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TEACHER EDUCATION AND CLASS AND GENDER

RELATIONS: A CRITICAL SOCIO-HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

Introduction

It seems as accurate today as it did thirty years ago to state that:

Teacher educators vary in their sensitivity to underlying forces which
move society. Yet inevitably they reflect these forces, and their
thoughts [and actions] must be judged accordingly. (Borrowman,
1956:27)

The purpose of this paper is to explore the relationship between the development
of institutionalized forms for the socialization of teachers and broader social
forces, notably unequal social class and gender relations characteristic of a
capitalist and patriarchal society, the United States.¹

This critical socio-historical analysis of normal schools, teachers colleges,
and university departments/colleges/schools of education is being undertaken
partly to provide an historical context for an ethnographic study focused on
themes of professionalism, proletarianization, conceptions of curriculum
knowledge, and social inequalities evidenced in a teacher education program
(Ginsburg, 1988). This analysis also encourages us to critically reflect upon
current "debates" about and proposed "reforms" of teacher education (Carnegie
Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986; Feistritzer, 1985; Joyce & Clift,
1984; National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985; National
Consortium for Educational Excellence, 1985; Southern Regional Education Board,
1985). That is, we need to be more alert concerning how contradictions in
social class and gender relations serve as the "rules and resources" (cf. Giddens,
1979) for such debates and proposals, while concomitantly the debates and
proposals serve to mask/mediate or expose/challenge contradictions in capitalist
and patriarchal societies.
Before explaining and engaging in this critical socio-historical analysis, however, it may be helpful to compare it with other approaches to the history of teacher education in the United States.

Approaches in the History of Teacher Education

Traditional histories of teacher education, like traditional histories of schooling, have tended to stress an evolutionary, functionalist perspective. Normal schools, teachers colleges, and university departments/colleges/schools of education all emerge when there is a need for their contribution, and they change over time as the need shifts. People are involved in this process but primarily in terms of enacting a script. For example, normal schools are created because there is a need for teachers for the common schools, which in turn have been developed to meet the needs of an evolving and basically non-problematic society. As Beggs (1965:7) describes it:

As capitalism, the industrial revolution, the inroads of scientific inquiry, and the resurgence of learning of all kinds gradually altered the structure of Western society, formal education came to be recognized as one of the basic ingredients necessary to the successful operation of the complicated cultural machinery. . . . [This notion was] paralleled with a new interest in the process of training teachers for the schools. (emphasis added)

Similarly, it has been argued that the "normal school, by a natural evolutionary process, adapted itself to changing economic and social situations" (Harper, 1939:129; emphasis added). That is, according to Pangburn (1932:2):

While the schools under conditions of local control were slowly adapting themselves to meet the needs of [industrial] society, the teacher training institutions were reorganizing to meet the needs of the schools. (emphasis added)

This point is clarified and expanded to consider teacher education in universities by Snarr (1946:6), who states that:
When the demand for better qualified high-school teachers became urgent, state normal schools were transformed into teachers colleges, and departments of education in state universities, into colleges or schools of education.

There are at least two problems with this evolutionary, functionalist approach to teacher education history. The first is that the broader social dynamics of society are treated unproblematically, as naturally evolved themselves and inherently beneficial for all or most members of the society. To clarify this first point contrasts the above references to "industrialization" or even "capitalism" to Borrowman's (1956:34) description of the conditions within which the normal school was developed: "An epoch of crisis -- moral, political, and economic" or, perhaps more significantly, to Borrowman's (1965:21) characterization of Horace Mann and others, who were active in the social construction of normal schools as well as common schools, as "so concerned with the threat of group conflict." I would argue such discussions move us closer to understanding the contradictions of capitalist and patriarchal societies and the attendant crises due to conflicts and problems that arise within them (see Ginsburg, 1985c; Grace, 1984).

The second problem with the evolutionary, functionalist approach is the lack of attention to social struggle, resistance and contestation. There is, as noted above, a view of people's involvement in the process, but for the most part a role that is "given" and thus they do what needs to be done. It is as if there is only one need or problem to address and there is only one mutually agreed upon course to follow, and someone merely has to volunteer to lead in that direction. This assumption may appear to be challenged by the centrality of the concepts of professionalism and professionalization in the history of teacher education literature. For instance, Herbst (1980:134) discusses his analysis of the development of teacher training in Wisconsin as involving a
struggle between common school educational leaders and the general population of tax-paying worker/citizens.

The former wanted to create single-purpose institutions for training a corps of professionals; the latter desired practical and inexpensive opportunities for their sons and daughters to acquire post-elementary education.

However, most of the time professionalization has been treated as an evolutionary process in itself, one that is not only compatible with the general evolution of society, but also functions in the best interests of all members of society. (See Johnson [1972] and Larson [1977] for a critical discussion of this approach to the study of professions.) This evolutionary notion is evidenced in one of the factors Snarr (1946:262) cites as leading to the transformation of university departments of education into university schools/colleges of education: "recognition by the . . . universities of teaching as a profession analogous to other professions." The same unproblematic, evolutionary conception of professionalization is contained in Pangburn's (1932:126) discussion of the metamorphosis from normal schools to teachers colleges (see also Harper, 1939:70):

The changes incident to the transformation of the normal schools into teachers colleges reveal . . . the growing realization that the educational practitioner has a need of prolonged, highly specialized technical preparation for his professional career.2

In a sense, many historians of teacher education have, in their writings about professionalization, ended up following an approach similar to that adopted by "nineteenth century schoolmen," whose strategies involved "a special process of professionalization which strove [at least rhetorically] to be above and outside considerations of social status and political maneuvering" (Mattingly, 1975:xii).

Making teaching a profession was the "battle cry" for many of the actors in the efforts to institute and then develop formal programs for the preparation of teachers.3 As Borrowman (1956:59) reports:
The word "professional" became the symbol of the new gospel, and
the need to make teaching a "true profession" was invariably cited
as one of the prime reasons for the normal school movement.

Johnson and Johanningmeier (1972:28-29) also make reference to the fact that
"by now, obvious requirement of professionalization in the teaching force was
to be focused primarily on the normal school." Nevertheless, the
professionalization banner was also unfurled by those developing teacher
education in the context of universities. For instance, James Earl Russell, who
served as the first dean of Teachers College, Columbia University (1897-1927),
built his case for university preparation of school teachers, explaining that
"teachers capable of such service [in schools] would be truly professional workers
and would take their place alongside professional experts in law, medicine, and
engineering" (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954: 28-29). Moreover, profession-
alization efforts within universities were often contrasted favorably with similar-
ly labeled efforts in normal schools. William H. Payne, who was appointed to
the first U.S. university professorship in education at the University of Michigan
(1879):

... contended that normal schools' stress on "mechanical exactness
and expertness" produced a "machine" rather than teachers of
"freedom and versatility." ... True professionals were taught to do
by knowing. Only quacks professed dogma that one learned to do
by doing. (Powell, 1980:41)

This last point signals another approach to explaining the development of
teacher education in the United States. This approach focuses on competition
between what Borrowman (1956) terms proponents of the "technical" and the
"liberal" in teacher education. The competition was played out by normal school
people and university people, respectively, but also took place in universities
between education faculty and arts/science faculty, respectively (e.g., Cremin,
appears to have operated (and continues to do so) within colleges of education,
involving curriculum and instruction faculty and foundations of education faculty (see Ginsburg & Spatig, 1985).

Such competitive relations, however, do not occur in isolation or within some political, economic and ideological vacuum. And it is not sufficient to fill the vacuum with some notion of the ambiguity or uncertainty of education as an academic field of study or as a profession (cf., Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972; Powell, 1980), for this is but another way to insert a version of the professionalization approach. Rather, what is needed is an approach to studying the history of teacher education that systematically takes into account broader social, structural and ideological phenomena. Institutional arrangements and curricular programs for the formal preparation for teachers do change over time, and competition and professionalization projects (Larson, 1977) are salient dimensions of these processes. But such dynamics are related to structural and ideological features of society.

The thesis here, though, assumes a more complex dynamic than is suggested in Lanier and Little (1986:535) that "variables associated with . . . the larger society are simply mirrored in . . . colleges and departments of education" (emphasis added). As I have argued elsewhere (Ginsburg, 1985, 1986a, 1986b), an important theoretical tool for avoiding such overly-deterministic "correspondence theory" approaches (cf. Bowles and Gintis, 1976) is the concept of contradictions. My approach is based on the Marxist notion, here expressed by Mao (1971:85-91), that contradictions, that is,
... unity of opposites, ... exists in the process of the development of all things, [i.e.,] nature as well as social and ideological phenomena, [but that the] particular essence of each form of motion is determined [at least in part] by its own particular contradiction.

Thus, we shall examine how contradictions in class and gender relations have informed the thought and action of those involved in construction of "teacher education practice" (Monroe, 1952:257). In so doing, we shall investigate how such agents serve to mask and thus mediate or to expose and thus challenge the contradictions imbedded within unequal class and gender relations.

**Contradictions in Class and Gender Relations**

We need to discuss contradictions in class and gender relations in the society generally, but also how they are manifest in schooling and teaching, since both sources of contradictions can be viewed to relate to teacher education. Our concern here with class and gender is not primarily about characteristics or background factors of individuals as "independent variables." Rather, the focus is on the structural phenomena of class and gender relations, the dynamic through which groups are mutually implicated. Class relations are conceived as "the set of relationships between ... groups which centre on property, wealth, the employment relation and the labour market as a means of organising the society's production of resources and deciding their distribution (Connell, 1985:8). Conflict and struggle are seen as inherent in such relations. Within capitalist political economies there is the fundamental contradiction that although production is a social activity, the ownership and control of the means of production is privately concentrated. Also relevant is the contradiction that production takes place for profit accumulation by capitalist rather than to satisfy the needs of workers, who constitute the vast majority of people. Moreover, another contradiction arises because of the profit motive to reduce labor costs and increase productivity; this is that while many workers experience deskill/ proletarianization and thus became less expensive workers and more
easily replaced by other humans or machines, a few workers undergo
ereskilling/professionalization as they can be seen to enhance the design or control
of the work process (cf. Braverman, 1974; Carter, 1976). Associated with this
latter contradiction is another one between mental and manual forms of labor,
that a few people are seen to engage in work of the mind, while the majority
are viewed to engage in work of the hand, leg, back, etc.

In the context of schooling and teaching, these contradictions surface in
a slightly different form. First, there is the contradiction that many educators
teach, while a few occupy management positions. Second, although schooling
may be provided for the masses, that available only on a selective basis is
considered of higher status. Third, knowledge and skill associated with "mental
work" is contrasted with and given higher value than knowledge and skill
associated with "manual work."

Gender relations are conceived to be the set of social relationships,
including:

... the sexual division of labour, the power relations between men
and women, ... institutions like the family, the social relations of
child rearing, and the social movements and political struggles
connected with issues such as sexual morality, the family, abortion
rights, violence against women, [and political and economic
participation and power]. (Connell, 1985:8-9)

Within patriarchal societies, the fundamental contradiction is that although
women normally constitute at least half of the population, political and economic
power is concentrated in the hands of relatively few (elite) men. Related to
this contradiction are the ideological notions that women "belong" in the home,
while men "belong" in the public sphere, and that males specialize in emotional
detachment required for authority positions, while females specialize in emotional
engagement necessary for nurturant/cretaking positions (see Connell, 1985;
Hochschild, 1983).
With respect to schooling and teaching, we should note the contradiction, which arose along with a mass education system in the United States, that although education (particularly at the primary level) is predominantly a "feminine" pursuit, the vast majority of those who control the means and manage the process of educational production—school board members and educational administrators, respectively—are men (Acker, 1983; Apple, 1984; Strober & Tyack, 1980). Finally, we should consider the contradiction in the role of teacher: the "opposing requirements" of emotional detachment and emotional engagement in relation to students as well as to their parents.

**Socio-Historical Analysis**

The discussion below is organized around three interrelated themes. The first two can be termed: (1) normal schools and teachers colleges versus universities and (2) education versus arts/sciences faculties in universities. Implicit in these themes is a sense of competition or conflict and a concern about professionalization. However, I hope to demonstrate that such competition/conflict and professionalization dynamics must be understood (at least in part) in terms their connection to unequal class and gender relations. We will see not only that each of these themes can be characterized on a predominantly female versus predominantly male dimension as well as on a lower versus higher class dimension. We will also note how issues about gender and class enter into the dynamics represented by these themes. In addition, the other theme will be explored: (3) curriculum responses to class contradictions and to gender contradictions.

**Normals/Teacher Colleges versus Universities**

The first teacher training institution in the United States evolved in 1821 from the Troy Female Seminary (founded by Emma Willard in 1814), although, ironically (given the gender issue), most historians tend to refer to the academy
Samuel R. Hall opened in 1823 in Concord, Vermont (Spring, 1986:114). Further examination of Table A indicates that the first private normal school was opened by James Carter in Lancaster, Massachusetts, in 1827, with the first public (i.e., state-funded) normal schools began operating as of 1839 at Lexington, as well as Barre, Massachusetts. The first collegiate-level department was created at Washington College in Pennsylvania in 1831 (Cremin, 1953:234). Departments of "normal instruction" were approved initially at the University of Missouri (1846), University of Wisconsin (1849), and the University of Iowa (1855) (Snarr, 1946:47-55), though the departments of education at the University of Iowa (1873) and the University of Michigan (1879) are more often cited as the beginnings of university-level instruction in education. Between 1899 and 1929, normal schools were transformed into teachers colleges (and later into state colleges/universities) and, during a similar period (1905-1930), university departments of education underwent a metamorphosis, emerging as schools/colleges of education (Snarr, 1946:273).

Although some, e.g., J. P. Harrison (in 1836), initially proposed "normal schools . . . for the instruction of men" (Snarr, 1946:96), normals almost from their origins became female-dominated institutions (especially in the east), at least in terms of their student population (Borrowman, 1965; Harper, 1939; Mattingly, 1975; White, 1982), if not with respect to faculty (Tyack, 1967:43). In contrast, university students have until recently been predominantly male.

The feminization of normal schools, in part, reflects the feminization of (particularly elementary) school teaching. With the expansion of the public school system, a source of cheap, and preferably docile, labor was sought. Women, because of greater restrictions on their educational and career options, could not only be recruited into teaching for less pay and with fewer demands for authority (than men), but also induced into pursuing normal school training
in connection with an occupation with such relatively low status, power and remuneration (Borrowman, 1965; Grumet, 1981; Mattingly, 1975; Richardson & Hatcher, 1983; Spring, 1986). There was a voluntary aspect to this recruitment for "exploitation," in that young women could, by pursuing work as a teacher, escape their greater subordination in the home. However, despite this liberatory moment, as we shall see, women were really invited into a hierarchical career modeled on the patriarchal structure of the family. As Grumet (1981:171) noted, a way had been found "to advance women into the public sphere without disturbing the dominance of patriarchal authority." Ideas attributed to Horace Mann and Calvin Stowe, key figures in the normal school movement, reinforce this point. Melder (undated:13) suggests that for Mann, public normal schools were preferred over seminaries because the former would "assure that men would have charge of educating women teachers." And Warren (1985:9) indicated that Stowe "thought that bringing women into teaching might deflect feminist urges to speak at public meetings and hold elective office."

Universities and normal schools not only attracted students of different gender, but also of remarkably different social class backgrounds. Given normal students tended in the early years to be engaged in or aspiring to positions in the common elementary schools, and given the pay, working conditions, and status of such work, it is not surprising that normalites (compared to university students) more often came from "modest social backgrounds" (Clifford, 1986) or "lower economic and social classes" (Borrowman, 1956) and had more limited educational and occupational opportunities (Borrowman, 1965). Mattingly (1975) comments that compared to universities "normal schools . . . never attracted students in any numbers from the wealthy and professional classes" (p. 143) and that normal school students increasingly came even from the "middling social class of self-sufficient farmers and mechanics," while increasingly they were
"sons and daughters of hostlers, teamsters, sailors and gate-tenders" (p. 163). Similar inter-institutional comparisons have been made of the class composition of teachers colleges versus state or private universities (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954; Harper, 1939).

Thus, the student populations of normal schools/teachers colleges versus universities can be seen as stratified along gender and social class dimensions. Moreover, class and gender relations also entered into the antagonisms and competition between these sets of institutions. This occurred both explicitly and implicitly, through the theme of liberal versus technical education for teachers, during the two major phases of the relationships between these sets of institutions. At first normal schools rushed into the scene to provide formal preparation for common elementary school teachers—a scene that universities generally ignored or disdained (Clifford, 1986; Harper, 1939; Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972; Sarason, Davidson, & Blatt, 1962; Snarr, 1946).

The second phase, beginning in about 1890 (Mattingly, 1975:143), involved more frequently a head-to-head competition to recruit and prepare secondary school teachers. This competition arose because both institutions began to focus on preparing secondary school teachers. Some viewed the move by normals to train secondary school teachers as a move to abandon or de-emphasize the preparation of elementary teachers (Monroe, 1952; Pangburn, 1932), although initially normal schools undertook this task because universities were seen not to be sufficiently discharging this responsibility (Pangburn, 1932; Snarr, 1946; Trow, 1961) and, although some more "elite" universities looked askance on preparing any level of school teachers, preferring (as we will discuss in more detail later) to focus instead on the training of administrators or developing a science of education (e.g., Clifford, 1986; Palmer, 1985; White, 1982), many universities did become involved in educating high school teachers (e.g.,
Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972; Pangburn, 1932). It was frequently argued by some that universities were more appropriate institutions within which to prepare secondary school teachers (cf., Borrowman, 1956; Cremin, 1953; Elsbree, 1939; Monroe, 1952; Snarr, 1946; White, 1953). The competition between normal schools/teachers colleges and universities in programs to prepare high school teachers was governed partly by quests for enrollment and funds, either state allocations or private philanthropy (Cremin, 1953; Harper, 1939; Monroe, 1952; Tyack, 1967). As Johnson and Johanningmeier (1972:326) describe the relationship between the University of Illinois and the normal schools/teachers colleges in that state:

An interesting brand of academic imperialism thus resulted from [University of Illinois College of Education's Dean Thomas Elliott] Benner's tendency to argue that the College [of Education] ought to be enlarged in order to prevent the old normal schools--now teachers' colleges--from enlarging themselves. (emphasis added)

It is important to note that in the context of this competition, the normals tended to be "suspicious and narrowly defensive" and the universities were "frequently maddeningly condescending" (Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972:246). Often normals were "held in contempt" by the universities (Beggs, 1956:9). This can be explained in terms of normals' association with the common elementary schools⁵ (Harper, 1939; Sarason, Davidson, & Blatt, 1962) and the not unrelated differences in the social class and gender compositions of their student bodies (Lanier & Little, 1986). In terms of class relations, Mattingly (1975:163) discusses how Henry Barnard worked to establish normal instruction as a "legitimate collegiate enterprise" and observes: "Had he succeeded, the collegiate prejudices against normal schools would likely never have sharpened into the social class divisions of the early twentieth century." High school teachers and principals often reinforced the social class related distinctions between the two types of
institutions in conjunction with their own professionalization project. As Powell (1980:31) describes it:

Male high school principals perceived a growing educational and social-class chasm between their own ambitions and the reality of the normal school. (emphasis added)

With respect to gender relations, concerns about the "peril of women" teachers in public secondary schools in the U.S. (Richardson & Hatcher, 1983) was drawn upon in the competition between normals and universities (Clifford, 1986:434). Once again, the sought-after client played a significant role in highlighting gender divisions.

High school men wished to avoid the normals' low admission standards and growing accessibility to persons of low social status, their emphasis on practical techniques, and their rapid feminization. (Powell, 1976:5; emphasis added)

As the reference (in the quote above) to normals' "emphasis on practical technique" indicates, the competitive relationship between the institutional types derived from, and concomitantly engendered, an ideological struggle concerning where secondary school teachers could be most appropriately trained.

The collegiate [or university-level] institutions entertained grave fears regarding the ability of the normal schools to properly equip teachers for the high schools, while the normal school was certain that the failure to provide practice teaching and the need of adapting subject matter to the mind of the high school pupil rendered collegiate education inadequate. (Pangburn, 1932:52)

The ideological struggle that transpired should not only be conceived of in terms of "liberal" versus "technical" (Borrowman, 1956), but in relation to "mental" versus "manual"—terms which have a clearer association with social class relations, but also, I want to argue, with gender relations.

Although some proponents of normal schools stressed the need for a liberal education, understanding, and developing the "culture of the mind" (Buetow, 1972; Lemlech & Marks, 1976; Monroe, 1952), and although State universities created out of the 1862 Morrill Act were at least initially conceived of as
having a practical and technical orientation (Borrowman, 1965; Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972), the technical versus liberal distinction was one that became clearly associated with contrast between normal schools and universities (Lanier & Little, 1986; Sarason, Davidson, & Blatt, 1962; Sears & Henderson, 1957; Tyack, 1967; Weiss, 1969). Whether the polarized labels were validly assigned is perhaps less important than the fact that various parties in the bitter rivalry between the normals and universities made use of such a conception (Borrowman, 1956:63). For example, William H. Payne, who was appointed to the first university professorship of education in the United States in 1879, argued not only that:

Normal schools' stress on "mechanical exactness and expertness" produced a "machine" rather than teachers of "freedom and versatility." True professionals were taught to do by knowing. Only quacks professed dogma that one learned by doing. (Powell, 1980:41)

but also that:

the technical training appropriately offered to immature students in normal schools, who could only be expected to become competent craftsmen, at best, was fundamentally different from the liberal-professional education offered potential educational leaders in the university. (Borrowman, 1965:13)

The mental/manual distinction was also proffered, but with a "western" flavor, by a Minnesota superintendent in the 19th century, when he wrote in support of normal schooling:

The university professor ... may have his chair and from it satisfy a well-established demand; but the normal-school professor must live in his saddle in the field and on the march. (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954:244)

And as Snarr (1946:244) informs us, many of the debates at National Education Association meetings after 1901 were focused on whether the university's liberal education/scholarship orientation or the normal school's technical/practical orientation was more appropriate for the preparation of secondary school teachers.
Clearly, normal school people were more oriented to addressing immediately the practical, daily problems as school teachers viewed them (Bogner, 1978; Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972). And in this sense, unlike universities, normal schools and later teachers colleges ... 

... sought only to be a "peoples college," tied closely to the local community and eager to serve students without any special desire for the high-brown culture of the traditional [universities and] colleges. (Borrowman, 1965:19-20)\(^6\)

It was, however, this association with less elite members of the population--lower and working classes, farmers, and women--which helped to locate them at the lower end of the liberal-technical hierarchical relations. Nevertheless, we should note that normal school people did not create this mental labor-manual labor hierarchy, and many of them (much like Paul Willis' [1977] "lads") tried to argue that the hierarchy should be inverted, or at least that mental and manual should be treated as two equal (and perhaps inseparable) aspects of the division of labor.

The point, though, is that the normals' image suffered because of the form of their organization and programs. Normal schools were often promoted as "inexpensive" alternatives to university preparation of teachers (Snarr, 1946). Moreover, as Borrowman (1956) observes, "[t]he normal school was doomed to modest beginnings" (p. 49), because Horace Mann "apparently failed to perceive" that "Prussian teacher education had a social class basis" (p. 47). Thus, although Mann was impressed with the status of the more elite, civil servant schoolmasters in Prussia, he imported the form of teacher education used in Prussia "to train teachers from the lower class for the lower class" (Borrowman, 1956:47).\(^7\) Moreover, the apprenticeship model of practice teaching, originated in the normals and only later, after considerable resistance, adopted in university settings, because it was "associated with lower class occupations, ... had the disadvantage of maintaining the inferior status" (Weiss, 1969:15).
From the above discussion, it is probably clearer why I am analyzing these dynamics in terms of social class relations than why gender relations should be considered germane. The head versus the hand ideological distinction linked to class relations is more apparent at least in the writings I have reviewed. Nevertheless, the head versus the heart ideological distinction—that men think and then do and women do what they feel—also seems to enter here. The parallels in themes between the normals versus universities debates and the higher education for women versus men debates are also suggestive. In the latter, the focus was on training females for housekeeping versus educating males for the "professions," business and political leadership. In the former debate, training women for schoolkeeping and educating men for the "professions," business and political leadership. (See Grumet, 1981, for an insightful discussion of the contradictions women encounter in the patriarchal realms of domestic and school work.) Certainly, given the different gender composition of universities and normal schools, it would be surprising if gender-connected ideologies were not drawn upon in the struggle and debates.

Up to now we have seen how university-normal school relations seem to correspond to class and gender relations. To conclude this section of the paper, I want to point to two contradictions in university-normal school relations. Given how vehemently normal school people argued against the liberal education model of universities as an inappropriate context for the preparation of teachers, it may be surprising to note that over the years normals "applied" the liberal arts curriculum of the universities in their search for academic respectability and degree-granting status (Harper, 1939; Monroe, 1952; Sarason, Davidson, & Blatt, 1962). As Pangburn (1932:68) explains about the transformation of normal schools into teachers colleges:
In the efforts which have been put forth to elevate the normal schools to collegiate status, the tendency has been toward the creation and exploitation of courses which would secure the approval of the colleges and universities.

This transformation was catalyzed in the context of normals-universities struggle for the right to prepare secondary school teachers by (university, and then state accrediting processes that came to require that high school teachers have degrees (Harper, 1939). Nevertheless, we should note that what occurred paralleled what happens to groups at the bottom of an unequal relationship. While one may believe one's culture and organization are equal or even superior, upward mobility in the existing set of unequal social relations seems to require the subordinate group to ape the dominant group. Johnson and Johanningmeier (1972:464) express the situation for normal schools this way: "To judge the normal school in light of discrete disciplinary [i.e., university liberal arts] criterion," is to ensure that normal schools will be "always judged to be second rate, in a sense which they could escape only by denying [and eschewing] their central commitment," their culture and structure. Normal schools thus were mobile; they were upgraded to degree-granting institutions, but in a way that did not really challenge the class and gender relations in which they were imbedded. Thus, teachers colleges and later the state colleges and universities that normals became, as well as the university schools/colleges of education, found themselves operating in a similar set of social relations.

Perhaps, even more surprisingly, many universities, despite their rhetoric against teacher education as being too low status, due at least in part to the social class and gender composition of teacher education students, moved over time to incorporate teacher education as a major, if not central, function. This was done partly because of market considerations—to recruit sufficient numbers of students and especially for public institutions to improve public relations (Clifford, 1986; Mattingly, 1975; Snarr, 1946). But as we shall see in
the next section, this boundary-spanning effort was not done in a manner that really challenged unequal class or gender relations. Indeed, it can be seen as a "logical" response to contradictions in class and gender relations. That is, while the working class and women have less status and power, they do not constitute a minority of the potential students, consumers, tax-payers, and citizens.

**Arts and Sciences Versus Education**

While the competition and debates between normal schools and universities were going on, and subsequent to the transformation of the normals into teachers colleges and later state colleges and universities, a similar form of debate and competition has been taking place within universities. Not unexpectedly, perhaps, we observe that the social class and gender compositions of these two antagonists parallel those evidenced in contrasting normals and universities.9 In terms of social class, students in education (either education majors or arts and science majors pursuing teacher certification) and faculty in education have tended to have lower social class backgrounds than other university students and faculty (Lanier & Little, 1986).10

With respect to gender, although initially faculty positions in education, especially in "elite" institutions, have tended to be occupied by men (Clifford, 1986; Powell, 1980; White, 1982), and although males have continued to predominate numerically among education faculty (Lanier & Little, 1986), compared to arts and sciences faculty, the gender ratio in education has continued to be closer to unity. For students, the picture has been similar. Initial reluctance to admit female undergraduate students at the Universities of Michigan, Indiana, and Wisconsin, for example, was followed by an uncomfortable, but an increasing feminization of university teacher education programs (Snarr, 1946). Parallel dynamics are reported for Harvard University (Powell, 1980).
and Teachers College, Columbia University (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954). However, in these institutions and many others, including Stanford and Chicago, the thrust toward graduate education programs for school administrators was (at least until recently) associated with efforts to masculinize university schools and colleges of education (Sears & Henderson, 1957; White, 1982). According to Lanier and Little (1986:538), "Over three quarters of the prospective teacher population" in recent years are women; and, despite an absolute decline in the number of women entering teacher education, "the student pool now seeking initial certification has a growing proportion of women." Thus, even as females become a slight majority of university students as a whole, education programs continue to be characterized by a higher female/male gender ratio.

Within the university context, education and the arts/ sciences not only tended to attract students and faculty whose characteristics were located at different levels of status, wealth and power. The relations between these two components of the university tended to be hierarchical and conflict laden as well. As Palmer (1985:52) observes: "The low status of teacher training in state universities was established early, and it has persisted." And Lanier and Little (1986:530) discuss "the inverse relationship between professional prestige [in the university context] and the intensity of involvement with the formal education of teachers." Education's situation within the university has been described in terms of a "chronic inferiority complex" (Clifford, 1986:439), being in a state of "perpetual disfavor" (Warren, 1985:11), being the target of "contempt" and "hostility" (Beggs, 1965:9; Powell, 1980:vii), and only being able to enter through the "back door" (Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972:454).

Relations between education and the arts and sciences can be viewed as a "historical power struggle" (Weiss, 1969:187) divided into at least two periods. Monroe (1952) distinguishes between the 1890-1907 period, when universities
resisted inclusion of professional-technical training in education, and 1907-1933 (and really until today) when arts/sciences faculties' views ranged from acceptance with critique or mild support. While the dates are somewhat different, the case of the University of Illinois (Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972) is perhaps the most excruciating illustration of this continuing struggle by educationists for access to and then respectability in the university. Other case studies of Harvard (Powell, 1980) and Teachers College, Columbia University (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954) provide similar images.11 Additionally, when Ellwood Patterson Cubberly resigned his post as superintendent of the San Diego School District to accept a faculty appointment in Education at Stanford in 1898, he was informed by the President of the University, David Starr Jordan, "that the department was in serious disrepute, that if faculty were to decide, there would be a unanimous vote to discontinue" education at Stanford (Sears & Henderson, 1957:63).

The degree of animosity directed toward education by faculty in the arts and sciences is strikingly communicated in a book by James Bryant Conant. In *The Education of American Teachers*, a volume which sparked considerable controversy and debate about teacher education in the academy and more generally in the population (Weiss, 1969), Conant recalls his views about education prior to his assuming the presidency of Harvard in 1933:

> Early in my career as a professor of chemistry ... I shared the views of most of my colleagues or the faculty of arts and sciences that there was no excuse for the existence of people who sought to teach others how to teach. ... When any issues involving benefits to the graduate school of education came before the faculty of arts and sciences, I automatically voted with contempt upon the school of education. (Conant, 1963:1-2)

Ironically, although Conant went on to explain how after becoming president he attempted "to increase mutual understanding between the two hostile camps" (p. 2), his book, and to a lesser extent Koerner's (1963) *The Miseducation of
Teachers, served to heighten the "hostility" between education and arts/sciences faculties.

To what can these hierarchical and conflict-laden relations be attributed? Again, the situation is very similar to that discussed in the previous section regarding normal school-university relations. Part of the explanation resides in the association of the departments/schools/colleges of education with the "lower" schools (Weiss, 1969:20). However, there is also an important, more direct contribution of class and gender relations (Clifford, 1986:433; Conant, 1963:12; Lanier & Little, 1986:30). As Lanier and Little (1986:558) conclude with reference to class relations:

The social context of teacher education in higher education may be better understood when the typically underplayed issues of social status, power, and displaced class conflict are taken into account.

That the issues were not simply academic ability or the perceived sophistication of the knowledge content in education, but rather a question of social class, is evidenced by James Earl Russell's comments in 1912 about a proposal to raise admission standards at Teachers College, Columbia University: "the proposed standards ... made us dependent upon ... a class that never before entered any [U.S.] training school for teachers" (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954:60-61).

Gender relations also played a more explicit role in education-arts/sciences relations in universities. As Clifford (1986:441) notes:

Gender was an acknowledge factor in the low esteem of many schools of education, a chronic threat to their status... In the response [restricting the numbers of women students and faculty] to their version of the "women problem," ... the education faculty was in concord with the rest of the university. Yet this was a joining of prejudices more than a meeting of minds.

As early as 1837 we observe the University of Michigan creating "branches" for normal training, in which women were enrolled, at least partly in response to resistance, which lasted until 1850, to admit women to the University (Snarr,
1946:43-44). In 1887 and 1892 proposals by Nicholas Murray Butler and James Earl Russell, respectively, to establish a formal link between New York College for the Training of Teachers (later Teachers College) and Columbia University were rebuffed because of a University policy against women enrollments (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954:19 and 30). Even after Teachers College was incorporated into Columbia University, arts/sciences faculty continued to have hostile attitudes toward the presence of women at Teachers College, which was derogatorily referred to as "hairpin alley" (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954:70). Similar stories can be told at least about Chicago, Yale, Stanford, and Berkeley (Clifford, 1986; White, 1982). And although the School of Education was an authentic pioneer in securing Harvard opportunities for women, the fear of the feminized enclave was ever present. [Henry] Holmes12 had little doubt that the School's reputation and success within Harvard was directly proportional to its dominance by males. (Powell, 1980:154)

One example of this was the furor that was raised over proposals to merge Mrs. Prince's School (of teacher preparation for the retail trades) into the Graduate School of Education because of the "negative" impact this would have on the gender ratios of faculty and students at Harvard (Powell, 1980:141).

As we discussed in the section on normal school-university relations, unequal class and gender relations informed ideologically the action and discourse of educators in an indirect manner through the issue of liberal versus technical education. And as Weiss (1969:9) indicates:

Because many struggles were necessary to establish the professional education of teachers at college or university level, teacher education has become more identified with [the technical phase associated with normals] than with the general or liberal aspects.

It is partly this association with the lower status, technical aspect of education that leads teacher education to be viewed as a "farce" by arts and sciences faculty (Snarr, 1946:89).
Powell (1980) relates in detail the struggles during the 1920s at Harvard between University President Lowell and Education Dean Holmes to secure a place for Education in the university. In the context of these struggles "protracted discussions had ensued about whether 'technical' knowledge in education was as intellectually mature as Holmes claimed or as rudimentary as Lowell believed" (p. 9). But at the same time the liberal-technical distinctions between education and the arts/sciences were reinforced. These struggles had real consequences for faculty in education, as Lowell refused to appoint, promote, or tenure those who focused their energies, with the encouragement of Dean Holmes, on technical aspects of education and program development at the expense of liberal traditions of scholarship (Powell, 1980:145 and 169).

In more recent eras we have witnessed the liberal versus technical debate in the late-1940s through mid-1950s, recapitulated in the publications of Arthur Bestor's (1953) Educational Wastelands and Albert Lynd's (1953) Quackery in the Public Schools (Borrowman, 1956; Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972; Spring, 1986; Tyack, 1967). Education as a field was criticized for being anti-intellectual, by which was meant that educationists tended not to fully adopt an Aristotelian notion of the liberal function of education, that is:

\[
\text{to produce a free man--a man who, relieved from the need to produce goods or artisan services directly, could spend his time in speculative thought concerning the problems of philosophy and government. (Borrowman, 1956:3; emphasis added)}
\]

About a decade later, perhaps catalyzed by the Soviet Union's successful launch of Sputnick, similar debates raged again (Sarason, Davidson, & Blatt, 1962; Turner, 1985). These discourses entangled in the liberal vs. technical question were reflected in and refueled by Koerner's (1963) The Miseducation of Teachers and, more so, despite its less provocative title, by Conant's (1963) The Education of American Teachers. The latter debates, especially, also evidenced the conflict
and competition between arts/sciences and education faculties for control over the "life span" of teachers--life space that not only could be filled with liberal or technical education, but which had student enrollment and funding implications for both parties.

Given this competition, and because of the class and gender related hierarchies implicit in the liberal-technical distinction, university schools and colleges of education have tended to "ape" the liberal arts and sciences tradition and standards (Clifford, 1986). Sometimes, usually at the more "elite" institutions, this meant the abandonment of teacher training and the development of "academically respectable" graduate programs to train educational leaders and to develop the science of or liberal scholarship in education (Clifford, 1986; Cremin, 1978; Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954; Lanier & Little, 1986; Powell, 1976, 1980; Sears & Henderson, 1957; White, 1982).

This effort to fuse the training of superintendents and principals with science and university liberal education traditions (Mattingly, 1975) can be seen in part as a strategy to "professionalize" educational administrators at the expense of teaching as an occupation (White, 1982). Thus, university educationists both depended on the increasing hierarchical relations in the public schools, but also help to perpetuate and legitimate them. University educationists could make claims for enhancing their own status by being associated more so with the power and status of school administrators than with teachers (Clifford, 1986; White, 1982). So for example, educationists often found it in their own best interests to concur with (at least with the basic ideas, if not the military metaphor) of Thomas Burrill, the chief academic officer of the University of Illinois in the early 1890s, when he stated that:
Illinois wanted to train the leaders for the great army of teachers . . . who had already been equipped with the weapons of their calling and who already knew or had a good idea of how to fire those weapons. (Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972:121)

At the same time, the "leading schools of education" have helped to confirm a career structure in which the central practitioner role of teacher became perceived by the profession itself as less desirable and more transient than managerial roles held by a few and characterized by the absence of contact with clients. (Powell, 1976:19)

Put another way, university educationists were key contributors to a dynamic which worked to "continue, and to rationalize, the existing dual pattern--setting one program for leaders and a second for followers" (Borrowman, 1956:102).

Such strategies, of course, were not unrelated to extant class and gender relations. By devoting more attention to preparing school administrators than to educating school teachers, university departments and later schools/colleges of education were able to attract a more masculinized and higher social class of students (Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972; Lanier & Little, 1986; Monroe, 1952; Sears & Henderson, 1957; White, 1982). For instance, as Clifford (1986:442) observes, professors of education, especially at the "elite" universities, came to concentrate their efforts on preparing prospective school administrators in order to contain "the woman problem" . . . [since] the school administration fraternity had learned strategies by which to close the field to aspiring women. By doing so, it retained male hegemony in the better-rewarded and revered professions, saving school administration from the disgrace of "feminization."

However, despite this capitulation toward defining liberal education, associated with higher class males, as the higher status, more desirable focus, the educationists' strategy did not resolve "their troubled relations with their academic fellows" (Clifford, 1986:428; see also Lanier & Little, 1986:559). Education remained the poor cousin even as they worked to solidify the basis upon which the arts and sciences based their claim to superiority.
Similarly, the related strategy of developing the psychological, research methodological, and social/historical/philosophical foundations of education provided a status of marginality in the university for the faculty in such fields--neither in the liberal disciplines nor in the technical-professional field, while at the same time reinforcing the "foundation" upon which arts/science faculty solidified their higher status (Borrowman, 1956:171; Clifford, 1986; Powell, 1980; Tyack, 1967).

The case of Harvard's Graduate School of Education is interesting and relevant here. Efforts were made by Holmes and others to obtain education's independent from the faculty of arts and sciences by offering "professional" degrees--M.Ed. and Ed.D. While some "believed the new degrees would celebrate the liberation of professionalism from the 'skirts of the philosophical faculty'," as things developed, it appears that the observers who were more perceptive were "those who contended that . . . new degree[s] [were] given for essentially the same work as the Ph.D." and M.A. (Powell, 1980:137). As may be the case with many universities where only the professional education degrees are offered, Harvard's programs tended often to celebrate the liberal tradition, although not fully becoming recognized as a full member of this "esteemed" association.

One final strategy--developing competency-based teacher education programs--that was pursued by educationists, partly in response to Conant's (1963) liberal educationist critique of teacher education, was to attempt to develop teacher education programs based on "scientifically" developed "esoteric" knowledge of teaching. As Turner (1985:119) observes, professors of education had a problem in that:
they had no claim to an esoteric area of knowledge that professors of science and arts did not also have a claim to. In attempting to define such an area they identified specific [technical] pedagogical skills which teachers required. In this way it was hoped that a teacher education programme could be developed that was designed to give prospective teachers the minimum competence essential to be a teacher through competency-based teacher education.

But as with other strategies in educationists' struggles with colleagues in the arts and sciences, the liberal education and positivistic science traditions were accorded legitimacy, while education remained viewed as occupying terrain more toward the technical end of the continuum.

Professors of sciences and the arts have not been unwilling to view the teacher as a pedagogical technician who transmits knowledge, but does not have any control over its generation and selection. (Turner, 1985:119)

While educationists were seeking status and respectability by aping the arts and sciences, these liberal arts faculties were dealing with the contradiction that despite women and the lower classes being considered lower on the hierarchy, such populations constituted a relatively large base of potential public and a sizeable source of student enrollment. It was not just disdain that led arts and sciences faculties to opposed education in universities, it was also their competition with education for resources and students (Beggs, 1965; Lanier & Little, 1986; Monroe, 1952). This is why "despite such opposition and skepticism, college and university presidents reluctantly gave in to the trends of the times" and developed departments and then schools and colleges of education (Elsbree, 1939:320). As Clifford (1986:436-37) explains, universities in the U.S.:

launched their initially modest ventures in professional education because it served their own interests. First, there was the public relations move: ... educating a few teachers could project an image of contributing to the public weal, [thus justifying] ... tax support. ... Second, there was the motive of attracting more students to ... higher education. ... By admitting women and by assisting their plans to teach, higher education might [more than] double its potential pool of applicants.
Such motives as well as acquiring a five-year grant from the General Education Board seem to explain Columbia's cooperative arrangement with the all-female Barnard College to develop a "program for the pre-service education of teachers" (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954:195).

It should be noted, however, that the response to these contradictions not infrequently resulted in contradictory decisions. To illustrate this point, despite (or because of) the availability of federal funding provided by the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act of 1977 and large potential students enrollments, programs were not supported at the University of Illinois in industrial arts, agricultural education, and home economics teacher training (Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972:238-40), although similar programs were developed at Harvard. Nevertheless, the administration at the University of Illinois, which usually approached such issues in concert with arts and sciences faculties, facilitated the development of an athletic coaching program in the College of Education (Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972:252). Coaching as a field was more masculinized than home economics, but not compared to industrial arts or agricultural education. Coaching may have been seen as viewed as serving a higher status clientele, thus attracting a higher status student group to the University, than would have been the case with the other predominantly male programs not supported. Johnson and Johanningmeier (1972) explain the favoritism directed toward athletic coaching in terms of concerns about the improvement of inter-collegiate and inter-scholastic athletics. In any case, it appears that acting within the context of contradictions imbedded in class and gender relations is more complex than suggested by the following assertion by Johnson and Johanningmeier (1972:232-33):
Education needed to remain free [of federal influence through grants, etc.] to serve the "public good," but the public good was effortlessly if unconsciously translated . . . as that of the business community or the entrepreneurial class.

It seems that the capitalist agricultural and industrial class' interests might have been served by the development of the industrial arts and agricultural education programs, more so than the athletic coaching program. However, class relations' may have been strengthened by the ill fate of such programs in an institution of higher education, just as gender relations may have avoided challenge when the home economics program was not allowed to flourish at the University of Illinois.

Curriculum Responses to Gender and Class Contradictions

In the two previous sections we have explored how the contradictory nature of unequal social class and gender relations connect with the competition between and debates about different organizational arrangements for the education of teachers. In this section of the discussion of findings from the critical socio-historical analysis, we examine how such contradictory relations constrained and enabled curricular developments within teacher education programs. As was evidenced at the end of the last section, it is not just a question of what populations are included in the programs or under what institutional auspices that we need to consider. And it is not just "market considerations," that is, "shortages and surpluses of teachers," that "have driven both the policies and curricula in teacher education" (Warner, 1985:10). We must also focus our attention on how curricula or programmatic content emphases in the field of teacher education are shaped in relation to broader structural dynamics.

It seems as valid today as it did in 1932 when Pangburn concluded: "There is ample evidence that curriculum revision has been a constant feature of the preparation of teachers in the United States" (1932:79). And as Harper (1939:155) observes, such curricular changes in teachers colleges must be understood as
derived in part from "society and its problems" or "our complex and contradictory
civilization." The situation is more complex, though, because teacher education
can be seen not only as responding directly to problems and crisis in society
generated because of fundamental social contradictions, but also as responding
to developments in the schools, and thus indirectly to societal dynamics (Monroe,
1952:242). However, teacher education "in no way" is seen to be "merely a
responding organism" (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954:271) or merely some
sort of "a holding company for the solution of ad hoc problems defined by
outside forces" (Powell, 1980:274). Rather those who have constructed and
reconstructed teacher education have operated in the context where the rules
and resources which constrain and enable their action are informed by problems
and crises arising out of social contradictions.

The processes of teacher education curriculum development, thus are not
only constituted by, but also constitutive of class and gender relations. In
addition, by focusing attention on "reforms" or "innovations" in teacher education
curricula, there is often a tendency to deflect effort from examining the need
for and undertaking changes needed in society (see Weiss, 1969:68).

In the United States during the 19th century, the transformations in the
economy from an agricultural production through a cottage industry operation
to large-scale capitalist industrial organization had a profound impact on social
class and gender relations.

As capital accumulated in the hands of those who [oversaw the
building of] the new railroads and factories, income distribution
became more highly differentiated, and a sharper class structure
began to emerge. . . . The cottage industries that had permitted
women to work within their own homes diminished as machinery drew
labor into the factories. . . . In the new urban centers like
Massachusetts and New York, there was no place for independent
women. . . . Distinctions . . . developed between the culture of
the home and that of the workplace and it was expressed in differing
expectations of the men, women and children who spent there days
in those spaces. Women were detained in their kitchens and nurseries.
(Grumet, 1981:168-73)
Quoting Douglas (1977:69), Grumet (1981:173) goes on to describe the contradictions implicit in the emerging role of women connected to an "ideal of motherhood":

She was to exert moral pressure on a society in whose operations she had little part, and to spend money—or have it spent on her—in an economy she [did not control].

It is in the context of these changing social relations and contradictions, seen by some in conjunction with the nature and size of immigration as a source of destabilizing crisis in the U.S. (Borrowman, 1956:34), that common elementary and secondary schooling as well as normal school and university programs for teacher education emerged and initially developed. And as especially the high schools were shaped around 1880 toward mediating these contradictions by offering skill and value training programs in domestic and industrial arts, it is said that "specialized preparation of teachers became necessary" (Snarr, 1946:286). The curriculum of teacher education programs were developed, often by the same groups who promoted and developed them in the schools, to prepare domestic arts and industrial arts teachers.

Perhaps the most interesting example, because of the link with Columbia University, is that of the Kitchen Garden Association, which later evolved into the Industrial Education Association and then the New York College for the Training of Teachers before being named Teachers College. A key figure in these institutional efforts, Grace Hoadley Dodge, was:

deeply concerned over slum conditions and their deleterious effects upon their homes. The struggle of young housewives, ignorant of cooking and sewing and any kind of budgeting, to hold their families together evoked her special interest. (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954:11)

These organizations, which began in the last decades of the 19th century, primarily as philanthropic entities to support the development of school programs in manual and domestic arts for boys and girls, respectively, whose living
conditions concerned Grace Dodge so deeply, but over time increasingly took on the task of training teachers for these and other school programs. It should be noted that these curricular areas for high school students or the training programs for their teachers were not defined primarily in terms of technical skill development, but rather focused on socialization for the roles of urban worker and urban housekeeper. For instance, Grace Dodge:

had quietly resolved to improve the schools of New York City in the direction of a more "practical" education with emphasis not upon academic but rather upon moral and spiritual values. (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954:14).13

The economic panic of 1893 and the increased antagonism between capital and labor around the turn of the 20th century reflected problems derived from the contradictions of social class relations in the U.S. (and more globally). We saw above some aspects of the efforts by educationists to deal with these contradictory relations as they intersected with gender relations. Additionally, it was in the context of this "growing class conflict" according to Powell (1980:67) at the end of the 19th century, that led Paul Henry Hanus, Professor in the History and Art of Teaching at Harvard, to focus on social concerns and social objectives in his teacher preparation courses as well as in courses being developed for a new emphasis on training school administrators. Some sense of how Hanus and others like him conceived of the role of education as a "social force" and how they were likely to orient educators is evidenced in the following quote:

Schooling should equip youth to resist entrapment by the "prey of demagogues and the social agitator." It was essential to foster a "wise conservatism" to promote suspicion of "plausible but fallacious solutions" to social problems. The 1896 election results mandated education to combat anarchistic license and socialist utopianism.

The social crisis of the period as it affected educationists' concerns directly and indirectly (through philanthropic opportunities) facilitated schools/colleges of education—particularly, but not solely, those in private, "elite" institutions
like Harvard and Columbia, in becoming "active in shaping a variety of specialized
courses] and careers aimed at the social and vocational adjustment of [non-
college going] adolescents" (Powell, 1976:8). These specialty areas included
vocational guidance, industrial and commercial education, play, recreation,
physical education, and testing and measurement.

Capitalist economies in the U.S. and elsewhere in the world experienced
another crisis point—termed the Great Depression—as evidenced by the 1929
U.S. stock market crash. Again we can see teacher education being reshaped
in the context of problems created by contradictory class relations. As Snarr
(1946:214) explains it, seemingly from a different theoretical and political
perspective,

the . . . depression . . . with its accompanying financial, economic,
industrial and social dislocations . . . brought into relief significant
problems in education, problems implying new practices in teacher
education.

And as was the case four decades earlier, social (versus psychological) dimensions
in education and teacher education were highlighted (Johnson & Johanningmeier,
1972; Monroe, 1952), but in this case, these were couched more frequently social
change rather than social amelioration terms. As Borrowman (1956:210-11)
reports:

The function of the teacher in respect to social change and stability
was greatly emphasized during the depression and war years.
Moreover, the concept of democratic school administration which
made the teacher an active participant in making decisions about
curriculum, discipline, and other crucial matters gained currency.

This is the period in which George Counts and colleagues at Teachers
College, Columbia University, who initiated more critical discussions about
education and society than had previously been found within departments/schools/
colleges of education. Through the journal they started, Social Frontier, and
through their personal associations and influence, such ideas became somewhat
generally available. Cremin, Shannon, and Townsend (1954:143) describe the developments this way:

The depression everywhere did more than cause financial distress; it jarred to the core the nation's social, political and economic attitudes. The spectacle of the virtual collapse of their economy caused the... people [in the U.S.], especially the intellectuals, to reexamine their political views, to question their social and philosophical assumptions, and to cast about... for a social outlook better fitted for a world of rapid change and uncertainty. Such social-intellectual ferment was bound to affect educational thought and practice.

There is clearly more evidence of how educational thought (as compared to programs and curriculum) was shaped in this context, at least in teacher education. In addition to the pages of Social Frontier, take, for example, George Counts' (1932) published speech, "Dare the Schools Change the Social Order." Nevertheless, we know, from Cremin, Shannon and Townsend (1954:152), that at least at Columbia the interdisciplinary foundations of education course focused on a "host of social political, economic and personal issues formerly considered alien to the educator's scope—or even vision." Moreover, from 1932 until 1938 "New College," an experimental elementary and secondary level teacher education venture at Teachers College, was being pursued. Importantly, it is claimed that:

The whole experiment reflected the social ferment that came in response to the Great Depression... [and thus it was believed that it was the] peculiar privilege of the teacher to play a large part in the development of the social order of the next generation.... The faculty, fearing an ivory tower attitude [given the relatively elite backgrounds of the students enrolled], attempted to foster political activity among the students. (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954:222-26)

As the spectre of fascism in Germany and Italy became more clear, as World War II punctured the bubble of isolationism in the U.S., as the "cold war" and McCarthyism began to take hold, and as the post-war economy expended, the reform and social transformation orientation characteristic of some educationists' endeavors during the 1930s dissipated. The problem of social
stratification and concerns about a "free and classless society" were "almost forgotten" (Powell, 1980:260). The shift is partly explainable in terms of faculty perceptions being altered by the new social structural dynamics, but one must also take account of the role of federal and foundation funding. For example, in 1938, when Teachers College's "new college" teacher education program was being phased out, Columbia received a sizeable, five-year grant from the General Education Board to create a Commission on Teacher Education methods and to develop a cooperative teacher education program with Barnard College (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954:195-96). The GI Bill, which infused many programs with "mature" students ready to be trained quickly so they could get on with their careers and lives, should also be mentioned as should the war-related and post-war stimulated "neutral," social scientific research and development projects in education (Powell, 1980).

The crisis in the cities of the mid- to late-1960s, which although having a basis in class relations as well, was characterized primarily in terms of race relations (see endnote 1), provided some shift in dynamics associated teacher education curriculum. This was partly indicated by the trends in educational research. As Powell (1980:276) notes about this period:

Although some employed research designs consistent with social science methodology, others were not "research" in the sense of dispassionate controlled inquiry. They celebrated moral passion, social activism, and optimistic reforms of a new sort. The principle themes were urban education and the limits of formal schooling.

The class- and race-related crisis in urban education intersected with growing problems and struggle around the contradictions in gender relations. These developments informed curricular developments in teacher education, particularly the emergence and at least rhetorical adoption of curricular foci on multicultural education and concerns about sexism in textbooks and teachers' practice.
In many colleges/schools of education, however, these curricular thrusts were incorporated in processes associated with competency-based teacher education (CBTE). Thus, such topics became translated into cognitive or behavioral objectives, allowing, if not prescribing, a relatively superficial treatment of questions related to class, race, and gender relations. We discussed earlier how the CBTE movement can be conceived as an example of a strategy by educationists to enhance their stature within universities by appealing to norms of "scientism." But CBTE must also be seen as a set of ideas and practices which arose in the context of social crises, developed with the financial support of the federal government and the states (see Ginsburg & Spatig, 1985), and served to mediate, at least temporarily, contradictions in class and gender (as well as race) relations.

Conclusions

Relying on published historical accounts of teacher education in the United States, we have attempted to illustrate how trends in normal schools, teachers colleges and university departments/schools/colleges of education can be seen to be related to contradictions in class and gender relations. With respect to normal school--university relations and arts/sciences--education relations within the university, we explored how unequal class and gender relations were drawn upon by various actors in the debates and competitive struggles that ensued.

Often these dynamics have, in a sense, depended on the assumption that lower/working class members and females have less power and status than the bourgeoisie (or even middle class members) and males. Thus, the hierarchical relations evidenced in teacher education were to some extent constituted by and constitutive of broader, unequal class and gender relations. Nevertheless, we also identified how, because of contradictions in these broader relations, teacher education developed in ways that could not be predicted only on the
basis of the greater power and status of, say, males. This was particularly
evident in the "decisions" to develop programs for these less powerful and lower
status students, if only to increase enrollments and financial support.

We have also seen how at least part of the explanation of changes in
teacher education curricular emphases must be located in crises and problems
that occur in society deriving from contradictory social relations. Sometimes
the crises are "read" directly (but not necessarily fully or accurately) by teacher
educators, who then develop curriculum in response to the crises. Other times
there is a more indirect route via the response schooling to the interpretations
of what the crises or problems consist. In any case, although it is the
educationists who act, their actions are frequently stimulated and shaped by
others whose ideological work, philanthropic activity, and/or control of the state
power enable and constrain certain courses of action.

Parts of this historiographical analysis are sketchy and suggestive rather
than detailed and conclusive. We should remember, however, that the historical
writings upon which this paper is based do not, for the most part, take class
and gender relations, let alone contradictions therein, as their central
problematic. Thus, the additional details that may exist in primary sources
were not available in the analysis herein. Clearly, there is a need to further
test the thesis presented herein through an in-depth historical analysis.

Nevertheless, this socio-historical analysis should encourage use to be
cautious about current debates about and proposals for teacher education. The
first question we should pose is: What crisis generated out of contradictory
class and gender relations has given rise to the current controversies in the
field? I suggest that to look at what is going on merely as a reflection of
citizen or professional concern about education or teacher education is to allow
other groups, whose interests are thus served, to deflect attention from more fundamental problems we face as a society and as a human race.

Secondly, we must examine how the analyses of the "problem" and the proposed "solutions" not only depend upon, but also appear to reinforce, unequal class and gender relations. One illustration will suffice here and this pertains to the Holmes Group (1986) proposal for differentiating teacher education programs in terms of their location (in research universities or not), their level of delivery (graduate or undergraduate), and the occupational rank of their graduates (teacher leaders or instructors). The parallels between these proposals and what we earlier discussed in relation to differentiation between administrator-teacher, secondary-elementary teacher, and university-normal school programs should be enough of a warning of how class and gender relations are penetrating these discussions.

Thirdly, we need to go beyond academic analyses of how such debates and proposals may reproduce unequal class and gender relations. We should seek to intervene in these dynamics to exploit space created by the contradictions in these social relation to inject more progressive strategies. For example, what would be the implications if we were to focus on further developing educational programs for all educators (and all people) rather than trying to find a strategy that would seem to upgrade the status, if not the competence, of a minority—who, I would predict, would be disproportionately male and from "higher" class backgrounds? The issues raised here are not just about the lives of other groups, but also of teachers in that the socio-historical analysis presented herein would indicate that the latter strategy usually fails to dramatically enhance the status, power, and wealth of the educationist associated with the more desirable programs and students. Moreover, the strategy has helped to solidify ideologically the unequal relations within which educationists find themselves
devolved compared to arts/sciences faculty and other groups. Perhaps the individualist and professionalist strategies of teacher educationists must be eschewed in favor of collaborating in a broader struggle with the groups who have even less power, wealth and status than we do. There have been hints in the history of teacher education that such an orientation is plausible, if not always followed to its logical conclusion.
References


Southern Regional Education Board. (1985). Improving teacher education: An agenda for higher education and the schools. Atlanta:


1. I believe that race relations must also be considered in attempting to understand fully the connections between society, schooling and teacher education. The omission, or better, adapting Giddens' (1979) term, the "bracketing" of race relations in this paper primarily reflects the extent historical literature on teacher education. Race and ethnicity seem to occupy an "absent presence" in much of the writing analyzed and cited herein. Sometimes the issue surfaces in the context of society and schools responding to the "flood of immigrants" or "urban problems," but the race of the prospective educators to be educated, for example, is rarely a focus of attention (but see Jones, 1937; Tyack & Lowe, 1986; White, 1982).

2. It is interesting, in light of the continuing struggle by teachers over professional autonomy vis-a-vis the state (see Ginsburg, 1986b) that Pangburn (1932:126) continues his discussion by noting that the recognition of teachers as professionals "implies a dual obligation on the part of the state: [1] ... insuring such preparation through imposing rigid requirements for entrance to this profession [and] ... [2] establishing, maintaining, and liberally supporting the teachers college" (emphasis added).

3. While the concern with professionalization emerged as central concern to teacher educators in the U.S. during the 19th and 20th centuries, there is evidence that the concern was not a new one. For example, the Englishman Richard Mulcaster (1530-1611), headmaster of two famous academies in London, St. Paul's and Merchant Taylor's, wrote in Positions (1582) words that were echoed three centuries later across the Atlantic: "Why should not teachers be well provided for, so they can continue their whole lives in the schools, as divines, lawyers, and physicians do in their several professions? ... I consider, therefore, that in our universities there should be a special college for the training of teachers" (Weiss, 1969:11).

4. Lemlech and Marks (1976:12-13) report that during the 1776-1823 period, many teachers were indentured servants. And according to Weiss (1969:14): "When indentured servants worked off their bondage by apprenticing for teaching, conditions were so poor that many apprentices ran away."

5. The disdain that many university protagonists directed toward normal schools was not merely because of their association with "lower" branches of knowledge. Sarason, Davidson, and Blatt (1962:21) indicate that liberal arts college and university faculty "seriously doubted" that elementary school teaching "was anything more than a somewhat skilled occupation."

6. Here I am not arguing that normals actually served the real interests of the "common people." Indeed, in a manner different from the universities, they may have functioned equally well, though by no means perfectly, to reproduce class (and gender) relations. Moreover, by drawing on Borrowman's work here, I am not accepting his notion about the "anti-intellectualism ... amongst the rural groups and the lower economic and social classes from which students of the normal schools, and later the teachers colleges, were largely recruited" (Borrowman, 1956:33). Rejecting "classical" aristocratic traditions of the liberal arts, or even their "modern"
bourgeois version that has come to dominate universities in the U.S., is not, in my view, tantamount to being anti-intellectual.

7. It is interesting to note that the "term, normal school, ... was used by the French and derived from the Latin noun, norma--meaning "a carpenter's square, a rule, a pattern, a model" (Elsebree, 1939:145). Thus, the class character of normal-university relations may have been reinforced by the name of one of the institutions being associated with a tool of a segment of the working class.

8. Similarly, the American Institute of Instruction (AII), which provided an alternative form of teacher preparation to normal schools and university departments of education, began in 1826 with a male and higher class biased population of students. In 1837, however, the AII changed its meetings to locations outside of Boston so as to become accessible to less economically advantaged teachers, at least in part because of a drop in membership (Mattingly, 1975:96-7). Moreover, beginning in 1867, first female teachers were admitted as full participants in AII, reflecting renewed concerns about membership declines, due partly to loss of potential male members during and after the Civil War (Mattingly, 1975:110-111).

9. In this regard, it is interesting to note that Teachers College, Columbia University emerged out of efforts by Grace Hoadley Dodge, a daughter of New York's wealthiest merchant, to train teachers for projects directed toward providing the working class with "needed" skills for housework and manual labor. Such efforts were originally located organizationally within the Kitchen Garden Association, then the Industrial Education Association, followed by the New York College for the Training of Teachers, prior to the creation of Teachers College. As we shall discuss below, the social class and gender composition of its clients and teacher trainees remained a "handicap" as Teachers College sought to obtain acceptance and recognition within Columbia University.

10. In characterizing the class membership distinctions of education versus arts and sciences students and faculty, I am not assuming, as Lanier and Little (1986:565) seem to, that many "teachers and teacher educators come from home and family backgrounds whose academic roots are often shallow and which are, therefore, not likely to engender strong and ingrained intellectual propensities." Such an assumption is at best a gloss on the complex relations between social class, culture, schooling and cognition, and at worst a blatant example of blaming-the-victim. (See also endnote 6.)

11. It is interesting, particularly as it parallels the case of the University of Houston (Ginsburg & Spatig, 1985), how significant the provision of funds for a building for colleges/schools of education was as a symbol of victory or defeat in the education-arts/sciences struggle at Teachers College, the University of Illinois, and Harvard (Cremin, Shannon, & Townsend, 1954; Johnson & Johanningmeier, 1972; Powell, 1980).

12. It should be noted that Henry Holmes, the long-term Dean of the Graduate School of Education (GSE) whose name has been appropriated by the Holmes Group currently at the center of controversies in teacher education, proposed in the late 1920s that a new building be constructed to house the GSE and attract residential students, none of whom would be women.
His concern to bar women was based on the notion that "somehow the presence of women seemed inconsistent with the spirit of community and colleagueship he longed to establish." For him, the "ultimate emulation of the Harvard professional ideal--proposed in deepest secrecy--was to abolish women's unique eligibility for Harvard degrees" (Powell, 1980:169).

13. As with normal schools, the attraction to the technical aspect was encouraged by university educationists' association with and dependence upon school people. Although initially university educationists scorned "technical problems of serious concern to classroom teachers" (Borrowman, 1956:30), they were still pulled more in this direction than their colleagues in the arts and sciences faculties. As Powell (1980:144) notes, for example, "Holmes distinguished sharply between the fundamental [i.e., liberal] and technical fields of study within the education curriculum . . . [preferring to emphasize the former]. But he knew that the best way to attract experienced teachers was to expand the technical or practical side of the curriculum."

14. See Ginsburg and Spatig (1985) for a discussion of similar developments a half century later at the University of Houston, where efforts in the College of Education to accumulate "academic capital" through producing a competency-based teacher education program eventuated in six of nine education faculty recommended for promotion being turned down by the University because of insufficient scholarship activity.

15. The quote below clearly illustrates the link between the liberal-technical question and class relations--liberal pertaining to education for elite non-workers or for "a man of leisure" (Borrowman, 1956:133). Although the gender-biased language may simply be a usage, common in the 1950s, of males to refer to human beings of both sexes, it may also reflect the link between the liberal-technical question and gender relations.

16. Ironically, perhaps, it is the foundations of education faculty which help develop the liberal-technical debate within the context of the schools and colleges of education. See Ginsburg and Spatig (1985) for a case study of the University of Houston, in which foundations of education faculty's cultural identity with liberal education traditions serves to block their collaboration with curriculum and instruction colleagues, even as some of both groups are experiencing forms of proletarianization.

17. A similar contradiction seemed to be confronted by Charles W. Elliot, President of Harvard, in 1884, seven years prior to the first professorship in education being appointed. As Powell (1980:18) relates, "Elliot's new sensitivity to the broken connections between Harvard and the schools was fueled not only by concern for Harvard's accessibility to less privileged students but by a more general fear that the university's own growth rate might be stunted."

18. This emphasis on value socialization and training for the domestic (as well as manual) arts versus educating in the liberal arts academic subjects gives different meaning to Lanier and Little's (1986:532) discussion about how the early attempts by teacher educators "to have professional schools for teachers reflect specific attitudes of intellectual discipline . . . were displaced as women and members of the lower social classes came to
compose a majority of the teaching force." Here the issue may not be the "quality" or even the preferences of the students as much as the designs that more powerful group had for them in the social order.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Troy Female Seminary (founded in 1814 by Emma Willard) becomes the first teacher training institution in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Samuel R. Hall opened 1st American School of Teachers, Concord, Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>American Institute of Instruction convened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>James Carter opened Normal School at Lancaster, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Washington College, Pennsylvania, Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>First New York State Teachers Institute, Watertown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Henry Barnard and Emma Willard organized 1st Teaching Institute in Hartford, Connecticut (classes for women opened in 1840) Massachusetts State Normal School, Lexington Massachusetts State Normal School, Barre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Massachusetts State Normal School, Bridgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>New York State Normal School, Albany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>University of Missouri, Department of Normal Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin, Department of Normal Instruction Iowa State Normal School, Andrews Iowa State Normal School, Oskaloosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Brown University Teacher Preparation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Michigan State Normal School, Ypsilanti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Salem State Normal School, Massachusetts Rhode Island State Normal School, Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>New Jersey State Normal School, Trenton University of Iowa, Department of Normal Instruction (until 1873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Illinois State Normal School, Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Minnesota State Normal School, Winona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Kansas State Normal School, Emporia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Institution / Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Wisconsin State Normal School, Platteville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>New York State Normal School, Oswego</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1868 | Minnesota State Normal School, Mankato  
      | Wisconsin State Normal School, Whitewater |
| 1869 | Minnesota State Normal School, St. Cloud |
| 1870 | Indiana State Normal School, Terre Haute |
| 1871 | Missouri State Normal School, Kirksville  
      | Missouri State Normal School, Warrensburg  
      | Wisconsin State Normal School, Oshkosh |
| 1873 | Missouri State Normal School, Cape Girardeau  
      | University of Iowa, Department in Education |
| 1874 | Illinois State Normal School, Carbondale |
| 1875 | Wisconsin State Normal School, River Falls |
| 1876 | Iowa State Normal School, Cedar Falls |
| 1879 | University of Michigan, Department of Education |
| 1881 | University of Wisconsin, Department of Education |
| 1884 | Johns Hopkins University, Department of Education  
      | University of Missouri, Department of Education  
      | University of North Carolina, Department of Education |
| 1885 | Wisconsin State Normal School, Milwaukee  
      | Ottawa University, Kansas, Professorship in Education  
      | University of Wisconsin, Department of Education |
| 1886 | University of Indiana, Department of Education  
      | Cornell University, Department of Education |
| 1887 | New York University, Department of Education (until 1890) |
| 1888 | Minnesota State Normal School, Moorhead |
| 1889 | Clark University, Department of Education  
      | New York College for the Training of Teachers |
| 1891 | Harvard University Professor of Education  
      | University of Chicago, Department of Pedagogy  
      | Stanford University, Department of Art and History of Education |
| 1892 | Teachers College, Columbia University  
      | University of California, Berkeley, Department of Education |
1893  University of Minnesota, Department of Education
1894  Wisconsin State Normal School, Stevens Point
1895  Michigan State Normal School, Mount Pleasant
      University of Nebraska, Department of Education
1896  Wisconsin State Normal School, Superior
1898  Northwestern University, Department of Education
1899  Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti
      Illinois State Normal School, DeKalb
      Illinois State Normal School, Charleston
      Michigan State Normal School, Marquette
1901  Iowa Agricultural College, Department of Education
1902  State Normal College of Ohio University, Athens
      State Normal College of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
      Illinois State Normal School, Macomb
      Minnesota State Normal School, Duluth
1904  Michigan State Normal School, Kalamazoo
1905  University of Illinois, School of Education
      University of Minnesota, College of Education
      Missouri Teachers College
1906  Missouri State Normal School, Springfield
      Missouri State Normal School, Maryville
1907  University of Iowa, School of Education
      Ohio State University, College of Education
      Illinois State Normal University, Normal
      Southern Illinois Normal University, Carbondale
1908  University of Indiana, College of Education
1909  University of Missouri, College of Education
      Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls
      Wisconsin State Normal School, La Crosse
1913  Ohio State Normal School, Kent
      University of California, Berkeley, School of Education
1914  Ohio State Normal School, Bowling Green
1915  University of Iowa, College of Education
1917  Wisconsin State Normal School, Eau Claire
1918  University of Illinois, College of Education
      Indiana State Normal School, Muncie
1919  Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville
      Central Missouri State Teachers College, Warrensburg
      Southwest Missouri State Teachers College, Cape Girardeau
      Southwest Missouri State Teachers College, Springfield
      Northwest Missouri State Teachers College, Maryville
      Minnesota State Normal School, Bemidji

1920  Harvard University, Graduate School of Education

1921  University of Michigan, School of Education
      Eastern Illinois State Teachers College, Charleston
      Western Illinois State Teachers College, Macomb
      Northern Illinois State Teachers College, DeKalb
      Winona State Teachers College, Minnesota
      Mankato State Teachers College, Minnesota
      St. Cloud State Teachers College, Minnesota
      Moorhead State Teachers College, Minnesota
      Duluth State Teachers College, Minnesota
      Bemidji State Teachers College, Minnesota

1925  Platteville State Teachers College, Wisconsin
      Whitewater State Teachers College, Wisconsin
      Oshkosh State Teachers College, Wisconsin
      River Falls State Teachers College, Wisconsin
      Milwaukee State Teachers College, Wisconsin
      Stevens Point State Teachers College, Wisconsin
      Superior State Teachers College, Wisconsin
      La Crosse State Teachers College, Wisconsin
      Eau Claire State Teachers College, Wisconsin

1927  Central State Teachers College, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan
      Northern State Teachers College, Marquette, Michigan
      Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Michigan

1929  Kent State College, Ohio
      Bowling Green State College, Ohio
      Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute
      Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana

1930  University of Wisconsin School of Education