a task for university researchers; it is avoided, belittled, and when it is performed it is usually done so begrudgingly. It is a messy ordeal, one that can be difficult to control or predict—at times it can even be emotionally volatile. In fact, one way to characterize the teaching of teachers is to note that it is as close as one can get at the university to teaching elementary or secondary students. Teaching teachers generally entails larger classes that enroll a younger, less sophisticated, student population. In teacher education courses, questions of practice and preparation loom large: Cognitive dissonance and affective apprehensions surface and both craft-based and research-oriented matters arise. The research-oriented school of education deals best with questions of practice when they are contained and intellectualized. Students, however, fueled by the fears and apprehensions that animate their lives, cannot always mold their concerns to fit the research paradigms. There is a problem of fit. The conundrums of the craft of teaching, whether they be moral or practical, occupy some prospective teachers and loom large as issues in the profession. Standard research, however, has little to say about those matters. In fact, as the Bolster quotes above indicate, the deliberation entailed in craft concerns and the processes of thought involved in research can be quite distinct. Certain modes of research certainly provide a bird's-eye view of educational phenomena, and this is essential for a comprehensive understanding. Prospective teachers, however,

long for some very particular and, at times, immediate, responses. Some balance is needed and called for. In teacher education, training and reflection are required; and they are required in a manner that recognizes the place and importance of each component. In the preparation of teachers, there are issues to examine, skills and behaviors to develop, and norms and values to inspect. Research can contribute, but it is certainly not the only nor perhaps the central component in the preparation of teachers.

In U.S. teacher education there is, however, a preferred trinity of program components. Generally, students are given instructional methods, social and psychological foundations, and field experience (e.g., student teaching) courses. These three types of educational experiences constitute the backbone of U.S. teacher education. In the "methods" component, instructors generally feel compelled to "train" students in a particular pedagogical approach or to acquaint students with a range of pedagogical strategies employed in that content area. Generally, these skills or approaches conflict or simply do not coincide with the practices found in the local schools. The university teaches one approach while the local school district adheres to another, or the university faculty tend to teach the "proper" approach and view teachers in the local school district as simply not able to put it into practice. Students see the disjuncture and, in the end, they go with the established, institutional practices.<sup>8</sup> In the foundations course work, the disciplinary content (psychology, sociology, philosophy) often seems removed and remote from the every day travails of schools and students. Knowledge- and discipline-based problems, rather than felt and perceived issues, seem to animate the discussion. For many students, the disciplinary "solutions" seem to be empty and unsatisfactory. In the end, students sense that foundation course work provides little in the way of any sort of foundational understanding and seems to be simply one more set of courses to take and get out of the way. Student teaching is the pinnacle of the teacher education experience, and it usually begins the true education and socialization of the teacher. Cooperating teachers are paid little, if at all, and are relied on greatly. This "capstone"

experience tends to reject rather than utilize large portions of what went on before it.

For faculty members in teacher education, the levels of uncertainty and ambiguity are generally high and the rewards fairly low. Talking about teaching practice when one's experience tends to be dated (or nonexistent) is not the most comfortable or secure setting for instruction. Teacher education is a labor-intensive endeavor, one that requires attention to the students, the existing literature, the local schools, and the university's program. Students' excitement and apprehensions, the research literature's inability to address directly questions of practice, the normally tenuous relationship with the local schools, and the bureaucratic university and state requirements can be taxing and are certainly time consuming and labor intensive. Chores, minute and large, abound and range from addressing a students' personal needs to wending one's way through the current state legislation and local bureaucracy.

At the university the production of research is the most highly valued endeavor, with teaching and service counting for very little. Time spent in the labor-intensive area of teacher education is frequently construed as time that is lost and not to be recovered for the research effort. One learns to leave these endeavors behind, to limit one's interactions with prospective teachers, and to restrict both the range of issues discussed and the time available in interactions with prospective teachers. One learns that while such tasks constitute some of the central functions of a school of education, they are neither recognized nor rewarded.

### *Teaching Researchers*

Preparing researchers and university professors is a distinctly different task. It is both recognized and rewarded within the university. In educating and training researchers, one is preparing "one's own." One is preparing future scholars of education, individuals who will carry on the intellectual traditions and perspectives that currently reign in schools of education, hopefully transforming and adapting these traditions over time. For the most part, this advanced graduate work is

carried on under fairly amicable and congenial conditions. Faculty members can usually indicate the number of graduate students they will work with, and within reason, with whom they will work. Students at this level tend to have a good inkling about where they want to head and the focus that they want to pursue. Uncertainty and ambiguity, while definitely present, tend to be limited to the intellectual terrain.

The "methodological" terrain that is covered, whether it be quantitative, qualitative, or conceptual, is certainly no simple matter. Here the intellectual complexity is an intrigue, a headache, and a delight for the established scholar and the student. For the professor the complexity is in terrain through which one has traveled and continues to travel as a part of one's daily professional existence. Graduate students tend to further extend the faculty member's own intellectual pursuits, whether it be through working on research projects or covering intellectual terrain that is of a shared concern.

A central goal of the doctoral enterprise is for the student to contribute, in a "significant" sense, to the research literature. While such an achievement is not easy to attain, it is somewhat easier to identify what constitutes a contribution to the research literature than what constitutes exemplary teaching. When one's work is published and cited, when one's arguments or findings are noted, and when one's presence is requested—a contribution and a reputation are being (or have been) established. These are the "standards" that guide both the faculty member and the doctoral student in their efforts to make a significant contribution.

At the university, research is supported and rewarded. The professional recognition, the increase in increments in pay, and the peer acceptance depend to a large degree, if not exclusively, on one's research. When national and international acclaim is achieved, prominence is attained. At the university, one is "paid" to do research. One's contribution to the academy and the greater public is linked to one's knowledge production. Production is the key element, production recognized by other experts. At the university, teaching is not really supported or rewarded. Teaching, whether it be in the arts and sciences or one of the professional schools, is said to be integral to the

institutional effort, but the truth of the matter is that it rarely "counts." Assistant professors are informed early on that research is all that really matters—teaching and service need to be performed, but their performance is rarely ever critically assessed. Given the amount of time and energy that is required in collaborative research endeavors and in research that engages teachers, such collaborative practices are even less likely to be performed. In this way, the gap between the university researcher and the teacher is reinforced both within the university setting and as a result of the distance between the school of education and the public school.

From this brief and pointed summary and from a perusal of the past fifty years of the pertinent literature, it seems evident that there is something amiss in our attempts to educate teachers.<sup>9</sup> It seems to be an educational endeavor that energizes few, offers much too little, and as a result fails. But it does not seem to fail in a dramatic or highly visible way. It is not like the crumbling levees of the Mississippi, the dismantling of the Berlin Wall, the disappearance of the Mars probe, or the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Rather than falling apart or disintegrating, it simply and continually fails to attain what many deem to be realistic expectations. And in doing so, our institutional endeavors end up frustrating teacher educators, prospective teachers, and many practicing teachers. The current explanations for this failure contribute to an understanding of our situation. Most of the proffered views, however, seem to lack connection to the daily lives and tensions that many teacher educators experience or to the internal dynamics of schools of education. Let me briefly summarize three prominent answers and then add to this collection the domestic labor analogy.

### Explanations for the Dismal State of U.S. Teacher Education

While there are many microexplanations for pieces of the teacher education "situation," at least three general claims stand out: John Goodlad's (1990) and Nona Prestine's (1991) complex

system analysis; Harry Judge's (1982) market explanation; and Milton Schwebel's (1985) class-based social reproduction "model." Briefly they are as follows.

John Goodlad and Nona Prestine (and many others—most notably Harry Judge 1982 and Geraldine Clifford and James Guthrie 1988) note throughout their separate works the complex, interconnected nature of the teacher education enterprise. Goodlad argues that in order to create a successful teacher education endeavor a number of individual efforts have to come together—efforts that usually are not well coordinated or orchestrated. According to Goodlad, these factors include individualistically oriented faculty, state mandates, regional needs, and student perceptions, all elements that infrequently coalesce. In a somewhat similar manner, Nona Prestine maintains that teacher education is, in part, an outcome of the conflict between internal institutional variables (e.g., pluralistic membership of the school of education, isolation and insularity, and decentralization) and external environmental forces (e.g., lack of support from significant external groups, general public mood, and the formation of a coalition of interest groups).

Given the complexity of the situation Goodlad maintains that:

... a large part of the diagnosis as well as the remedy lies in the concept of syzygy—the straight-line configuration of relevant, separate, but interrelated parts both inside and outside of colleges and universities. These parts are not well lined up now; and as a result, the efforts of people with leverage on one part (however inspired and energized they are) do not and cannot affect the whole—only a part, and even that only for a short time and under the most fortuitous circumstances. (Goodlad, 1990, p. 151)

While Goodlad believes that the parts can "come together," this belief does not seem adequately substantiated in his text.<sup>10</sup>

Nona Prestine maintains that the conflict between the internal and external forces causes innumerable problems and eventually must be muted or somehow resolved. Citing former Dean Donald McCarty at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, she highlights some of the internal obstacles to teacher education reform. She writes:

... the university faculty "with its time-honored mechanisms of modest structural changes and minor additions to or deletions from the curriculum" was not likely to be a source of substantial reform: "Professors are unusually adept at practicing the occult art of strategic concession instead of blatant resistance. They are after all highly individualistic human beings and are not terribly interested in extensive reform since it involves working with others on policies and ideas, efforts that do not contribute significantly to their own careers. This is the main reason teacher education has been so static." Schools of education must either be willing to expend the time and effort required to meet significant demands for reform or be willing to see such decision-making authority wrested from their control. (Prestine, 1991, p. 272)

Both Goodlad and Prestine highlight the multiple players and forces acting upon teacher education. Institutional complexity and "inevitable" conflict are key parts of that process and are highlighted in their explanation for why teacher education is in such a dismal state.

Harry Judge offers a somewhat different explanation. He maintains that teacher education fulfills particular market-driven functions. Judge claims that in a market situation institutions can survive only by being competitive. According to Judge:

The rules of competition are not set by graduate schools of education, and the rules cannot be altered by the schools. Moreover, the rules are powerful in two different fields of rivalry. A school of education can compete with another graduate professional school only insofar as it is linked with a powerful, organized, prestigious profession. In that sense its capacity to represent itself as a peer of medicine or law is directly limited by society's view of the status of teachers and other members of the educational profession.

The second field in which the rules of competition apply is in the G.S.E.'s themselves. They depend upon national comparisons and ratings, which, in turn, are equally dependent upon scholarly achievement. The pursuit of these achievements leads to a modelling of the G.S.E.'s on the standards of research prevalent in arts and sciences and, by implication, to neglect of the more sharply professional functions of the school.



It follows, then, that G.S.E.'s are engaged in two separate but related competitions. The tragedy is that they can abstain from neither and yet have little hope of triumph in either. (Judge, 1982, pp. 43-44)

According to Judge, this competitive market neither supports nor sustains the education of teachers. The market points schools of education in other directions, directions that are not conducive to the education of teachers. The market orients professors to an engagement in research and research education.

Milton Schwebel, a former dean of Rutgers School of Education, argues that schools of education function well—it is just that they function in ways integrally linked to the reproduction of a social order and not toward the creation of a quality teaching force. For Schwebel, the problem is not framed as a conflict between research education and teacher education but rather a “clash” between professional preparation and an arts and sciences education. He argues that the culture of the education faculty (EF) clashes with the arts and sciences ethos and that both, in their own fashion, end up reproducing a larger social order.

The cultures of the arts and sciences dominated university and the EF clash, then, in several significant ways. The mission of the former is, through a reflection-oriented way of life, to reproduce the upper levels of the predominantly male work force and to produce new knowledge crucial to the well-being of the economy and the government. The mission of the other is, through an action/reflection-oriented way of life, to reproduce members of the middle or upper-middle level of the work force as teachers. The teachers, predominantly female, reproduce the middle and lower levels of the work force. The EF mission also includes production of new knowledge to facilitate the carrying out of their mission. (Schwebel, 1985, p. 6)

For Schwebel, schools of education are implicated in the reproduction of the larger social order. Schools of education “educate” the masses.

Goodlad, Prestine, Judge, and Schwebel examine both external and internal forces. Their explanations highlight the complexity of the endeavor, the market forces upon and the

social reproductive effects of teacher education. While all four underscore the preeminence of research and the denigration of teacher education that occurs in schools of education, none of them *focus* on the internal dynamics within schools of education. An approach that looks at and examines more carefully the internal dynamics might illuminate features that have yet to be examined. The domestic labor analogy promises to do just that.

## Domestic Labor and Teacher Education

### *Domestic Labor*

An analogy that connects teacher education with domestic labor has to successfully connect teaching and teacher education with work and, more specifically, with a particular type of work—domestic labor. In effect, I need to argue that teaching and teacher education are work and that, as work, teacher education shares features with domestic labor. For many people construing teaching as work, as a labor process, seems odd or strange. Teaching is more akin to a calling or parenting—it does not seem like “work.” But I not only want to maintain that the energy expended in the teacher education endeavor is work, that it is a labor process whereby effort is expended in order to transform students in meaningful (and not so meaningful) ways, but also that it shares features with the tasks that are commonly associated with “woman’s sphere” in the home—that is, with domestic labor. For the purposes of this paper, I will assume that “teaching as work” is a claim that has a modicum of support. Teaching and its associated tasks can be seen as a labor process.<sup>11</sup> Here I will pursue the “domestic” aspect of the labor analogy, highlighting both the conceptual and the task analyses of domestic labor.<sup>12</sup>

A number of features stand out in the task analyses of domestic labor: domestic labor entails the necessary, ongoing, and time-intensive (reproductive) tasks of “keeping house”; it frequently includes the work that accompanies raising children; and it has traditionally been performed by women rather than

men. It is recursive, time intensive, and frequently emotional labor. It seems "never-ending" and is emotionally taxing. Domestic labor includes the daily chores of cooking, cleaning (clothes, utensils, and living quarters), and, when children are present, caring for children. Caring for children entails clothing, feeding, educating, and loving them. The "feel" of domestic labor, in this age of the second shift, is work that has to be performed so that the next day can begin and the next few months can follow. It is work that is usually juggled with other tasks. One plans the grocery list while listening to a story about what happened that day, how Quinn (the two-and-a-half year old) hit "me" (the four year old), or plans for the upcoming weekend. One pitches the ball to an eight year old batter sandwiched in between shopping for new shoes and picking up the lawn mower from the repair shop. One prepares the dinner meal amidst screams of sibling antagonism and cries for parental attention. Domestic labor can be rather intense emotional labor. It is, as Arlie Hochschild (1983) describes it, labor that

... requires one to induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others—in this case the sense of being cared for in a ... safe place. This kind of labor calls for a coordination of self that we honor as deep and integral to our individuality. (Hochschild, 1983, p. 7)

Emotional labor requires that we work on our own thoughts and feelings so as to communicate with and, at times, influence and affect others. Among working couples, the most recent research tells us that it is women who tend to work the greater proportion of the second shift. They end up putting more time into the daily chores of cooking, cleaning, laundry, and the care and nurturance of children. With regard to the basic functions of home life, women end up juggling more than one task, frequently engaging in two or three endeavors while being other directed. Men, on the other hand, consider their wives "lucky" if they engage in any sort of work at home and tend toward a schedule that guards time for themselves.<sup>13</sup>

In addition to the task analysis, a more conceptual approach is also offered. Christine Delphy (1984), a French sociologist, argues that in order to understand domestic labor we

need to view it relationally—not simply as tasks that are performed within the home. We need to see it as a production effort that occurs within a social relation. Trying to explain why standard economic accounts do not view housework as productive, Delphy maintains that the

... reason why housework is not considered to be productive and why it is not accounted is because it is done within the confines of the home for free: because it is not paid or exchanged in the general fashion. ... It is because of the nature of the contract which ties the female worker—the wife—to the household of her "master." (Delphy, 1984, pp. 87–88)

Extending the analysis further, Catherine MacKinnon (1989), a U.S. legal scholar and feminist, maintains that there are additional aspects of this production relation that need to be highlighted. Two features stand out. MacKinnon claims that 1) Women's non-waged work in the home is productive for capital in that it helps to reproduce their own and men's labor power on a daily and generational basis; 2) "Male workers benefit from women's services and support personally and sexually" (MacKinnon, 1989, p. 66). They also benefit materially from women's unpaid labor.

Both Delphy and MacKinnon maintain that viewing domestic labor as a production relation offers additional insights: It is non-waged work that reproduces men's labor power and from which men benefit. Given the earlier task analysis and this relational perspective, I think it is fair to say that domestic labor is non-waged work that is traditionally performed by women; provides the necessary basics for, and thus reproduces, daily life in the home setting; benefits others; and frequently entails a high degree of emotional involvement. It is low-status, intensive work for which little recognition is given.

One of the basic claims that accompanies the literature on domestic labor is that it is work that ought to be shared between the sexes and that frequently it is not, and this situation represents an injustice to women. Others add that such an injustice not only harms women but that it also harms those men who do not engage in caregiving endeavors.<sup>14</sup> Justifications for this inequitable situation include the claims that domestic labor

is "women's work": It entails care for children and a type of emotional labor for which women are best suited. The argument is that women know these situations best; they bring a natural talent to situations that require care and patience and an eternal balance to the savagery of the real world. Others simply argue that it is work that has traditionally been the province of women and so should continue to be women's work.

### *Teacher Education*

It seems clear, at least to me and on the basis of earlier discussions, that teacher education shares many features with domestic labor. If we see the home as a productive unit, with work being carried on in order to sustain the people within it, then I believe we can also see schools of education as productive units with various types of work occurring within them, work that "sustains" the faculty in a school of education. And in order for the domestic labor analogy to hold, we need not envision a conjugal or familial relationship. In fact, as most would guess, that assumption will only get in the way. Furthermore, we need not envision the work as being "women's work" or necessarily performed by women.<sup>15</sup> Despite these differences, I believe many of the task characteristics and the conceptual features of domestic labor apply to teacher education. Also, the moral claims focused on individuals' involvement in domestic labor have parallels in the realm of teacher education.

Recall the earlier summary description of domestic labor. I offered a view of domestic labor by saying that it is non-waged work that is traditionally performed by women; that it provides the necessary basics for, and thus reproduces, daily life in the home setting; that it is low-status, intensive work for which little recognition is given; that it benefits others; and that it frequently entails a high degree of emotional involvement. For each of these features there are parallels in the domain of teacher education.

Domestic labor is non-waged work that is performed in the home. It is not paid for directly. Similarly, one could argue that involvement in teacher education programs constitutes work that is performed in schools of education, but which, in a very real sense, is also non-waged work. In schools of education,

especially research-based schools, faculty are expected to teach and do "some" service. However, neither teaching nor service are critically assessed. They rarely constitute the basis upon which people are hired, fired (except for egregious error of judgment), promoted, or financially rewarded. Research is the single most important element, and it constitutes *the* basis for the wage labor in research institutions. The parallel can be seen in another way. Imagine the effort required for a teacher education endeavor to become a "program." For teacher education endeavors to become more than a collection of state- and tradition-mandated courses, it is necessary for faculty to collaborate and plan course work and field experiences. Faculty would need to plan collaboratively and work together with other university and public school personnel. Generally, faculty find it much easier to stick to their state-mandated and tradition-bound courses and to teach and plan alone rather than together. The extra work required in collaborative efforts is not seen as rewarded, professionally or monetarily, by the institution. The extra effort, if performed, would simply be non-waged labor—either "forced" labor or a labor of love.

Domestic labor provides the necessary basics for, and thus reproduces, daily life within the home. Without attention to the elemental physical needs and human requirements, life in and outside the home could not be sustained. Teacher education performs an analogous function. Schools of education came into existence and, for the most part, continue to legitimate their existence through educating teachers. Teacher education is a state-mandated and certified process carried on within schools of education. Teacher educators, those whose time, energy, and attention are focused on students, the public schools, bureaucratic regulations, and their students' future job demands, sustain the teacher education endeavor. They, in effect, provide for the necessary basics of the institutional life—and thus contribute to the reproduction of that institutional existence. If teacher education were carried on elsewhere, schools of education, as we know them, would cease to exist. It seems difficult to ignore this essential function.

Domestic labor is low-status work for which little recognition is given and which generally benefits others. For

many individuals, work around the home is considered a necessary evil, part of our "private lives." It certainly benefits those within the home who eat the meals, wear the clothes, and grow from the nourishment and care that are provided. Those who work in teacher education programs most probably recognize that their status is low in the institutional scheme of things. In research institutions they are frequently adjuncts hired on for part-time work, graduate students working as teaching assistants, and/or teachers who envision a better life at the university. Their work benefits those who engage in research education and the research projects unrelated to the tasks of teacher education. Teacher education provides the home base from which educational researchers can ply their trade. Teacher educators create the institutional rubric from which researchers work. But while this fact sustains the institutions, while teacher education provides the justification for the institution's existence, rarely is this work recognized and allotted the material and monetary benefits it deserves. Rarely is someone recognized, embraced, and rewarded for his or her work in teacher education. Instead an individual's contribution tends to be duly noted, generally appreciated, but remains work that few want to be involved in or associated with.

Domestic labor, when it is focused on a spouse or children, entails a significant degree of emotional engagement and investment. Caring for others takes a considerable amount of personal attention and energy. Teaching well, no matter what level (elementary, secondary, or tertiary), is labor intensive. Teaching children well requires a great deal of emotional investment. It entails working through one's own and on others' emotions in order to motivate and engage children in learning. Teaching prospective teachers to teach children entails a similar investment of emotion. If one is going to take seriously any of the recent constructivist calls to attend to students' thoughts and understandings, then it is difficult to imagine a teacher educator who would not be compelled to attend to the thoughts and feelings, the reasons and emotions of their students—these prospective teachers. Choosing to learn to teach is not an insignificant decision, and those who do so bring with them a wealth of life experiences from which feelings and emotions

cannot be excised. Teaching elementary and secondary students is certainly emotional labor, and preparing those individuals to teach at the elementary and secondary level is the closest one gets at the university to the life of the "real" teacher.

There are also parallels between the conundrums and moral appraisals of domestic labor and the calls for the improvement of and greater involvement in teacher education. Enhanced engagement by those who have only a very limited involvement in teacher education is usually met with resistance and claims that they lack the knowledge, experience, and expertise required. The teacher educator finds her/himself in the awkward place of the "wife" trying to get her husband, who has been raised and trained to be inattentive to domestic details, to be more involved and more skilled in the domestic labor. Practically, for the wife, there is the realization that any progress that might occur may be quite tenuous and might entail one step backwards so as to take two steps forward. Questions arise. Do you put up with ill-prepared meals and miniature versions of one's freshly laundered clothes in hopes that the involvement will, over time, become more skillful? Analogously, do you encourage your school of education colleagues who know little about the daily dramas of school life and the predicaments of new teachers to become more involved in the teacher education program? On both counts I believe the answer is a qualified "yes."

I think, at this point, a story might be appropriate. Daniel Nagrin, who in the late 1970s was a septuagenarian modern dancer operating out of New York City, used to relate the following account. Whenever he traveled with female dancers he would offer, hesitatingly, to carry their luggage. He hesitated because he believed, as he would relate to his companions, that every time he carried both sets of luggage he, not she, would become stronger. Relative strength, in ballet and modern dance, has affected the development and contours of the art. Male upper torso strength has helped to define and delimit, for many years, male and female dance roles. Nagrin observed and reflected on the degree to which his everyday labor affected his and others' artistic abilities and expressions. His continual lifting and "her" acceptance and participation were reflected in the

dominant images of dance. He urged his companions to alter their participation in this work and "thereby" alter the roles they played on stage. It seems that if we attend with care and consideration to the tasks that we perform, whether those be physical, aesthetic, domestic, or educational, we may very well improve our abilities and enhance our range of capacities. Our labor and the choices we make about that labor affect what we will do and who we will become. When Daniel Nagrin began carrying less baggage and his companions began carrying their own baggage, choices were made and perceptions altered.

With regard to domestic labor there are few of us, it seems, who are inherently or genetically ill-equipped to fix a meal, launder clothes, carry luggage, or care for children. Likewise, it seems that there are really very few in schools of education who are constitutionally unable to participate in the education of teachers. And it seems that once we start to perform these labors, with some attention paid to the craft and the nuances of practice, we become more skilled at the endeavor.

There are, of course, complicated moral conundrums underlying these questions of participation. As in most moral matters, the resolutions to the issues that arise are not ethically crystal clear, and ambiguity certainly does prevail. It will, I think, be helpful to discuss in a more personal way my own reactions to this situation and then to examine moral analyses that bear on these issues. Sandra Bartky (1990), an American philosopher, and Virginia Held (1983), a British philosopher, discuss these issues, and in the next section I will examine the moral conundrums that accompany the domestic labor analogy into teacher education, employing their insights. In connection with this moral analysis, I want to highlight developments in U.S. higher education that may impinge on the future of teacher education.

### Who's Lucky? Moral Claims and Teacher Education

Thus far, I have highlighted teacher education conundrums by underscoring the parallels between teacher education and the domestic chores within the home; so let me once again return

home. When Michele and I have hung on to our ornery moods and when, while in this frame of mind, we have persisted in discussing our domestic labor at home, I have (on more than one occasion) inevitably raised my hands up in frustration and with a sense of "rightful indignation" said, "You know you're lucky you're married to me and not to someone who would care less about all this stuff." At that point in the conversation she would turn to me and say, "No, luck isn't the issue. Either neither of us is lucky, or we are both lucky."

One night while reading in bed I came across Arlie Hochschild's (1989) analysis of "second-shift luck," and I read the passage below out loud. Hochschild, in her examination of the second shift, echoed Michele's comments, noting that in her analysis of working, married, heterosexual couples:

... husbands almost never talked of feeling "lucky" that their wives worked, or that they "did a lot" or "shared" the work of the home. They didn't talk about luck at all, ... But if women who have an equal deal feel "lucky" because it is so rare and precious and unusual and precarious an arrangement to have—if all of us who have some small shard of help are feeling "lucky" maybe something is fundamentally wrong with the usual male outlook on the home, and with the cultural world of work that helps create and reinforce it. But if sharing work at home, as I shall argue, is vitally linked to marital harmony, should something so important hinge on luck? Wouldn't it be far better if ordinary men and women lived in "lucky" structures of work and believed in ideas about men and women that brought that "luck" about? (Hochschild, 1989, p. xii)

Now Michele and I no longer argue about who is lucky. Instead, we continue our efforts to create a domestic structure that supports our ideas about men and women and mothers and fathers.

At the university the "domestic" situation seems a bit more complicated and not so "easily" resolvable. And at times my level of frustration seems surprisingly high. On certain days "at work" I carry around a lot of envy and resentment. On those days, I feel overwhelmed by the tasks I encounter as an academic researcher and a practicing teacher educator *and* as a wage

earner outside the home and a worker and parent inside the home. The variety of the demands seems far reaching and the number unending.<sup>16</sup> When I look around and see colleagues and friends who have eliminated or simplified either their professional or their domestic lives, I can get envious and resentful. My resentment and envy kicks in when my colleagues have simplified their tasks by reducing either their involvement in the institutional work of teacher education or the domestic labor at home. Toward my colleagues (those who are also parents and married to career-oriented spouses) I can feel bitterness when they seem to care little for or participate only slightly in the chores of domestic life. Toward my colleagues in schools of education who attend little to the work of teacher education I feel a similar antagonism. Their institutional existence is premised on the teacher certification endeavor—and so why, I ask, should they be exempted from work in teacher education? But I also feel envious. They are (and certainly at points in my career I have been) pursuing a life of relative ease, and it seems conducive to creating a successful research endeavor. Now, I have no intention of being “confessional” here. These are simply honest reactions that are the background to and result of the research-practice conundrum in teacher education. These reactions are just that: *reactions* to an institutional context. They act as indicators of sorts—they point to concerns and issues that undergird my work.<sup>17</sup>

Within my professional life, I have struggled to balance my desire to engage in fairly conceptual and abstract research endeavors about schools, capitalism, and patriarchy *and* to participate in and reform programs of teacher education. As a scholar in the area of social foundations and curriculum, I know only too well that one has to engage actively in research efforts, producing papers, articles, and other products so as to be a productive and active member of the research community. This activity can be rewarding and engaging. As a scholar and practitioner in teacher education, I know that my work is invaluable personally and professionally, can, at times, plumb the depths of the craft of teaching, and is intellectually challenging. Both endeavors have their own intellectual enticements, emotional currents, and means of engagement. But

lately I have been struggling to find a vantage point that will balance my own desires and deal with some rather strong emotional and intellectual currents; unfortunately, I do not have a clear, resolute vision of what constitutes that perspective. I have had to realize that I need to make some choices about the kind of labor I will perform, when I will perform certain types of labor, and the type of researcher/teacher educator I will become. In Daniel Nagrin's terms, I need to decide when and how much luggage I will carry. Honestly, I am undecided. But recently it has become more apparent to me that the research endeavor dominates the agenda within the schools of education scene and that teacher education constitutes the domestic labor of our institutional lives. In this realm, it seems obvious to me that it is the “researchers” who are privileged and lucky. It is they who benefit from the labors of teacher educators.

It seems that justice and freedom require that greater attention be paid to the equality of work performed in our schools of education. That is, that the labors of teacher education should be more equitably shared so that all can pursue endeavors of their choosing. But, at the same time, university research requirements, the intellectual engagement that goes with them, and one's professional career require the narrowing of duties and responsibilities. In order to produce this chapter, I have had to “hide away” one to two days a week for eight weeks. Resolutions to these ambiguous real-life situations can rarely be dealt with in a clean and clear-cut manner. And I certainly will not resolve them here. However, it seems that in this sort of situation one needs to consider the kind of harm that is being incurred and the moral arguments for addressing that harm. In what follows, I summarize Sandra Bartky's views on domestic labor and exploitation and Virginia Held's arguments about the obligations of mothers and fathers, and look for parallels in teacher education.

In an essay entitled “Feeding Egos and Tending Wounds,” Sandra Bartky (1990) argues that women are disempowered and alienated as a result of their caregiving to men. Women, in their nurturant and caregiving attention to men, not only strengthen men and deplete their own energy but also place themselves in a relationship that creates “subtle affective and ideational

changes" in women that tend to keep them in subservient situations. She explains that in the acts of caregiving women are affirmed in some ways and diminished in others. But what goes unnoticed is that

The woman who provides a man with largely unreciprocated emotional sustenance accords him status and pays him homage; she agrees to the unspoken proposition that his doings are important enough to deserve substantially more attention than her own. (Bartky, 1990, p. 115)

And so for Bartky,

Disempowerment, then, may be inscribed in the more prominent features of women's unreciprocated caregiving: in the accord of status and the paying of homage; in the scarcely perceptible ethical and epistemic "leaning" into the reality of one who stands higher in the hierarchy of gender. (Bartky, 1990, p. 114)

In Bartky's analysis, many women are exploited because they are in situations in which, through their caring, they accord higher status to the ethical and epistemological orientation of one who is "higher" in the gender hierarchy. Because a "caring" orientation accepts the other person's perspective, sees and feels the world from the other's point of view, then the caring individual has a tendency to view the world from that perspective. Accordingly, Bartky maintains that in these situations there is a tendency for the woman to see a "male" cognitive framework as more "valid" and, as a result, she becomes disempowered.

The question for this analysis is whether this sort of situation occurs within schools of education? And this question includes both conceptual and empirical features. The conceptual issues I can address briefly; the empirical examination will have to wait for another time.

In schools of education the groups that perform the domestic labor can be quite varied. They include faculty members in particular divisions (i.e., at times curriculum and instruction), graduate students who serve either as teaching assistants in certification course work or as "supervisors" of field

experience, or elementary and secondary teachers who are on leave from their schools or on loan to the university for teacher education. The disempowerment that Bartky speaks of—accepting another's perspective and thereby displacing and devaluing one's own experience—can occur in these situations. It seems at first glance not to be the predominant mode of domination in teacher education. However, it appears and seems to occur most readily when those involved in teacher education lean "into the reality of one who stands higher in the hierarchy" of faculty status. Those who enter into the teacher education endeavor and feel compelled to accept and buy into the status and prominence of university research, while feeling that the issues of educational craft and practice are being disregarded or demeaned, can be disempowered in the manner that Bartky highlights. At times, this disempowerment can be experienced by faculty members in a school of education that is experiencing a change from a teaching-oriented institution to a research-focused institution, or by those faculty who are committed to a form of craft analysis and deliberation within a research-obsessed setting. It may also be experienced by former practicing teachers, now graduate students, who find the mode of analysis in a research setting to be discomforting, or by teachers who are "acting" as adjunct faculty members. Certainly not everyone who "falls" into these categories would experience the disempowered sense that Bartky relates, but it seems that they are structurally positioned (or inclined) to do so. And it is the structural inclination that needs to be underscored. For this is not simply an individual phenomenon but rather a structural situation. The structure of schools of education is such that their rules, norms, and routines position individuals to have certain disempowering experiences.<sup>18</sup>

It also seems that another type of disempowerment occurs, one that is less subtle and focuses more on relations among "equals"—among faculty members. Those faculty members involved in teacher education can be viewed as working in an arena that, while necessary for institutional existence, tends to go unrewarded. At the university, relative status, power, and pay come with the production of research not with the teaching and service entailed in teacher education. A commitment to and

engagement in teacher education tends, over time, to reduce one's relative status, power, and pay. In this sense, teacher educators become effectively disempowered.

It seems then that an aspect of the domestic labor analogy is a moral claim: Involvement in U.S. teacher education harms some while it benefits others. In such situations, many of us tend to look for ways to rectify the situation. If we think the situation is in some ways harmful and alterable, we attempt to alter it.

Virginia Held has examined moral claims as they relate to parental obligations and responsibilities. These claims illuminate further the conundrums and the difficulty of encouraging more people to take part in the teacher education endeavor. In her paper entitled "The Obligations of Mothers and Fathers," Held (1983) analyzes what those obligations ought to be. In summarizing her view she states:

Equality of obligation, then, does not require that both parents perform exactly the same tasks, any more than equal opportunities for occupational attainment require that each person spend his or her working life at exactly the same kind of work. But it does require a *starting presumption* that *all* the tasks connected with supporting and bringing up children should *each* be divided equally. . . .

She adds further that

Equality of obligation *does* require that every departure from each parent performing the same tasks be justified in terms of relevant criteria and appropriate principles. There must be good reasons, and not merely customs and social pressures, for such departures. Simply being male or female is not relevant ground for such departures and cannot be the basis for justifiable differences in parental roles. And equality of obligation requires that the choices to perform given tasks at given stages of our lives should be no less voluntary for one parent than for another.

Finally she states:

Any differences in tasks performed would have to be the result of voluntary agreement between the parents, arrived at on the basis of initial positions of equality, such

agreements to include provisions for any later reversals of roles equality would require. (Held, 1983, p. 19)

Held maintains that in situations of parental domestic labor: 1) we ought to begin with the initial assumption that the tasks should each be divided equally; 2) when departures are made from this equal division good reasons must be given; and 3) these departures can be altered when the participants deem necessary.

Applying Held's criteria to teacher education is not a simple or uncomplicated task. As much as I have drawn parallels between teacher education and domestic labor, teacher education is an institutional not a marital arrangement, and teaching is not parenting. In schools of education, there are multiple roles and tasks assigned to all of the players; and these distinctions tend to be the result of educational training, professional choice, *and* social dynamics. And in our work lives the personal investment tends to be less than in our marital situations, and therefore the motivation for commitment and change is lessened. But despite these differences, I remain convinced that Held's criteria are relevant and ought to be used to examine our teacher education endeavors. Faculty ought to examine the participation patterns in teacher education, and it seems that something akin to Held's equality assumption ought to be applied. And while it seems that faculty will inevitably recognize that certain departures from the norm of equal participation will be necessary, considerations of how to deal with and adjust for those norms need to be examined. If a tenured faculty member chooses to devote his/her efforts to program development in teacher education, how is that effort to be assessed and rewarded? If a junior faculty member creates a productive collaborative endeavor between public school and university faculty, how is that member's efforts to be assessed? Should faculty be able to buy out class time for program planning? Will teaching and program development attain the status or receive the rewards that research provides? How are practicing teachers to be integrated within schools of education? Many other questions could be raised. But for the purpose of this paper, I will simply maintain that further analyses need to be produced and ought to be the focus of discussions among school



of education faculty. It seems that something like Bartky's critique and Held's criteria need to be considered in schools of education. In fact, it seems both morally recommended and practically necessary.<sup>19</sup>

Thus far I have related a sense of why I think such discussions are morally advised; now let me discuss briefly why I see them as necessary given the probable developments in U.S. higher education. It seems likely that higher education in the United States will face a severe downsizing of resources. In such periods of fiscal retrenchment, discussions focused on resource use and allocation are inevitable. Such developments could end up encouraging or discouraging the education faculty to take more seriously the tasks of teacher education.

### The Downsizing of Higher Education and the Future of Teacher Education

In a paper entitled "Educational Policy in an Age of Productivity," Ernie House (1993) argues that in

... the coming decades [U.S.] higher education is likely to be severely "down-sized" and transformed. ... Likely policies include elimination of tenure, consolidation of campuses, departments, and programs, cut-backs in staff, more students per faculty member, more faculty contact hours, setting of priorities by legislatures and governors, interference in internal campus affairs, mandating of policies and curricula, outsourcing of services, privatization through corporations choosing which research to support, and use of comparative productivity indicators. (House, 1993, p. 14)

House's reading of the future is neither positive nor uplifting to those of us in higher education. But he is not alone in this reading of the future. In an economic era in which education is no longer viewed as a public investment but rather a matter of private consumption—the public funding of education will come under attack. As House relates:

The real issue is economic: higher education is extremely expensive. Can the society afford it? Does the society want to, even if it can? In a society with a massive national debt in which retrenchment has occurred elsewhere, the answer seems to be that society does not want something this expensive. Productivity can be improved by cutting costs or producing more. Fundamentally, the government and public want to reduce costs. The bottom line is the bottom line. (House, 1993, p. 13)

Schools of education will be forced to examine the bottom line. And such a retrenchment could encourage an examination of business as usual—of the split between research education and teacher education. How prospective teachers fare in the process could become an important criterion in the new allocation process. How prospective teachers fare in the institutional process ought to be the bottom line. I fear, though, that they will not fare well.

It would seem advantageous for schools of education to take up these issues in an active rather than reactive manner. In doing so, it would seem appropriate to pursue policies that would recognize and substantially reward the labor of teacher education. Ernest Boyer's 1990 Carnegie report, entitled *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, is one well-known report that attempts to acknowledge the full range of a faculty member's professional responsibilities. Boyer's delineation of the range of scholarship (e.g., the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching) underscores the need to recognize and reward the full scope of academic work. A tenure and promotion policy similar to the one outlined by Boyer would alleviate a significant portion of the onerous load of teacher education.

But such talk is hopeful. If House is correct that the future will bring further constraints, then it seems that while thoughtful transformative efforts are possible, they may not be likely or probable. It seems improbable that so many years of persistent failure can be altered. It seems improbable that a faculty so accomplished in the "occult art of strategic concession" will take it upon themselves to see beyond their own office doors. That is unfortunate. It is unfortunate given that the opportunity for valuable institutional changes could be knocking on those doors.

I doubt the knocks will not be answered. I could be, and I hope I am, wrong. But it seems that while changes in the landscape of teacher education and schools of education are likely, it is difficult to discern the direction and directors of that change.

## NOTES

1. I would like to thank Michael Dale, Phil DiStefano, Margaret Eisenhart, Ernie House, Ken Howe, Bill McGinley, Pat McQuillan, Ofelia Miramontes, Linda Molnar, Michele Seipp, Wally Ullrich, and Ken Zeichner for their comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

2. In Hochschild and Machung's (1989) work entitled *Second Shift: Inside the Two-Job Marriage*, they explore why it is that when husband and wife both work outside the home it is wife who comes home and works the second shift.

3. Throughout this chapter, I will refer to "schools of education" as a shorthand for schools, departments, and colleges of education. Great differences exist among these institutional entities, but for the purpose of my argument I will be focusing on certain shared features. My claims, however, are pitched more toward the research-oriented schools of education than the non-research-based ones. I highlight the research orientation later in the chapter.

4. Here I borrow Jane Roland Martin's (1994) and Lorene Clark's (1976) characterization of women's work as work that is relegated to the ontological basement.

5. See, for example, work by Clifford and Guthrie (1988), Schwebel (1985), and Liston and Zeichner (1991).

6. For example, see Ken Howey (1989).

7. Certainly I exaggerate here, but it seems an apt characterization. For a more balanced view, see Ducharme (1993).

8. See, for example, Zeichner and Gore's (1990) summary of the teacher socialization literature.

9. For further documentation and examination of this issue, see David Labaree's contribution to this volume and the chapter entitled

"Traditions of Reform in U.S. Teacher Education" in Liston and Zeichner (1990).

10. See Goodlad's discussion that follows on page 152 of his book.

11. For an extended analysis of teaching as work, see Connell (1985).

12. For many people in the U.S., the phrase "domestic labor" has an odd ring to it. Frequently, when I use the term people unfamiliar with labor analysis cock their heads trying to figure out what is being said and what type of picture is being drawn. In addition to this lack of familiarity, the problem is compounded by the fact that the literature on domestic labor is not wildly extensive. It certainly exists and MacKinnon (1989) highlights some of it; however, it is not that extensive.

13. See Hochschild (1989) for further discussion and analysis of these issues.

14. Jane Roland Martin (1993 and 1992) repeatedly makes this point in her work.

15. In this paper I will not pursue the "demographic" topic: the degree to which teacher education is work performed by women. That topic deserves a separate analysis and one that cannot be accomplished here.

16. These are demands that traditionally many women have faced upon entering the work force. Now, it seems, some men are experiencing similar constellations of demands.

17. These reactions are by no means idiosyncratic. For an elaboration of the personal frustrations experienced by teacher educators, see Chapter 6 of Ducharme (1993).

18. The "structural" features of this depiction require further elaboration, but I cannot develop those features at this time.

19. After reading versions of this text, colleagues have noted that my claims about teacher education would seem to apply to teaching writ large at the university. While I do think that one could argue that within a research university teaching is akin to the domestic labor of the institution, I would maintain that teacher education represents a particularly intensified version of that labor. In fact, it seems that teacher education may represent one of the extreme cases within the university.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bartky, S.L. 1990. *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression*. New York: Routledge.
- Bolster, A., Jr. 1983. "Toward a More Effective Model of Research on Teaching." *Harvard Educational Review* 53(3):294-308.
- Boyer, E. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Clark, L. 1976. "The Rights of Women: The Theory and Practice of the Ideology of Male Supremacy." In *Contemporary Issues in Political Philosophy*, ed. by W. Shea and J. King-Farlow. New York: Science History Publications.
- Clifford, G.J. and J.W. Guthrie. 1988. *ED School*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Connell, R.W. 1985. *Teacher's Work*. Boston: George, Allen and Unwin.
- Delphy, C. 1984. *Close to Home: A Materialist Analysis of Women's Oppression*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Ducharme, R. 1993. *The Lives of Teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Goodlad, J. 1990. *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Held, V. 1983. "The Obligations of Mothers and Fathers." In *Mothering: Essays in Feminist Theory*, ed. by J. Trebilcot. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Allanheld.
- Hochschild, A. 1983. *The Managed Heart*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hochschild, A. Machung, A. 1989. *Second Shift: Inside the Two-Job Marriage*. New York: Penguin.
- House, E. 1993. "Educational Policy in an Age of Productivity." Unpublished paper, University of Colorado at Boulder.
- Howey, K. 1989. "Research about Teacher Education: Programs of Teacher Preparation." *Journal of Teacher Education* Nov./Dec.:23-26.
- Judge, H. 1982. *American Graduate Schools of Education: A View from Abroad*. New York: Ford Foundation.
- Liston, D. and K. Zeichner. 1990. *Teacher Education and the Social Conditions of Teaching*. New York: Routledge.
- MacKinnon, C. *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Martin, J. 1993. *Schoolhome*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Martin, J. 1994. *Changing the educational landscape*. New York: Routledge.
- Prestine, N. 1991. "Political System Theory as an Explanatory Paradigm for Teacher Education Reform." *American Educational Research Journal* 28(2):237-274.
- Schwebel, M. 1985 "The Clash of Cultures in Academe: The University and the Education Faculty." *Journal of Teacher Education* July/August:2-7.
- White, W. 1982. "The Decline of the Classroom and the Chicago Study of Education, 1909-1029." *American Journal of Education* 90(2):144-74.
- Zeichner, K. and J. Gore 1990. "Teacher socialization." In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, ed. by W.R. Houston, pp. 329-48. New York: Macmillan.