This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A STUDY OF ROLES FOR THE TEACHER
FROM AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

presented by

Clyde Emerson de Bourg

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Foundations: Social & Philosophical

Carl H. Gross

Major professor

Date 12/17/79

A STUDY OF ROLES FOR THE TEACHER FROM AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

By

Clyde Emerson de Bourg

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

1980

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF ROLES FOR THE TEACHER
FROM AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

By

Clyde Emerson de Bourg

The purpose of this study was first, to determine what the conceptions of teachers' roles were in Ancient Times, during the Sixteenth Century, and in Early Modern Times; second, to compare and note changes in conceptions of roles held by exemplars of each historical period with respect to such areas of teaching as methods of instruction, discipline, moral training of students, and modelling; third, to determine which conceptions of roles persisted throughout the periods under review; fourth, to evaluate these roles in the light of modern pedagogy.

The method used was historical rather than empirical. Well-known educators of three historical periods, namely Ancient Times, the Sixteenth Century, and Early Modern Times, were selected as exemplars in order to illustrate and exemplify different approaches to teaching. Their conceptions of roles for the teacher were traced back to the original sources. The theories on which these educators based their conceptions of the teacher's roles

were examined and evaluated. Consideration was given to the socio-cultural forces as well as the historical background of the times in which these exemplars lived.

The findings were that some role conceptions changed over the three periods under review while others persisted. The areas in which significant changes were made in role conceptions were in instructional methods, discipline, moral training of students, and modelling by the teacher. Role conceptions for teachers persisted in two areas: first, in teacher-student relationships, and second, in the provision of the correct environment for learning. Reasons for the change or persistence of roles were suggested.

The study also revealed that there was not always consensus of opinion regarding conceptions of roles for the teacher even among educators who represented the same historical period, and that despite inadequacies in their general approaches to pedagogy, some exemplars of Ancient Times and the Sixteenth Century had useful insights into the psychology and methodology of teaching.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge indebtedness to Dr. Carl Gross, my advisor, and to express my sincere thanks to him for the great assistance, encouragement, and inspiration which he gave me during my course work and in the writing of this thesis. His scholarly advice and the patience he showed will never be forgotten.

Appreciation and thanks are also due to Dr. J. G. Moore for his careful reading of the chapters and his helpful suggestions for improving their organization and style.

Finally, I wish to thank the other members of my guidance committee, Dr. Ben Bohnhorst, Dr. Keith Anderson, and Dr. Henry Kennedy, for their constructive criticisms which have proved helpful to me in the writing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Images that have been associated with the expectations of teachers' roles have been many and varied, largely due to the fact that they are perceived differently by educators, parents, students, and others. It was Socrates who compared the teacher to a midwife, because to Socrates, the role of the teacher was to educe or draw forth knowledge from his pupil. This maieutic concept of teaching was in accordance with his belief that the human soul had a preexistence before birth, at which time it was imbued with knowledge, which became partially forgotten when the soul entered the body. To him, teaching was therefore a matter of recovering this partially forgotten knowledge. More recently, the role of the teacher had been compared to that of a leader by the pragmatist, John Dewey, and others of his philosophical persuasion who saw the teacher not as a commander in charge, but as a senior member of a group, a resource person, one who was expected to give assistance, advice, and encouragement to students when needed. This position contrasts strongly with the traditional conception of the teacher as an authoritarian, who, by virtue of his

age and superior knowledge, was in supreme command of the class. His role was to give orders, that of his students to obey. Skinner, in keeping with his behaviouristic philosophy, prefers to regard the teacher as a reinforcer, while the therapist, Carl Rogers, perceives the teacher as a facilitator of learning.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of the study is first, to determine what the conceptions of teachers' roles were in Ancient Times, during the Sixteenth Century, and in Early Modern Times; second, to compare and note changes in conceptions of roles held by exemplars of each historical period with respect to such areas of teaching as methods of instruction, discipline, moral training of students, and modelling; third, to determine which conceptions of roles persisted throughout the periods under review; fourth, to evaluate these roles in the light of modern pedagogy.

Justification of the Study

Much empirical research has been done in education regarding roles of the teacher and the effects that they have on the learning and behaviour of students. However, little historical research has been done. This, therefore, is the writer's rationale for undertaking the study from an historical perspective. The writer believes that it is

by studying the past that one recognizes trends which can be of help in predicting and preparing for the future.

Because this study provides an historical background for conceptions of teaching roles, and the philosophical, social, and religious forces that influence them, it is hoped that it will benefit future teachers who need some foundation in the history of pedagogy. At the same time, the writer hopes that his work will make some contribution to the literature on teaching roles.

This study should also be of interest to educators, because it traces historically the antecedents of many concepts and practices in modern pedagogy. Teachers are concerned about the effects different roles have on the educational advancement of their students and relationships with them; hence the writer examined a number of teaching roles as conceived by representative exemplars and discussed their implications for education.

Methodology

The writer's approach in this thesis was historical rather than empirical. The conceptions of teaching roles held by exemplars chosen were traced back to their original sources. In order to maintain objectivity in interpretation of the primary sources and also to support his arguments, the writer utilized additional material taken from secondary sources.

An analysis of roles conceived for the teacher by representative educators of Ancient Times, the Sixteenth Century, and Early Modern Times was made. Well-known educators were selected to illustrate and exemplify different approaches to teaching. These included Socrates, Isocrates, Plato, and Quintilian, who represented the ancient pedagogues; Ascham, Montaigne, Mulcaster, and the Jesuits, who represented Sixteenth Century teachers; Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel, who represented Early Modern pedagogy.

The theories on which the above educators based their conceptions of the teacher's roles were examined and evaluated. Some consideration was given to the sociological and historical background of the times in which these educators lived as well as the religious forces that influenced their thinking.

Reasons for choice of exemplars and historical benchmarks are given in Chapter II.

Sources

The primary sources that the writer used comprised the educational treatise written by the representative exemplars in which their pedagogical ideas were expounded in detail. Since some of the exemplars wrote only in their native language, which included German, Greek, and French as was the case with Pestalozzi, Plato, and Rousseau, the writer used the most reliable translations.

A large number of secondary sources was consulted. These sources were found useful since they helped to clarify the pedagogical ideas of the exemplars as well as their conceptions of roles for the teacher. A list of both primary and secondary sources is provided in the bibliography.

Limitations of This Study

This thesis is an historical and comparative study of teaching roles held by educators of Ancient Times, the Sixteenth Century, and Early Modern Times. It is not an exhaustive study of the educational philosophies, principles, and methodologies of the educators concerned, although these areas have been dealt with to some extent, since they contribute to an understanding of the topic.

There are limitations on the conceptions of teaching roles since all roles could not be studied. By the same token, all educators could not be selected. The focus was placed on educators who contributed significantly to educational theory and practice, especially those who stated their positions regarding roles for the teacher.

Since the entire history of pedagogy could not be covered, certain periods were used as benchmarks. These were Ancient Times, the Sixteenth Century, and Early Modern Times. These periods were chosen because of their significance in the history of pedagogy.

In view of the fact that the pedagogical history of the entire Ancient World did not have much bearing on this dissertation, the term "Ancient World," as used here, focuses only on Greece and Rome as these were the important areas in this time frame of educational history. Countries like Ancient China, Israel, India, and Egypt have been omitted because they have not played as great a part in influencing the educational ideas of the western world.

Definition of Terms

The term "role" is used rather loosely in education today. However, in this dissertation, the writer has adopted the definition offered by Wallens and Travers in their article in Handbook of Research on Teaching entitled "Analysis and Investigation of Teaching Methods." According to these researchers,

> The term role is simply a pattern of behaviour shared by a group of teachers which is identifiable and generally related in some way to the learning process. The concept of a teacher's role is also related to that of a teaching method.[1]

Examples of teaching roles include disciplinarian, guide, facilitator of learning, and parent substitute.

The term "goals" may either refer to "aims" in which case they are end-results of a generalized nature which the teacher hopes to achieve through his teaching; or they may refer to behavioural objectives in which case

they are specific statements which describe the behaviour the student will be expected to display after a learning experience.

"Philosophy of education" refers to a system of beliefs held by educators with respect to such areas of education as metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology.

The term "Ancient Times" as used in this dissertation includes only the period that lasted from the fifth century B.C. to the disintegration of the Roman Empire in the West in 476 A.D. "Early Modern Times" refers to the period that lasted from the beginning of the eighteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth.

Organization of the Study

In Chapter II teaching roles are categorized and described. Illustrations of each category are furnished. Reasons are advanced for the choice of historical benchmarks used in the study as well as the choice of exemplars. The philosophies on which the exemplars based their conceptions of roles for the teacher are examined. In Chapter III the writer deals with persistent roles of the teacher. These are traced historically to the educators who advocated them. Reasons for the persistence of these roles are given. Conceptions of roles which have changed from Ancient Times to the Early Modern era are examined in Chapter IV. The focus is on such areas of teaching as

instructional methods, discipline, the moral training of students, and modelling by the teacher. Reasons for the changes in role conceptions are suggested. A general summary of the dissertation as well as an evaluation of the roles advocated by the representative exemplars is presented in Chapter V. Conclusive remarks are made.

Footnote--Chapter I

[1]"Analysis and Investigation of Teaching Methods," in Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. N. L. Gage (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963), p. 449.

CHAPTER II

SELECTION OF ROLES

Illustrations of Types Chosen

Two different categories of roles are referred to in this study. These are persistent and changing conceptions of roles. Since the writer acknowledges that there may be differences of opinion regarding the meaning of these terms, some further explanation is therefore furnished. The term "persistent roles" refers to roles that endured from Ancient to Early Modern Times. To use an illustration from the realm of medical science, cancer may be regarded as a persistent disease, because it has afflicted people from Ancient Times to the present. By contrast, smallpox, which was once prevalent in many countries of the world, is no longer a persistent disease, having been eradicated by medical science. The term "changing roles" refers to patterns of teacher behaviour which have been replaced by different forms of behaviour from Ancient Times to the Early Modern era. For example, conceptions of teaching roles have changed from authoritarian in Ancient Times to facilitator of learning in Early Modern Times; from indoctrinator in Ancient Times, to one who encourages self-directed learning in Early

Modern Times. Finally, "changing roles" in this dissertation does not indicate that the roles are irreversible.

Reasons for Choice of Benchmarks

Three periods were chosen as benchmarks in this study. These were Ancient Times (500 B.C. to 476 A.D.), the Sixteenth Century, and Early Modern Times (1700 to 1850). Reasons for their selection will now be advanced.

Ancient Times

Ancient Times was chosen because it was the period during which civilization advanced to great heights in Ancient Greece and Rome. Areas in which considerable advancements were made included philosophy, politics, architecture, and engineering. Since the accomplishments of the Ancient Greeks and Romans in philosophy are most pertinent to this dissertation, this aspect of their civilization will be dealt with first.

Ancient Greece was the birthplace of philosophy. This discipline thrived here not only because of the love of the Greeks for learning as the word "philosophy" signifies but because the gods whom these ancient people worshipped and revered expected them to live virtuous lives.

The wise men of Ancient Greece endeavoured to determine what constituted the virtuous life; hence philosophy developed. The virtues which were identified and held in high esteem were justice, prudence, fortitude,

and temperance. These were called the cardinal virtues because they were considered fundamental to morality. Ancient Greece was the birthplace of great philosophers as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle.

Plato's reverence for the virtues was so intense that this was reflected in most of his writings. The Republic, his most renowned educational treatise, centers on the question of what justice is, and how best it could be applied to his hypothetical state. Since the virtues were held in such high esteem by the Ancient Greek philosophers, the controversial question arose as to whether they could be taught. Aristotle's answer to this question was in the negative while Socrates argued affirmatively. It was probably Socrates' concern for the teaching of virtues that led him to develop his famous approach to pedagogy known as the Socratic Method. Aristotle wrote on politics, ethics, physics, and metaphysics.

Interest in philosophy led to the growth of philosophical schools, which had great influence on education. Thus Plato founded the Academy; Aristotle founded the Lyceum; Zeno, the school of the Stoics; and Epicurus, the Epicurean school. Schools of rhetoric were also founded in Greece and Rome.

The people of Ancient Greece and Rome were leaders in the fields of politics and law. Democracy was first practised in the Greek city states. Many of the democratic

principles observed in the Western World today such as the rights and responsibilities of citizens and protection of property by law could be traced back to Ancient Greece. Roman law contributed greatly to modern law, for the legal systems of many countries today are based on the laws of Ancient Rome.

The Ancient World also made valuable contributions to medicine, architecture, and engineering. Hippocrates, the famous Greek doctor who lived approximately 400 B.C., is still considered as the father of medicine. Greek and Roman architecture won the respect and admiration of the world. The Parthenon in Athens with its beautiful sculpturing and the amphitheatre of Rome are notable examples of Ancient architecture.

Although the Ancient Egyptians did not contribute as much to modern pegagogy as did Greece and Rome, credit must be given them for their skill in engineering. Such notable monuments as the pyramids and the sphinx testify to the high level of engineering technology attained by these people.

The Sixteenth Century

The Sixteenth Century was chosen as a benchmark because events which took place within that time frame exercised important influences on education. To begin with, this period saw the decline of scholasticism, which

was the intellectual movement designed to strengthen the Church and its doctrines by the application of reason to faith. Well-known exponents of this method were St. Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus.

The Sixteenth Century also witnessed the waning of medievalism with many of its associated features such as decrease in the power and influence of the Church in such areas as education and politics. Citizens were beginning to question the Church in matters of doctrine, which led to a decrease in faith in ecclesiastical authority. Stability came back to Europe in the Sixteenth Century. Cities were being built and advancements were made in the art of navigation.

The two greatest historical events which characterized this period were the Renaissance and the Reformation. The Renaissance or "rebirth" was a concerted attempt by man to free himself from authority in his social, political, and intellectual life. During the Middle Ages, there was a tendency for man to think of himself as part of a group. His way of life, attitudes, and behaviour were in accordance with tradition. During the Renaissance, however, man's class in society became less important for greater emphasis was placed upon individuality and man's worth was judged on his merit rather than on his societal class.

The Renaissance was marked by a revival of interest in Greek and Roman culture, the subjective world of the emotions, and the natural world. The areas of interest included art and sculpturing, literature, and methods of analysis. Italy was perhaps the most famous for Renaissance art and sculpturing perfected by such celebrated men as Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci. In literature, Petrarch and Boccaccio were leaders.

There were three important developments in the Renaissance: the intellectual, which embraced the humanistic aspect; the scientific; and the aesthetic. Since the humanistic aspect of the Renaissance is of greater relevance to this dissertation, it will be discussed at greater length. Humanism was the movement which placed its main emphasis upon man, promoted his freedom, developed his individuality, and led him to appreciate life to a fuller extent. In keeping with this emphasis on individuality, humanistic educators recognized the need to adapt the subjects taught to the age, aptitude, and interest of the individual learner. Humanistic educators promoted liberalism in education based on the seven liberal arts taught by the Greeks. The humanists later failed in their intentions to provide a broadly based education, for humanistic education came to be synonymous with the teaching of classical languages so common in European schools at the middle of the nineteenth century.

The Reformation was primarily geared towards bringing about reforms in the Roman Catholic Church. According to Mulhern, there were four causes: economic, social, political, and intellectual.[1] The intellectual ramifications are of greater importance to this study. As a result of the revival of learning, men became more independent in their thinking and at the same time relied less on authority. According to Mulhern, "it was the spirit of free inquiry and man's right to reason, which the humanists espoused, which linked the humanist movement and its scholarship to the work of the reformers."[2] Some of the most prominent reformers were Martin Luther, John Calvin, Philip Melanchthon, and John Knox.

The invention of printing helped to precipitate the Reformation because books became more easily available, so that men were able to read about the Church in the first century and compare it with regard to organization, structure, and leadership in the Sixteenth. The information they obtained made them conclude that the Church of the Sixteenth Century was not meeting the needs of the times nor was it providing the leadership which the laity of the earlier centuries enjoyed.

Early Modern Times

Early Modern Times, which extended from the eighteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century, was

characterized by man's espousal of ideologies which had significant implications for education. These included Rationalism, Romanticism, Naturalism which led to Humanitarianism, and Nationalism. Each of these will be discussed in some detail. Nationalism was a concerted attempt by European countries to foster pride and loyalty to the state by severing ties from foreign domination in their political, economic, and religious affairs. In order to achieve their goals, national systems of education were organized in such countries as Prussia, France, Russia, and England so as to place emphasis on the study of the national language as well as the history, culture, and literature of the homeland. To promote group feelings, citizens were constantly reminded of their common heritage and descent, tradition, history, religion, and economic interests. The good citizen was characterized as the person who manifested patriotic qualities like loyalty, obedience, and service to the state.

Another popular ideology, namely Rationalism, taught that the world was completely subjected to natural law, which if discovered by man will enable him to control his own destiny. Accordingly, the rationalists rejected everything that they regarded as supernatural, including revealed religion, since they thought that the latter was contrary to natural law. As would be expected, the

proponents of this ideology--Voltaire, Diderot, and the Encyclopedists--came into conflict with the Church.

Rationalism led to Naturalism, the philosophy espoused by Rousseau and others, which claimed that there was goodness in general in nature, hence all human beings were born good. Rousseau's belief in Naturalism influenced his conception of the role of the teacher to a considerable extent. Humanitarianism was a by-product of Naturalism. In education it promoted a new approach in the relationship of the teacher to the child, for Humanitarianism emphasized respect for the individuality of the pupil and more humane methods of discipline.

It was the teachings of naturalists, especially Rousseau, which contributed to the French Revolution, a movement which championed the rights of the common man against oppression by the French nobility with such emotional slogans as liberty, equality, and fraternity.

Romanticism contrasted strongly with Rationalism in many ways. The romantics did not subscribe to the view that nature was governed by intrinsic laws. Instead, they regarded nature as a mysterious force which was incomprehensible to man but with which he could nonetheless empathize and form an emotional attachment. In addition, the rationalists believed that through reason, man could master his environment and make a better life for himself. The romantics, on the other hand, did not subscribe to

this belief but claimed instead that man could never achieve the power to control the universe. According to their way of thinking, man was governed more by his feelings than by his intellect.

Another rationale for choosing Early Modern Times as a benchmark was that during this period the impact of the pedagogical ideas of Pestalozzi and Froebel was first felt. These ideas, some of which were closely allied with Naturalism, had implications for the role of the teacher. These included Pestalozzi's concept of Anschauung, Froebel's laws of unity, self-activity, and development or unfolding; and the naturalists' views of human nature. These concepts will now be described in more detail. The writer will define Naturalism, to which earlier references had been made, by quoting from Good's Dictionary of Education.

> Naturalism as formulated by Rousseau was a revolt against the artificialities of eighteenth-century French life, it emphasized a return to the "natural," that is, the hypothetical primitive social state, recognized the existence of natural developmental stages in the child, levels of readiness, individual differences and other elements of modern progressive education; stressed the necessity of education in harmony with natural human development, learning by activity and experience, self-imposed discipline, individualization of instruction, development of moral character from within, by experience, rather than from without, by indoctrination; antithetical to eighteenth-century theology on the one hand and to rationalism on the other.[3]

It is advisable at this juncture to show how the conception of human nature held by the three Early Modern exemplars was influenced by Naturalism.

Rousseau's concept of human nature.--One of the chief reasons for Rousseau's revolutionary changes in approach to teaching (in keeping with his adherence to Naturalism) was his conception of the child at birth. The Church had espoused the belief in inherent depravity, because of original sin, as a direct result of Adam's rebellion against God and the loss of sanctifying grace. Rousseau rejected this belief, claiming instead that the child was innately good. So firmly did he hold this belief that he used it as the fundamental tenet on which his principles of education were based and as the opening statement of his thought-provoking treatise, the Emile: "God makes all things good; man meddles with them and they become evil."[4] In Book II of the same treatise, he reiterated: "Let us assume as an incontestable maxim that the first movements of nature are always right; there is no original perversity in the human heart."[5]

The implications for the role of the teacher, based on these two statements, seem obvious, since they suggest that he should refrain from attempting to correct the natural impulses of the child and try instead to use nature as his guide. This approach and its ramifications for teaching will be discussed in more detail later.

Pestalozzi's concept of human nature.--Pestalozzi held with great conviction the theory of innate goodness in man. This was attributable to his naturalistic

tendencies as was the case with Rousseau and Froebel. In addition, Pestalozzi held a genetic conception of man, comparing human development to the growth of a tree from a seed which he believed contained all the potentialities for its development to maturity. But just as the tree needed the proper environment to grow healthily, so too man needed the proper environment to realize his potentials. Because of the many parallels seen by this educator in the growth and development of the child and the seedling, Pestalozzi exhorted parents and teachers to imitate nature from which he thought much could be learned.

> Man, imitate the actions of Nature who, out of the seed of the largest tree first produces a scarcely perceptible shoot, then, just as imperceptibly, daily and hourly by gradual stages, unfolds first the beginning of the stem, then the boughs, then the branch, then the extreme twig on which hangs the perishable leaf. Consider carefully this action of great Nature--how she tends and perfects every single part as it is formed, and joins on every new part to the permanent growth of the old.[6]

The above quotation reveals Pestalozzi's conception of nature as "unfolding." As will be seen with Froebel, he also subscribed to the view that development took place in the direction inside-outwards, which was contrary to that held by Sixteenth Century educators.

Since Pestalozzi adhered to the theory that each individual is composed of mind, body, and spirit, he attempted to devise methods of teaching appropriate to the natural growth of the child, intellectually, physically, and spiritually.

In this quotation he affirmed his belief in the spiritual nature of man:

> The animal instinct is a principle which knows no higher object than self. Self-preservation is the first point which it tries to secure; and in its progressive desire of enjoyment, self is still the centre of its agency. It is not the same with the mind, or with the affections of the heart. The fact which speaks most unquestioningly for the spiritual nature of man, is the sacrifice of personal comfort or enjoyment, for the happiness of others; the subordination of individual desire, to higher purposes.[7]

Froebel's concept of human nature.--Froebel was in agreement with Rousseau and Pestalozzi in his belief in the innate goodness of man. Like Rousseau, he rejected the Christian concept of original sin, claiming that man was pure when he came from the hands of God. Since God his Creator is Himself perfect, it was logical to conclude that He could not create a morally corrupt individual. This belief in man's inherent goodness is eloquently affirmed in a quotation taken from The Education of Man:

> For surely, the nature of man is in itself good, and surely there are in man qualities and tendencies in themselves good. Man is by no means naturally bad, nor has he originally bad or evil qualities and tendencies, unless, indeed we consider as naturally evil, bad and faulty the finite, the material, the transitory, the physical. . . . Whoever then considers that which is finite material, physical as in itself bad, thereby expresses contempt for creation, nature as such--nay he actually blasphemes God.[8]

Froebel even rejected the neutral viewpoint of man as being born neither good nor bad and condemned this

conviction as an act of treason. He pointed out that the evil and shortcomings of man were not there initially, but were caused by conflicts arising from suppressed or perverted good qualities.[9] Other fundamental principles of the above educators which had bearings on their conceptions of roles for the teacher will now be discussed.

Froebel's law of unity.--In Froebel's view, the universe comprised a great unit in which there was no division between the realm of spirit and the realm of nature, nor between an individual and society.[10] In this view he was influenced by Schelling, who sought for a principle that would reduce the whole of nature to a unity. Froebel's religious convictions strengthened his philosophical obsession with the concept of a unifying force in the world of spirit and nature, for since God was the Creator of what seemed to him to be an organized universe, it was logical to think that all things therein must be a part of a great unit, with each being or object having a part to play in the scheme of things.[11] The opening chapter of his chief work in education, The Education of Man, reveals the importance which he attached to this principle of unity. According to Froebel,

> This Unity is God. All things come from the Divine Unity, from God, and have their origin in the Divine Unity, in God alone. God is the sole source of all things. In all things there lives and reigns the Divine Unity, God. All things live and have their being in and through the Divine Unity, in and through God.[12]

God was thus seen by Froebel as the guiding spirit and the ultimate goal of all existence. Since all things found their unity with God, Froebel saw as the life work of each individual, a striving to become conscious of this unity.[13] Accordingly, it was only when this unity was attained that the individual felt fulfilled. Hence the aim of education as Froebel saw it was to help the child realize this unity.[14] So obsessed was the latter educator with this concept that he saw unity in the process of growth and evolution to higher forms in nature; he saw unity between man and God, nature and man; he saw unity between man's physical, intellectual, and spiritual powers and between knowing, feeling, and acting.

Froebel's law of self-activity.--Just as Froebel's fundamental educational laws were based on the theory of unity and inner-connectedness, his educational process was based on self-activity. Self-activity, as the term implies, suggests that the motive and impulses that cause the child to act, originate from the child himself and become the driving force behind the education process. As such, the child becomes involved in his own self-initiated activity with only the guidance of the teacher whose role it is, according to Castle, "to provide the situations and materials that induce children to be actively engaged, whether in play or otherwise in activities

directed towards a desired end."[15] As Monroe aptly explains it:

> Thus for the school, self-activity means this desire of the child to enter into the life of others and the life around it; the desire to help, find out, to discover, to participate in common activities, to create, to discover the identity or connection between itself and the activities and processes of others--the discovery which constitutes knowledge.[16]

The importance of self-activity as a doctrine of interest in school work is clearly brought out in the above statement. In whatever form it may take, this desire on the part of the child to know his environment and become a part of life around him is of great importance in his education. Moreover, self-activity trains the child to act independently and forms the basis of discipline or self-discipline, which is the goal that education should strive to attain.

Pestalozzi's principle of Anschauung.--The principle of Anschauung constitutes one of Pestalozzi's greatest contributions to education. Since it has ramifications for his conception of the role of the teacher, some attention will be given to the term here, bearing in mind that because Pestalozzi used the term loosely, some confusion has arisen from it. The term is reminiscent of the principle of tabula rasa propounded by John Locke, based on the Aristotelian theory that everything that is in the mind came there by way of the senses. According to Romana

Walch, Pestalozzi used the term "to describe each of five different methods of acquiring knowledge through sense impressions."[17] Robert Rusk describes it as "the immediate experience of objects or situations."[18]

Pestalozzi saw the principle as having ramifications in both the academic and moral domain. In the academic sphere, according to Boyd, "a lesson in which the child sees, handles, or otherwise makes direct acquaintance with an object is an Anschauung lesson: Anschauung enters into a geography lesson, for example, when the pupil sees natural phenomena or places for himself instead of merely hearing about them, or learning about them from diagrams."[19]

In the moral sphere, Anschauung operates when a child experiences situations in which, for example, he may be shown love, or compassion by others, or one in which he himself is moved to empathize with another person who is experiencing some misfortune.

From all this, it is clear that it is incumbent upon the teacher to provide direct experiences for the child whenever possible, if learning is to make an indelible impression on his mind and lessons be better understood. This was Pestalozzi's protest against the abstractions associated with the pedagogy of his day.

Reasons for Choice of Exemplars

The writer has selected a number of educators whose conceptions of the role of the teacher have had profound impact on pedagogy for the three historical periods covered by this study. These include Isocrates (393-338 B.C.), Socrates (469-399 B.C.), Plato (427-347 B.C.), and Quintilian (35-97 A.D.), who represent the pedagogues of Ancient Times; Roger Ascham (1515-1568), Michel Montaigne (1533-1592), Richard Mulcaster (1531-1611), and the Jesuits (16th-18th century), who represent Sixteenth Century educators; Rousseau (1712-1778), Pestalozzi (1746-1827), and Froebel (1782-1852), representatives of Early Modern Times.

Plato has been chosen as an exemplar of Ancient Times because of his outstanding contribution to the philosophy of education through the books he wrote. First and foremost, the Republic, which Rousseau called "the greatest treatise on education ever written,"[20] the Laws, the Lache, the Symposium, and the Meno. Plato had such a high esteem for education that in the Republic he rated it as "the grandest and most beautiful subject"[21] and in the Laws he repeated that "it is the first and fairest thing that the best of men could ever have."[22] So impressed was Emerson with the Republic that he declared "burn the libraries for their value is in this book."[23]

Plato was very much concerned with the role of the teacher; hence much of his writings were devoted to this subject. For example, the teacher was seen as an authoritarian and strict disciplinarian in the Laws, and as an indoctrinator in the Republic.

So convinced was Plato that it was the business of the state of educate the people that he gave this subject extensive coverage in the Republic, where he proposed a structure for education and a curriculum of studies for the entire population of artisans, guardians, and rulers.

Isocrates was selected because of his advocacy of roles for the teacher particularly in such areas as discipline and relationships between the teacher and student. Isocrates acquired a great deal of experience as a teacher, having remained in the teaching profession until he was ninety-seven years old, and this experience would qualify him to assign roles.

For the wisdom that he bequeathed to the world from his practical experience as an educator, and for his illuminating books on education, namely Against the Sophists and Antidosis, Isocrates deserves merit. Though his main field was rhetoric, his teaching methodology had widespread application to other subjects as well. He has been called by many "the most famous schoolmaster of antiquity."[24]

Socrates was selected because of the impact he made on the history of pedagogy through his introduction of a dialectical form of questioning known as the Socratic Method, which has implications for the role of the teacher. This methodology cannot be ignored because it is still believed by some educators to produce intellectually alert students and rated as a valid approach to teaching. It is also worth mentioning that the Socratic Method is the basis of the modern emphasis on the discovery method of teaching.

Socrates wrote no books, hence he did not make any literary contribution, but his ideas have been written down for posterity by his pupil Plato in many of his dialogues.

To Socrates, teaching was a way of life. So obsessed was he with it that he took a delight in being the proverbial "gadfly," questioning those in his vicinity about supposedly simple concepts which they believed they knew, only to be convinced of their ignorance later.

Though his methodology has aroused some controversy in modern educational circles, the fact that it is still practised today testifies to the impact that Socrates has made in the field of teaching. For these reasons, he could not be ignored as an exemplar.

Because he was "the most prominent of Roman writers on education"[25] and an educator who had much insight

concerning the role of the teacher, Quintilian was chosen as a representative of Ancient Times.

For twenty years, Quintilian had been a most successful and devoted teacher of rhetoric. He was so devoted to his calling that he made it his goal to produce the perfect orator. His theories of education and his conceptions of the teacher's role were regarded as criteria to be followed in Latin grammar schools for centuries.

Quintilian was one of the few highly admired teachers of his time, and for this reason he enjoyed imperial favour. According to Castle, "his persistent practicality which kept his precepts always within the range of any good schoolmaster places him high among the great teachers."[26]

Numbering among his accomplishments was his famous work, Institutio Oratoria (Education of an Orator), consisting of twelve books. This work not only contains Quintilian's concepts of the teacher's role, but also rules to be observed in oratory. It received universal acclaim as "the most complete treatise on Roman education ever written."[27]

Last, since the pedagogy of Ancient Times embraces both Greece and Rome in this dissertation, the writer wanted at least one Roman educator to match the three Greek exemplars chosen. No better one could be found than Quintilian.

Montaigne had great insights into the educational methodology which was to become later, the hallmark of the naturalistic approach to teaching. This is illustrated clearly in "his insistence on things before words, judgment and understanding before memory, adaptation of instructions to the pupils' present ability."[28]

Moreover, insights into his conceptions of the teacher's role could be gleaned from his famous works, Essays on Pedantry and The Instruction of Children.

Mulcaster's choice as one of the Sixteenth Century educators was based primarily on two important qualifications he possessed: the fact that he was a worthy representative of humanism in education and his lengthy experience as a schoolmaster who showed much concern about the role of the teacher. Quick describes him as "one of the most famous of English schoolmasters, who by his writings proved that he was far in advance of the schoolmasters of his own time and of the times which succeeded."[29]

As a humanist teacher, he encouraged the spirit of free inquiry among his students and emphasized the role of the teacher in fostering a good personal relationship with his students.

Mulcaster's intuitive understanding of child psychology, a subject which was still in its embryonic stage during his time, was remarkable. Moreover, he recognized such concepts as levels of cognitive development,

individual differences among students, and readiness, all of which have implications for the role of the teacher with regard to teaching methodology. According to Quick, "when we read his books, we find that wisdom which we are importing in the nineteenth century offered us by an English schoolmaster in the sixteenth."[30]

Because of the enormous contribution they made to education as school teachers in Europe during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, the Jesuits were chosen as representatives. The Jesuits were one of a number of teaching orders associated with the Roman Catholic Church. Their conceptions of the role of the teacher deserve consideration because of their devotion to the profession, which won them universal acclaim and distinction. Their popularity was attested by William Boyd in his historical account of their educational institutions.

> In every part of the land they had flourishing colleges and universities, the latter attended by such numbers of students that even the university of Paris was seriously affected. In the middle of the century they had 14,000 pupils under instruction in the province of Paris alone; by the end of the century, their colleges, exclusive of universities, numbered 612.[31]

Much of what the Jesuits had to contribute to the conception of the teacher's role was in the area of human relationships and methods of instruction. Being clerics, they were particularly concerned about establishing rapport between teacher and student, and because of their

meticulous attention to methodology, they were interested in finding methods of instructions that suited their goals.

A tribute to their excellence as teachers comes from William Boyd, who maintains that:

> Concerning the excellence of the Jesuit colleges, there has never been serious question. Even opponents who had no sympathy with the other activities of the order, and who had distrusted the social effects of its educational work, recognized the Jesuits as masters of the art of education.[32]

Roger Ascham merited selection because of his concern for the role of the teacher as a humanist and as an educator himself. According to Williams, he was "much the best known English teacher of this century,"[33] meaning the Sixteenth Century.

His contribution to education includes several books, notably The Schoolmaster, in which Ascham illustrates and expounds his methodology in teaching Latin. The book is interesting and remarkable for his psychological insights into the art of teaching, the problem of discipline in the classroom, the effects of praise and blame in the teaching situation, and the importance of the role of the teacher in establishing good relationships with students.

Ascham's treatise on method has received the recognition of many educators. According to Monroe, "Ascham's treatise on method has been considered not only

the best of his time but has often been pronounced the best of any time."[34]

Hence, for his devotion to humanism, which exercised great influence in shaping his ideas on education, and his contribution to teaching methodology and the role that the teacher was expected to play in the education of the child, Ascham was included.

No name stands out so prominently in the history of pedagogy as that of Jean Jacques Rousseau. His revolutionary theories on education so captivated the minds of educators that they were forced to pause and question themselves and their role as teachers.

Rousseau caused this revolution in pedagogy primarily through his writings, for he himself had "little or no experience in teaching."[35] His educational ideas were expressed at great length in his treatise entitled the Emile, and to a lesser extent in his Nouvelle Héloise and Considerations on the Government of Poland. No better glowing tribute could be paid to Rousseau as an educator than that expressed by the well-known educational historian, William Boyd, who made the following assessment of the Emile:

> I believe further, that the Emile with all its faults is the most profound modern discussion of the fundamentals of education, the only modern work of its kind worthy to be put alongside the Republic of Plato.[36]

Rousseau's theories had great relevance for the role of the teacher. In fact, the impact made by the Emile was that it caused the teacher to see himself in a new light. No longer was he to treat the child as a miniature adult; no longer was he to "look for the man in the child,"[37] but to respect each developmental stage in its own right, for as Rousseau himself said, "every stage, every station in life has a perfection of its own."[38] The teacher was no longer encouraged to be an authoritarian but a guide and a facilitator of learning.

Pestalozzi, who earned the title of "father of modern pedagogy," merited selection as one of the Early Modern exemplars, because of the new light he shed on the conception of the role of the teacher. Pestalozzi was not just an educational theorist but a teacher as well. This position he held for many years. This afforded him ample opportunities for putting into practice the theories on education which he formulated, but more importantly, this qualified him for formulating theories on what the role of the teacher should be.

Pestalozzi's two important treatises on education, namely How Gertrude Teaches Her Children and Leonard and Gertrude, had considerable impact in changing the conception of the role of the teacher from an authoritarian figure to that of a gardener, or a surrogate parent who took over the education of the child from the biological

parent. These conceptions of the teacher's role led to an approach to teaching that was based on love and understanding. Moreover, it led to the psychologizing of education and new perceptions of the child.

Friedrich Froebel stands out conspicuously as an Early Modern educator. He is most famous as the founder of the kindergarten and for his conception of the teacher's role as that of a dialectical gardener, but he has made other outstanding contributions to education as well. According to Monroe,

> Some of the most profound changes in educational thought and practice of the present time are in accord with, if not in response to the demands formulated by Froebel. . . . Whether the emphasis in school work is placed upon the activities of the child, rather than upon the technique of the process of instruction, and whether development of character and of personality is sought, rather than mere imparting of information, and the training of intellectual abilities, there the Froebelian influence is to be recognized.[39]

Froebel's conceptions of the role of the teacher have widespread implications for the education of the child in many areas of teaching, including instructions, discipline, and moral training.

The compliment paid to Froebel by Monroe for his achievements in education is worth noting. As Monroe observed,

> Froebel possessed a power which few reformers have evinced . . . that of crystallizing theory into practice, of interpreting general principles in concrete form, of both stating the philosophy and organizing the practical application of new educational doctrines.[40]

Footnotes--Chapter II

[1]James Mulhern, A History of Education (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1959), p. 308.

[2]Ibid., p. 314.

[3]Carter V. Good, ed., Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959), p. 360.

[4]Jean Jacques Rousseau, Emile, trans. Barbara Foxley (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Everyman's Library, 1976), p. 5.

[5]Ibid., p. 56.

[6]Gerald Lee Gutek, Pestalozzi and Education (Chicago: Random House, 1968), p. 82.

[7]Robert Rusk, A History of Infant Education (London: University of London Press, Ltd., 1967), p. 5.

[8]Friedrich Froebel, The Education of Man, trans. W. N. Hailman (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1895), p. 120.

[9]Ibid., p. 121.

[10]Ibid., p. 1.

[11]Ibid., p. 2.

[12]Ibid., p. 1.

[13]Ibid., p. 5.

[14]Ibid.

[15]E. B. Castle, The Teacher (Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 131.

[16]Paul Monroe, A Text Book in the History of Education (New York: Macmillan, 1953), p. 657.

[17]Mary Romana Walch, Pestalozzi and the Pestalozzian Theory of Education (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1952), p. 98.

[18]Robert Rusk, The Doctrines of the Great Educators (London: Macmillan, 1962), p. 193.

[19]William Boyd, The History of Western Education (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1950), p. 324.

[20]Rousseau, op. cit., p. 8.

[21]Plato, The Republic, trans. Francis Cornford (Oxford: University Press, 1976), section 599.

[22]Plato, Laws, in The Dialogues of Plato, trans. Benjamin Lowett (Chicago: 1970), section 644.

[23]Will Durant, The Story of Philosophy (New York: Simon and Schuster Publishers, 1930), p. 10.

[24]Edward Power, Main Currents in the History of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970), p. 114.

[25]Ibid., p. 112.

[26]Castle, op. cit., p. 143.

[27]Power, op. cit., p. 179.

[28]Samuel G. Williams, The History of Medieval Education (Syracuse, N.Y.: C. W. Bardeen Publishers, 1903), p. 89.

[29]Robert Quick, Essays on Educational Reformers (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1899), p. 92.

[30]Williams, op. cit., p. 89.

[31]Boyd, op. cit., p. 255.

[32]Ibid., p. 207.

[33]Williams, op. cit., p. 106.

[34]Monroe, op. cit., p. 385.

[35]Rusk, op. cit., p. 135.

[36]William Boyd, The Educational Theory of Jean Jacques Rousseau (New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1963), p. 5.

[37]Rusk, op. cit., p. 156.

[38]Rousseau, op. cit., p. 122.

[39]Paul Monroe, op. cit., p. 642.

[40]Ibid.

CHAPTER III

PERSISTENT ROLES

In this chapter, roles of the teacher that have persisted from Ancient Times to the Early Modern era will be examined and analyzed. These comprise the establishment of a close personal relationship between teacher and student, and the provision of a good environment for learning. After the analysis, the writer will advance reasons for the persistence of these roles.

The Establishment of a Good Personal Relationship Between Teacher and Student

One of the important considerations in fostering learning is the establishment of a good personal relationship between teacher and student. This role of the teacher was promoted by our exemplars of Ancient Times, Isocrates and Quintilian. Isocrates believed that such a relationship was requisite for the teacher to exercise maximum influence on the character and scholarly aspirations of his protégé.[1] Ideally, this relationship was to be in the nature of a spiritual bond between the two parties. As Broudy interpreted it,

> Crucial to his [the teacher's] effectiveness was undoubtedly the close personal relationship that developed between master and pupil--a spiritual bond so intimate and powerful that it was frequently maintained throughout the life of both persons.[2]

Isocrates was an exemplar of his precept in this regard, for he resorted frequently to informality in his approach to teaching by conducting his classes in a relaxed atmosphere and encouraging frequent meetings with his students to allow his personal influence to be felt to the fullest extent. Indeed, when the students of Isocrates graduated, "so happy did they feel in their life with [him] that they would always take their leave with regret and tears."[3] Isocrates also boasted of the parents "rejoicing to see their sons spending their days in [his society]."[4]

Quintilian was another of the ancient exemplars who recognized how important it was for the teacher to understand, communicate with, and encourage mutual exchanges between himself and student. As Castle puts it, "he was the first serious student of the pupils' reaction to teaching."[5] Quintilian's attitude in this regard was quite different from his contemporaries who saw the teacher's position at the helm only, giving directives to students without allowing for feedback from them.

Quintilian saw the teacher as a professional whose role it was to make efforts to utilize the most effective

methods of teaching by using psychology to work upon the positive impulses of his students' temperament in order to encourage and motivate them to perform their best. Hence he exhorted teachers to observe that: "In correcting faults he [the teacher] must avoid sarcasm and above all abuse; for teachers whose rebukes seem to imply positive dislike discourage industry."[6]

The establishment of good rapport between teacher and student is also in accord with our Sixteenth Century exemplars, Ascham, Montaine, and the Jesuits. The Jesuits believed that the teacher should take the initiative in establishing a close personal bond between himself and his students, "especially those who are being groomed for the order."[7] As such, the teachers in the Jesuit schools were expected to take a natural interest in youngsters by providing leadership, assurance, and psychological support for them. This they did, for the Jesuits were "men with a burning enthusiasm for and devotion to their work and their religion"[8] and always exhibited a "natural interest in youngsters."[9]

The teacher's attitude towards his students was to be characterized "with a mixture of paternalism and solicitude."[10] The student, on the other hand, was to be obedient and respectful, to "conduct himself decorously and to study what was given him in the way he was told to study it."[11] The ideal teacher, according to the Jesuits,

was one who was understanding, appreciative, and sympathetic with those committed to him. It was his role to try to discover the potentials or possibilities that were in each of his students and develop them for the service of God and mankind.

In their efforts to establish good human relationships, the Jesuits did not neglect their responsibility for the physical well-being of their students, for they realized that poor health may have an adverse effect on one's attitudes. Hence care was taken to ensure that students did not suffer illness by being overtaxed mentally. To avoid this, the master was required "to study the character and capacity of each boy in his class, and to keep a book with all particulars about him."[12] This facilitated the assigning of the appropriate amount of work that was suited to the capacity and intelligence of each pupil. It was by knowing the needs and aspirations of his students and by keeping personal contact with them that the Jesuit teacher was able to fulfill one of the roles required of him, that of establishing good human relationships with his students.

Other Sixteenth Century teachers who recognized the importance of the role of the teacher in maintaining healthy relationships with his students were Roger Ascham, an Engligh schoolmaster of the humanist persuasion, and Michel Montaigne, a French educational theorist who has

sometimes been described as a humanist, a realist, and a naturalist.

Like other humanists, Ascham believed that for the child's educational progress, it was necessary for the teacher to establish a cordial relationship with his pupil. He argued that this served to eliminate fear which was a deterrent to learning since it stifled initiative and creativity on the part of students. The other ill-effects of fear were that it led students to turn to other sources for help in their school work instead of approaching the teacher, who was more qualified to give assistance. As Ascham put it in his well-known work, The Schoolmaster:

> Let your scholar be never afraid to ask you any doubt, but use discreetly the best allurements ye can to encourage him to the same; lest his overmuch fearing of you drive him to be helped by some other book, or to be prompted by some scholar, and so go about to beguile you much and himself more.[13]

Instead of instilling fear in his pupils in order to gain their respect, Ascham recommended instead that the teacher use praise and commendation to encourage learning. According to him, "I assure you that there is no such whetstone to sharpen a good wit and encourage a will to learning as praise."[14]

Again in The Schoolmaster, Ascham pleaded,

> But if the child miss, either in forgetting a word or in changing a good with a worse, or misordering the sentence I would not have the master either frown or chide with him, if the child have done his diligence, and used no truantship therein,

> for I know by good experience that a child shall take more profit of two faults gently warned of than of four things rightly hit.[15]

Montaigne believed that the teacher's attitude towards his pupils should be characterized by cordiality, friendship, and moderation rather than severity, violence, and force. He denounced vigorously the severity that was customary in the schools of his time and the harshness evident in the relationships between teachers and students, arguing instead that the teacher should accommodate himself to the ability of the pupils, an attitude which he regarded as "a mark of a lofty and very strong spirit to know how to condescend to those childish steps and to guide them."[16]

All three Early Modern exemplars agree that the teacher should take the initiative in establishing a close rapport with his students. In Rousseau's educational scheme proposed in the Emile, the relationship was to be in the nature of "father-child" since the tutor was expected to be a surrogate father for his hypothetical pupil Emile. This close personal bond was requisite if Emile's education was to be at its best. It was to be effected through a kind of contract. As Broome described it:

> Its terms are simple. From the parents, it calls for the transfer of all authority to the tutor; from the tutor, it requires complete dedication to his charge, the recompense for which

> will be the ultimate gratitude of the pupil and the moral satisfaction accruing from a task well done.[17]

Pestalozzi was an advocate of a close personal relationship between teacher and student on the grounds that it was necessary for true learning to take place. Hence in his treatise on education, How Gertrude Teaches Her Children, Gertrude, the mother and prototype of the ideal educator, taught her children in an atmosphere rich in affection, care, and concern. This was the type of relationship that Pestalozzi maintained should be established between teacher and student in the regular classroom. Hence he was strongly in favour of the school being a replica of the best home.

A close relationship between teacher and student is pivotal to Froebel's principles of education. This is again in keeping with the role he prescribed for the teacher--that of gardener. The analogy of the child as a young plant is thus appropriate here. Just as the young plant needs the care and watchful eye of the gardener, so too the pupil needs the care and watchfulness of the teacher. This can only be effected when there is a close relationship between teacher and student.

Providing the Correct Environment for Learning

Providing the correct environment for learning was another role that persisted over the three periods

covered in this dissertation. Isocrates, one of the exemplars of Ancient Times, promoted it. This was in keeping with his emphasis on the pre-eminence of the power of nurture over nature. Thus he wrote, "the majority of men tend to assimilate the manners and morals amid which they have been reared."[18]

The importance of providing or creating the appropriate environment conducive to learning has been recognized by educators throughout the ages; hence the practice did not originate with Isocrates. It was advocated also by Plato in Ancient Greece. After so many years of controversy, the nature-nurture problem remains an unsettled issue. The behaviourists, on the one hand, emphasize the influence of the environment on behaviour as opposed to the effects of heredity. This is evidenced by the often-quoted statement attributed to the famous philosopher of that persuasion, John Watson, who claimed that, given a normal healthy baby at birth and given control over his environment, he could train the individual to become any one of the following: "doctor, lawyer, artist, merchant-chief and yes even a beggarman and thief, regardless of his talents, penchants, tendencies, abilities, vocations and race of his ancestors."[19]

Plato's emphasis on the importance of having the proper environment for learning was perhaps more

pronounced than other educators of the Greco-Roman world. As Castle notes,

> Nowhere in the history of education do we find a more persuasive and vivid demonstration of the influence of environment, whether of evil or of the inflowing power of beauty and goodness over the growing mind as in the Laws where he deals with the schooling of ordinary children--education becomes a nurture in so strictly guarded an environment that we begin to discern the shades of the prison house.[20]

In Plato's educational theories, attention was to be given by the parent and teacher, early in the life of the child, because these were the formative, impressionable years. Hence Plato cautioned, "the beginning you know is always the most important part, especially when you are dealing with everything young and tender."[21]

The Sixteenth Century exemplars, notably Mulcaster and the Jesuits, were also proponents for providing the correct environment for learning. The reason for this, as Mulcaster puts it, is that:

> In the little young souls we find a capacity to perceive what is taught to them and to imitate those around them. That faculty of learning and following should be well employed by choosing the proper matter to be set before them.[22]

The phrase "the proper matter to be set before them" could be interpreted to mean arranging the correct environment that will foster the learning of desirable material to the maximal level. The proper environment is also important, because of the tendency, as Mulcaster

noted, "of little young souls to imitate those around them."[23]

The Jesuits believed that the school environment should possess the atmosphere congruent with the attitudes and desirable character traits that they tried to nurture in the students as religious leaders. Hence they regarded it as their responsibility as teachers to provide such an environment.

The Early Modern exemplars, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel, believed in the influence of the environment for good or evil; hence they exhorted teachers to give the matter great consideration. Rousseau believed that the best environment for learning could be found in the countryside, in natural surroundings away from objectionable attractions and societal influences. It was important for the tutor to take his pupil, Emile, to such an environment for his education.

Pestalozzi and Froebel believed that it was the responsibility of the teacher to create a classroom environment rich in love and acceptance where the seeds of moral character could be sown, and where the child could unfold the potentialities with which he was endowed by nature.

Suggested Reasons for the Persistence of These Roles

Several reasons may be advanced for the persistence of the establishment of a good personal relationship between the teacher and student. It would seem, though, that all educators did not have the same reasons for advocating this role. In Ancient Times, Isocrates and Quintilian probably believed that such a close association was of benefit, both to the learner and the teacher. The learner benefited, because he would likely interpret the teacher's initiative in establishing a close personal bond to mean that he had an interest in his academic and social welfare. The teacher in turn benefited from the close association because this afforded him opportunities to get to know his student better in such areas as his academic strengths and weaknesses, his character traits, and his scholarly aspirations. Such knowledge would be helpful to the teacher. Moreover, Isocrates and Quintilian seemed to be aware of the fact that they could help to motivate their students by showing a personal interest in them.

The reasons why the Jesuits promoted this role seem to center around the following:

They undoubtedly believed that by getting to know their students closely, they would have greater influence over them academically, morally, and socially. It is also conceivable that the Jesuits thought that by showing great

interest in their students, the assurances, encouragement, and support they needed to remain staunch adherents to their religion would be provided. One has to remember that the Jesuits were a teaching order that devoted much of its time and efforts to the spreading of Catholic doctrine at a period when Protestantism was on the rise in Europe.

Being a priestly order, the Jesuits were particularly interested in the religious welfare of their students. Hence they assumed the role of good shepherds whose duty it was to take care of their sheep. In order to be good shepherds, they had to know their sheep well and be able to communicate with and understand them. It seems logical to think that this was one of their reasons for taking the initiative in establishing friendly relationships with their students.

Another reason was that the Jesuits were concerned about making new recruits from promising students who would continue the work of these dedicated clerics in the service of God and man.

Finally, the Jesuits believed that their students would benefit academically from a close association with their teachers because there is a tendency for people to like those with whom they associate; and as Sacchini, a leading Jesuit, noted, "when pupils love their master, they soon get to love his teaching."[24]

Rousseau was a proponent of this role because the success of the teaching venture depended on the close relationship between the tutor and Emile. This association was to be based on love for childhood. Hence in a moving passage taken from the Emile he eloquently exhorted teachers and parents to:

> Love childhood. Encourage its sports, its pleasures and its instinct for happiness. Who of you has not sometimes regretted the period when a laugh was always on the lips and the soul always in peace? Why will you deny those little innocents the enjoyment of that brief period which so soon escapes them, and of that precious good which they cannot abuse? Why will you fill with bitterness and sorrow those first years so quickly passing which will no more return to them than they can return to you?[25]

Moreover, the role of facilitator of learning that Rousseau conceived for the teacher was dependent upon the establishment of a close personal relationship between teacher and pupil, for it was characterized by acceptance, trust, caring, and commitment. Rousseau believed that the ideal conditions for learning were present in such a relationship; hence it was incumbent upon the teacher to foster it.

The reasons that Pestalozzi advanced for his advocacy of this role were that a close personal relationship between teacher and pupil created an atmosphere in the school that demonstrated genuine affection and interest in the welfare of its students. In addition to this, "the teacher who keeps his pupils interested in their

progress and aware of his genuine interest in them will have few, if any, so-called discipline problems."[26]

Froebel believed that it was only through the establishment of a close personal relationship that the teacher was able to show the "love and care" that were needed for his pupils to attain their highest potentials.

Reasons for the Persistence of the Role of the Teacher in Providing the Correct Environment for Learning

This role persisted from Ancient Times to the Early Modern era because of the advantages each educator saw in advocating it. Isocrates, one of our ancient exemplars, thought it important because he believed in the power of "nurture over nature." He maintained with great certainty that individuals were the products of their culture, for there was a tendency for people to absorb the manners, attitudes, mores, and customs of those around them. The implication of this for education was that it placed the responsibility on the teacher to provide the correct environment for the education of the child.

Plato recognized the importance of providing the correct environment for learning, even from early childhood, because he believed at this time the child received impressions which made indelible marks on his mind for life. He urged parents to be very cautious about those

whom they chose to bring up their child. Teachers, governesses, and nurses were to be respectable and of impeccable character because they represented models which the child would imitate. Plato argued that the surroundings played as great a part in molding the minds of human beings as the subjects they studied. The importance Plato attached to the influence of environment on learning is glaringly revealed from a passage taken from the Republic:

> The young should live in a wholesome climate and drink in good from every quarter, so that like a wind bringing health from healthy lands, some influence from noble works may from childhood upwards constantly fall on ear and insensibly draw them into sympathy and harmony with the beauty of reason.[27]

The Jesuits believed that a good environment was important for learning and the inculcation of virtues. Hence this was provided for the students in Jesuit schools by the teachers who were themselves ordained priests, men who pledged to maintain high moral standards at all times and to display uprightness in their dealings with their fellowmen. In other words, the tone and atmosphere of Jesuit schools provided the correct environment for learning.

Our Early Modern exemplars were in complete agreement with the benefits to be derived from a good learning environment; hence this role of the teacher was maintained in Early Modern Times, though for different reasons.

Rousseau believed that a wholesome environment was important in educating the young. Hence in his Emile he recommended that the pupil be taken from the city to the salubrious country atmosphere, away from the contaminating influences of society which Rousseau held were responsible for making the child depraved. As indicated in the second chapter of this dissertation, Rousseau believed that the child was born good but that society was responsible for its subsequent depravity.

In Pestalozzi's educational scheme, the provision of a good environment for learning was one of the responsibilities of the teacher, hence Pestalozzi's analogy of the teacher as a gardener whose duty it was to create the correct environment and his insistence that the school should be in the nature of a good home where love, co-operation, and genuine interest prevailed.

Froebel likewise compared the role of the teacher to that of a gardener in the figurative sense for, following his methodology, the teacher was expected to provide the correct environment for the child to unfold, just as the gardener was supposed to provide the right environment for the healthy and successful growth of his plants.

Footnotes--Chapter III

[1]Harry S. Broudy, Exemplars of Teaching Method (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965), p. 22.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Frederick A. G. Beck, Greek Education 450-350 (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1964), p. 268.

[4]Ibid.

[5]E. B. Castle, The Teacher (Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 41.

[6]Quintilian, Institutes of Oratory, Book II, in Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom, ed. Robert Ulich (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950), p. 120.

[7]Luella Cole, A History of Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 319.

[8]Ibid., p. 319.

[9]Ibid., p. 314.

[10]Ibid., p. 321.

[11]Ibid.

[12]Ibid., p. 319.

[13]Roger Ascham, The Schoolmaster, ed. Lawrence Ryan (New York: Cornell University Press, 1967), p. 16.

[14]Ibid., p. 15.

[15]Ibid., p. 23.

[16]Samuel G. Williams, The History of Modern Education (Syracuse, N.Y.: C. W. Bardeen, Publisher, 1903), p. 88.

[17]J. H. Broome, Rousseau: A Study of His Thoughts (London: Edward Arnold Publishers, 1963), p. 81.

[18]Beck, op. cit., p. 269.

[19]John S. Brubacher, A History of the Problems of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1947), p. 156.

[20]Castle, op. cit., p. 72.

[21]Plato, The Republic, trans. Francis Cornford (Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 68.

[22]Cole, op. cit., p. 268.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Robert Quick, Essays on Educational Reformers (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1899), p. 53.

[25]Jean Jacques Rousseau, Emile, trans. Barbara Foxley (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Everyman's Library, 1976), p. 43.

[26]Romana Walch, Pestalozzi and the Pestalozzian Theory of Education (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1952), p. 164.

[27]Richard Livingstone, Plato and Modern Education (New York: Macmillan, 1944), p. 10.

CHAPTER IV

CHANGING CONCEPTIONS OF THE ROLES OF TEACHERS

In this chapter, conceptions of teaching roles which have changed from Ancient to Early Modern Times will be listed and analysed. The writer will suggest reasons why these changes have taken place. The roles are discussed under the following categories: methods of instruction, discipline, the teacher as model, and moral training.

Methods of Instruction in Ancient Times

In Ancient Greece and Rome, teachers and philosophers constituted the intelligentsia or enlightened class of the population, notwithstanding the fact that some teachers were slaves.[1] Knowledge was not as widespread among the populace as it is today. This was presumably because in the predominantly agrarian economy of Ancient Greece and Rome book learning was not given the same priority as knowledge of agriculture, military logistics, and skill in the weapons of warfare or the trades.

According to Good, teaching methods in Athens were "mechanical and the motive was often supplied by the rod."[2] Children were required to memorize long passages from Homer

and other poets which had to be regurgitated at forthcoming examinations. Teaching in general was in the nature of dispensing information. The role of the teacher was not conceived of as a guide, nor a facilitator of learning, nor a dialectical gardener, as the Early Modern educators advocated.

Role of the Teacher as Molder of Character and Indoctrinator

The image of the teacher as a molder of character and indoctrinator was common among the Ancient Greeks and Romans. At that time, children were considered as malleable clay in the hands of the potter--the teacher. Their youthful minds and character were to be shaped into the pattern acceptable to the community or state.[3] Plato believed in the power of molding and indoctrination, pointing out that teachers (and parents) were in positions of vantage for this role by virtue of the respect they received from the young and the fact that they spent a great deal of time with them. So deeply did Plato believe in this form of teaching that in his famous Republic, the teacher is required to mold children into a shape conformable to the laws of the state or the community's views of the good citizen under pain of dismissal.[4]

This molding and indoctrination were to be facilitated by censorship. Any material in the curriculum that did not meet the teacher's approval was to be expunged for

fear of its corrupting effect on the youth. Censorship was to be started early in the life of the child to facilitate and harmonize with the work of teachers later. Mothers and nurses were to tell their children only authorized tales, because these, Plato maintained, had great influence on character formation and the attitudes of small children.[5]

The young, he contended, were particularly susceptible to example which made them imitate the behaviour of those whom they admired, even if their heroes were only fictional. In Plato's own words,

> You must have noticed how the reproduction of another person's gestures or tones of voice or states of mind, if persisted in from youth up, grows into a habit which becomes second nature.[6]

Fundamental to Plato's philosophy of education and his ethics was the principle that only those things which led to virtue should be admitted in education. Thus a high value should be placed on truth. Likewise, temperance, implying self-control in sensual pleasures, and obedience to those in authority were to be commended. On the other hand, covetousness was to be condemned.[7] In keeping with this principle, he maintained that children should not be indoctrinated to believe that wicked men were often happy and that the good were miserable; neither should they be told that injustice was profitable when undetected.[8] Teachers, like mothers and nurses, were

cautioned to refrain from telling children stories about gods who demonstrated ill-will against their parents or fighting and quarrelling amongst themselves or even of gods transforming themselves, since the divine state, being already perfect, should not need change.[9]

Indoctrination and censorship were also prevalent in Plato's Laws. The poets who wrote material to be used in schools were restricted in the compilation of their anthologies, to themes and ideas that were conducive to virtue. Pupils were not to have any contact with such actions or emotions which Plato judged to be unworthy, as occurred so frequently in the works of Homer and Hesiod.[10] Dramatic poetry in particular was the target of attack, since Plato thought that the reciter or listener tended to absorb himself in the words or emotions expressed, which left an indelible impression on his character. The simple narrative recounting noble actions was to replace dramatic poetry. It is important to point out that Plato did not criticize the merits of these works as poetry but as educational material to be absorbed by children.

The music that the young should hear was to be sanctioned as well. Teachers were to be on the alert to reject all melodies that were effeminate and convivial and retain only those that would make the students courageous and temperate, for as Plato argued:

> Rhythm and harmony sink deep into the recesses of the soul and take the strongest hold there, bringing that grace of body and mind which is only to be found in one who is brought up in the right way. Moreover, a proper training in this kind makes a man quick to perceive any defects or ugliness in art or in nature. Such deformity will rightly disgust him. Approving all that is lovely, he will welcome it home with joy into his soul and, nourished thereby, grow into a man of noble spirit. All that is ugly and disgraceful he will rightly condemn and abhor while he is still too young to understand and reason: and when reason comes, he will greet her as a friend with whom his education has made him long familiar.[11]

Works of art were likewise to be examined and if found unacceptable were to be censored in order to protect the young student from their corrupting influences.

Maieutic Role of the Teacher

Socrates compared the role of the teacher to that of a midwife.[12] This maieutic conception of the teacher's role was based on his belief in the pre-existence of the soul before birth, at which time it was imbued with knowledge, which became partially forgotten when it entered the body.[13] In other words, he believed that knowledge was innate as it already resided in the individual; therefore it was unnecessary for the teacher to provide new experiences for the child. The teacher's role was to stimulate the intellect so that the student may recover or recognize the knowledge he already possessed, though partially forgotten.[14]

Following his methodology, based on this theory, the approach recommended is that the teacher ask the

student a series of carefully graded sequential questions designed not only to educe knowledge, but to clear the pupil of foggy thinking and moreover to make him question many ideas and concepts he previously took for granted.

The responsibility for educating the child in the Socratic approach therefore rested with the teacher, for knowledge was supposed to be inherent, but skill on the part of the teacher was needed to draw it forth.

In the Meno, one of Plato's famous dialogues, Socrates illustrated how he was able to implement his methodology when he succeeded in getting a slave boy who had never had the benefit of an education to comprehend complex mathematical concepts and solve eventually the theorem of Pythagoras.[15]

Socrates began his teaching by questioning his respondent about a subject or concept the latter took for granted he knew, or one that seemed beyond question such as the nature of courage, temperance, or justice. This led the respondent to display his ignorance on the question whose answer appeared previously to be obvious. The revelation of ignorance precisely where one thought himself knowledgeable always induced embarrassment which led to anger against Socrates but occasionally with oneself. At this point, the time was appropriate for the positive side of Socratic teaching--namely, dialectical self-examination.[16]

What is fundamental to this maieutic concept is the notion that the teacher cannot really teach anything, but can only help the student in his life-long task to recollect former knowledge. The role of the teacher, therefore, is to bring into sharper focus the forms of goodness and beauty which are the ultimate truth.

Though Plato was in agreement with Socrates in many respects, he seemed to have parted company with his teacher on this conception of the teacher's role as midwife, because of Plato's belief in molding and indoctrinating which suggested putting material into the student's mind, rather than educing it.

Methods of Instruction in the Sixteenth Century

Despite the efforts of Ascham, Mulcaster, and Montaigne to improve methods of instruction, teaching in the Sixteenth Century remained for the most part a matter of dispensing information, molding, and indoctrination.

Role of the Teacher as Molder of Character and Indoctrinator

In order to promote the doctrine and dogma of the Catholic Church, the Jesuits seemed to rely a great deal on molding and indoctrination, reminiscent of the methodology adopted by Plato as was seen earlier. What were the conditions that facilitated molding in Jesuit schools?

As Monroe put it, "the teacher and taught were in such close personal contact, that it gave to their schools a molding power beyond most others."[17] This supports Mulhern's observation about Jesuit educators.

> As educators, the Jesuits did not aim to develop in their students free minds, critical of authority. It was rather their aim to make them intellectual adherents and defenders of official Catholic orthodoxy.[18]

It was against molding, indoctrination, and unquestioning obedience to authority that the Early Modern educators, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel, directed their attention. This was particularly true of Rousseau, as will be seen later in this study.

The practice of indoctrinating with little or no regard for understanding seemed to be based on the assumption that the child would have doctrine so indelibly imprinted on his mind in childhood, when he was impressionable, that he would not forget the material learnt and hopefully would put it into practice when he was older. At any rate, this was one of the ways Jesuit teachers used to promote the teachings of the Church.

Role of the Teacher as Dispenser of Information

Dispensing of information was the methodology practised in many schools of the Sixteenth Century. The impact of our Sixteenth Century exemplar, Mulcaster, who had "an intuitive understanding of at least some phases of

child psychology"[19] and such principles as readiness, and the fundamentals of education according to nature, was not sufficient to change the status quo. Dispensing of information led to memorization on the part of the students, and this was generally done with little understanding of the material absorbed. This was prevalent in the Sixteenth Century, despite the efforts of Montaigne and his caution,

> To know by heart only is not to know at all; it is simply to keep what one has committed to his memory. What a man knows directly, that will he dispose of without turning to his book or looking to his pattern.[20]

Methods of Instruction in Early Modern Times

Role of the Teacher as Facilitator of Learning

One of the important roles Rousseau conceived for the teacher was that of facilitator of learning. Although this approach to teaching was not as well developed by Rousseau as it is today by Carl Rogers, a well-known therapist and educational theorist, it will be useful to compare this concept of Rousseau's from the Rogerian standpoint. To begin with, facilitation, according to Rogers, is effected when the teacher takes the initiative and

> provides the conditions which lead to meaningful or significant self-directed learning. The objective is to develop a group, including the teacher, into a community of learners. In such a community, the curriculum is freed, the sense of inquiry is opened up, everything is open to questioning and exploration.[21]

Certain behaviours and attitudes are requisite on the teacher's part for him to fulfill his role as facilitator. According to Rogers, his relationship to his student should be characterized by empathy, caring, trusting, prizing, and respecting the student as a person of worth.[22]

Based on the fundamental ideas of facilitation stated above, the teacher, using the Rousseauan approach, fulfilled the role as facilitator in a number of ways.

Following Rousseau, the curriculum was made for the child and not the child for the curriculum. In fact, the child was freed from the curriculum when he showed no desire for it. The role of the teacher was to surround his pupil with all the lessons he would like him to learn, but the choice was to be left to the pupil to react.[23] Freedom was given to the latter to explore the environment and to ask questions.

As facilitator, the teacher's aim was to make the child wish to learn and this, Rousseau contended, could never be achieved with threats and punishment, since learning is synonymous with pleasant experiences. In other words, as Rousseau always insisted, learning could not be promoted when lessons were detested.[24]

As facilitator, the teacher was expected to adapt school work to the cognitive level of development of the child. Certain subjects like history, literature, and geography were to be introduced at times when they were

more likely to arouse the interest of the student. Moreover, teachers were to bear in mind that "childhood is the sleep of reason,"[25] for Rousseau maintained that trying to convince a child that he committed an error was a futile activity.

In this setting, the teacher became a guide or resource person. However, the word "guide" is used in a different sense here by Rousseau since he did not mean that the teacher, because of his exemplary qualities, should necessarily serve as a model for his pupil. What he meant was that the teacher without being authoritative should assist the child, by suggesting, planning, and preparing the environment along with him. Help was to be given when the situation warranted it, and discretion on the part of the teacher was to be shown in this regard. The teacher was to allow the child to learn through his own experiences, and books were not to be a substitute for these. This distaste for books in lieu of experiential learning was consistent with the teachings of Rousseau. "Give your scholar no verbal lessons," he claimed, "he should be taught by experience alone. . . . I am never weary of repeating . . . learn from experience."[26] Moreover, Rousseau rejected explanations from the teacher because he believed that young people paid little heed to the teacher's words and they did not remember them anyway. "Things, Things," he insisted, "I cannot

repeat it too often. We lay too much stress upon words; we teachers babble and our scholars follow our example."[27]

Rousseau preferred to use the word "master" instead of "teacher" to designate the person responsible for educating the pupil during childhood. A quotation from his Emile will substantiate this point.

> Besides, I prefer to call the man who has this knowledge "master" rather than teacher, since it it a question of guidance rather than instruction. He must not give precepts, he must let the scholar find them out for himself.[28]

Role of the Teacher: Gardener

Because Froebel believed in the principle of unfolding, he compared the role of the teacher to that of a gardener, and the child to a human plant, whose intrinsic nature could not change. In fact, the name of the school he founded--the kindergarten or children's garden--was in keeping with this concept. The purpose of the educator was to facilitate the growth of the child into a man, just as the task of the gardener was to nurture the plant to its full flowering and fruition. This nurturing should be interpreted to mean providing the necessary nutrients, fertilizers, and moisture for the plant while at the same time allowing it to unfold according to its nature. The task of the teacher likewise, according to Froebel, was to see that the development of the child was unhampered and that he was provided with the resources

needed for his wholesome development. While taking the necessary external care of the child, the teacher should be as unobtrusive as possible. Two passages from Froebel's The Education of Man help to buttress this viewpoint:

> Education is in fact but the process of securing such an unfolding of what was from the first divinely enfolded. Moreover, the germ contains and is an exact proper plan of what the adult form should be. Under such conditions, that education is best which fosters most completely the full and unhampered unfolding of the original germ.[29]

> Therefore education in instruction and training, originally and in its first principles, should necessarily be passive, following; only guarding and protective, not prescriptive, categorical, interfering.[30]

In order to support his position more convincingly, Froebel drew references from the world of nature as analogies between the role of the teacher and the gardener or naturalist. Thus he argued:

> We grant space and time to young plants and animals because we know that, in accordance with the laws that live in them, they will develop and grow well; and arbitrary interference with them is avoided, because it is known that the opposite practice would disturb their pure unfolding and sound development, but the young human being is looked upon as a piece of wax or a lump of clay, which man can mold into what he pleases.[31]

This is an eloquent exhortation to teachers and parents to stop their intrusion or intervention in the natural course of development of the child. That educators should follow the methods of the gardener in the world of nature was Froebel's plea:

> In the treatment of things of nature, we may often take the right road, whereas in the treatment of man we go astray; and yet the forces that act in both proceed from the same source and obey the same law.[32]

Pestalozzi's conception of the role of the teacher was similar to that of Froebel's, for he compared the teacher's job to that of a gardener also and the child to a growing plant.[33] The teacher's task following this view is to supply the necessary conditions that will facilitate, rather than hinder, the unfolding powers of his students. As Pestalozzi puts it:

> He merely watches lest any external force might hinder or disturb the order of Nature in the development of the individual powers of his students; he sees to it that the development of the individual power finds an unimpeded course according to its own laws.[34]

Thus, in order that the teacher may succeed in his task, Pestalozzi maintained, it was necessary for him to work with and not against the grain, that is, in harmony with the laws of nature of which human nature is but a part. This necessitates acquaintance with these laws of growth and training as these will have relevance for his methodology. Failure to recognize and work with these laws inevitably leads to distortion of the natural development of the child, just as failure on the gardener's part to recognize natural laws leads to distortion of the growth and physical development of the plant.

Suggested Reasons for the Changes in Role Conceptions in Instructions

The concept of the role of the teacher with regard to methods of imparting information has changed greatly from Ancient to Early Modern Times, as was seen at the beginning of this chapter. In Ancient Times the teacher was either a dispenser of information, an indoctrinator, molder, or midwife in the Socratic sense of the term. There was not much improvement in methodologies in the Sixteenth Century for indoctrination, molding, and dispensing of information were still practised widely. The most distinctive and far-reaching changes in the conception of the teacher's instructive role came with the advent of Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel. These changes were attributable to the following factors:

The philosophy of Naturalism, espoused by Rousseau, the fundamental tenets of which were the existence of natural developmental stages in the child, levels of readiness, the necessity of education in harmony with natural human development, and learning by way of activity and experience.

These features of Naturalism, especially the existence of developmental stages in the child and levels of readiness, shaped Rousseau's conception of the teacher as a facilitator of learning and a guide rather than a dispenser of information and an indoctrinator. As

facilitator, the teacher was expected to adapt the material taught to the child's level of development. Moreover, discretion was expected from the teacher in his use or rejection of the curriculum as he saw fit. Teaching assumed the nature of guiding rather than enforcing because the child's ability to progress depended upon the cognitive level he attained, which affected in turn his readiness to learn. Hence any attempt on the part of the teacher to coerce the pupil when he was not mentally or physically prepared to do the task presented to him resulted in failure, which promoted a dislike for learning altogether.

Dispensing of information was considered anathema to Rousseau because this approach presupposed the child to be a passive receptacle in which information was to be stored. On the contrary, Rousseau thought learning was an active process which was in keeping with his adherence to Naturalism. In other words, he did not equate learning with the absorption of facts nor indoctrination. Learning could only be achieved by doing as the expression "learning by doing" states.

Froebel was dissatisfied with the role of the teacher as dispenser of information, indoctrinator, or molder. He vigorously expressed disapproval with molding because he thought that this approach presupposed the child to be "a lump or clay or wax in the hands of the

potter."[35] As indicated earlier, he preferred to think of the teacher as a gardener, preparing the environment for the child that would conduce to maximal learning. This was in keeping with his methodology of allowing the child to unfold what nature has enfolded.

Pestalozzi's approach to teaching also helped to initiate change in teaching roles from what they were in Ancient Times to new conceptions in Early Modern Times. Pestalozzi's conception of the teacher as a gardener was in accord with that of Froebel's, as was indicated earlier in this chapter. The need for change was also spearheaded by the Progressive Movement, which could be traced back to Rousseau[36] and his epoch-making book Emile. However, Rousseau was essentially an educational theorist, since he did little or no teaching. It was left to Pestalozzi, who had much experience in the classroom, to put into effect his ideas--and this he did creditably.

Disciplinary Role of the Teacher in Ancient Times

In Ancient Times, discipline in schools was very severe. The administering of corporal punishment for relatively slight misdemeanours was common. Isocrates and Quintilian, two of our exemplars of Ancient Times, had lenient views on the subject of punishment and this should be recognized, However, Plato's views on the role of the teacher in disciplining the child were different from the

two exemplars just mentioned, but were typical of educators of his day. Although he was in favour of some forms of play in his methodology, there is, however, the advocacy of strict discipline in Plato's educational scheme. The teacher was to be an authoritarian, "breaking the will" of boys, and subjecting them to do only what they were told. This approach was attributable to Plato's image of the child whom he regarded as crafty, wayward, mischievous, and difficult to manage; one who would conform to law and order not willingly but only when subjected to severe disciplinary procedure. This concept of the child and the strict disciplinary procedures that the teacher was advised to follow to counteract his undesirable tendencies is evidenced and supported from a passage in Plato's Laws:

> When the day breaks, the time has arrived for youth to go to their schoolmasters. Now, neither sheep nor any other animals can live without a shepherd, nor can children be left without tutors, or slaves without masters. And of all animals, the boy is the most unmanageable, inasmuch as he has the fountain of reason in him not yet regulated; he is the most insidious, sharp-witted, and insubordinate of animals. Wherefore he must be bound with many bridles.[37]

Again, in the Laws, Plato commissions the adult citizens of his hypothetical community under threat of condemnation for default to inflict punishment on any boy they observe committing a misdeed and to disgrace his teacher for abandoning his role in disciplining him.[38]

Another of Plato's delineations of the character of the child, with recommendations to the teacher to reform him, is quoted from the Laws to drive home the point.

> The child is by nature unruly and unmanageable, requiring frequent admonitions and heavy blows to keep him under control. Even at play he is never free from the supervision of adults and officials.[39]

The whole educational scheme in the Republic depends upon and is maintained by discipline. The guardians are to be rigidly screened through several successive stages during which their ability is tested so as to make self-control automatic and habitual. The fortunate ones who survive the severity of the tests of austerity until its final stages will, at that time, be so conditioned that no further disciplinary training will be necessary for them other than that provided by their insights into the Good.[40]

After reading the above excerpts from Plato's most famous and well-known treatise on education, one is surprised at his image of the child as "unwholesome" and his ready approval of corporal punishment in the form of "heavy blows" as he described it, to reform him.

In contrast to Plato, Quintilian did not believe that the teacher needed to use corporal punishment to reform his students. At a time when this was the accepted

practice in almost every Greek and Roman school in the Ancient World, Quintilian spoke in favour of its abandonment. Putting his case in strong terms, and outlining quite eloquently the psychological reasons for his conviction, Quintilian argued,

> I disapprove of flogging, although it is the regular custom and meets with the approval of Chrysippus, because in the first place, it is a disgraceful form of punishment and fit only for slaves, and in any case an insult as you will realize if you imagine it inflicted at a later age. Secondly, if a boy is so insensible to instruction that reproof is useless, he will, like the worst type of slave, merely become hardened to blows.[41]

Quintilian was of the opinion that the teacher would not have to resort to corporal punishment if he had been maintaining consistently the rules and regulations of his class. Corporal punishment was also antithetical to the pedagogical principles of the Sixteenth Century exemplars.

Disciplinary Role of the Teacher in the Sixteenth Century

Consistent with his plea for the establishment of friendly relationships between teacher and pupil, Ascham despised the use of the rod in reforming the child on both moral and pedagogical grounds, claiming that personal frustrations were generally at the root of the teacher's inclination to administer corporal punishment and that many schoolmasters punished students physically for their

own sadistic pleasure when they themselves were more worthy of punishment.[42] His disapproval of such teachers and the punishment they meted out is expressed in one of his quotations:

> I have now wished twice or thrice this gentle nature to be in a schoolmaster and that I have done so, neither by chance nor without some reason. I will now declare at large why in mine opinion love is better than fear, gentleness better than beating. . . . For when the schoolmaster is angry with some other matter, then will he soonest fall to beat the scholar; and though he himself should be punished for his folly, yet he must beat some scholar for his pleasure, though there be no cause for him to do so, nor yet fault in the scholar to deserve so.[43]

Ascham did not believe that the role of the teacher should be akin to that of the slavedriver, but that he should exercise moderation when giving schoolwork to his pupils. In keeping with his humanistic principles, he maintained that students should have diversion from their intellectual labours so that they could recuperate and regain their mental strength. He expressed this view in the following passage:

> And I do not mean by all this my talk that young gentlemen should always be poring on a book and by using good studies should leese [loose] honest pleasure, and haunt no good pastime. I mean nothing less. For it is well known that I both like and love and have always and do yet still use all exercises and pastimes that be fit for my nature and ability; and beside natural disposition, in judgment also I was never either stoic in doctrine or anabaptist in religion to mislike a merry, pleasant and playful nature, if not outrage be committed against law, measure and good order.[44]

Like all humanist teachers, Ascham was deeply concerned with the moral growth of his students. In this passage he laments over indiscipline and moral deterioration in his country, disrespect for age and authority, and the boldness of youth:

> But I marvel the less that these misorders be among some in the court for commonly in the country also everywhere innocency is gone, bashfulness is vanished, much presumption in youth, small authority in age; reverence is neglected, duties be confounded; and to be short, disobedience doth overflow the banks almost in every place, almost in every degree of man.[45]

Mulcaster was in agreement with Ascham and other humanists that corporal punishment should be banned as a general rule, but being very practical, he made allowances for its use on occasions when a pupil did not respond to gentle ways adopted by the teacher for his correction. In this excerpt from his writing, he expressed his disapproval for physical punishment and recommended the best course for the teacher to follow in his role as disciplinarian:

> The best way to secure good progress . . . is to ply [pupils] that all may proceed voluntarily and not with violence, so that they will be ready to do well and loathe to do ill, and all fear of correction may be entirely absent. Surely to beat for not learning, a child that is willing enough to learn but whose intelligence is defective is worse than madness.[46]

Mulcaster placed the responsibility for preventing misdemeanours on the shoulders of the schoolmaster,

stating that "a schoolmaster, if he is really wise, will prevent his pupils from committing faults."[47]

Mulcaster himself practised what he preached, for he did not resort to the use of the rod on his pupils during his tenure as school principal, yet had it around as a gentle deterrent. According to him:

> I myself had thousands of pupils passing through my hands whom I never beat; because they needed it not; but if the rod had not been in sight to assure them of punishment, if they acted amiss, they might have deserved it.[48]

Montaigne, the French humanist, believed that the teacher's authority over the child "ought to be sovereign," yet he did not recommend corporal punishment for correcting the child's misdeeds. He believed in discipline as stated above, but this could be effected by the teacher exercising "a firm gentleness" instead of using "rods and ferules, horror and anxiety." "Away with your violence," he urged, "away with this compulsion; nothing I believe more dulls and degenerates a well-born nature."[49]

According to the Jesuits, the teacher had a disciplinary role as well. They insisted, however, that "punishments were to be as light as possible, and the master was to shut his eyes to offenses whenever he thought he might do so with safety."[50]

Their general policy was:

> Let there be no haste in punishing nor too much in accusing. Let him [the teacher] rather dissimilate when he can without hurt, but abstain from injury in word or attack or deed.[51]

The function of the teacher as conceived by the Jesuits was to teach, not to coerce nor to punish. In fact, Jesuit teachers were exhorted to "unite the grave kindness and authority of a father with a mother's affection."[52] This necessitated arriving at some balance on the teacher's part. Firmness was to be accompanied by gentleness. Teachers were required to "identify and endear themselves to their pupils."[53] The psychological reason underlying this, according to Sacchini, was that "when pupils love their master, they will soon love his teaching."[54]

Disciplinary Role of the Teacher in Early Modern Times

The disciplinary procedures recommended by Rousseau were based on natural consequences, which constitute the moral application of a negative education. The principle of natural consequence was in keeping with Rousseau's naturalistic philosophy. In practical terms this meant that the child should be allowed to suffer the natural results of his own acts without the intervention of the tutor or any other adults to protect, pamper, or punish him. This contrasts strongly with Plato's advocacy of corporal punishment for misdemeanours committed by the child. It must be pointed out, however, that Rousseau did make allowances for rare occasions when it was acceptable for the tutor to punish his pupil, so long as he made it

appear that the punishment suffered came through natural consequences and that his intrusion had nothing to do with it. To use practical examples, if the child overate, Rousseau suggested that he be allowed to suffer the consequences and be sick. The pain he suffered from his indiscreet act would hopefully prevent him from repeating a similar injudicious act. If he forgot, conveniently or otherwise, to go on an errand at his parents' request to buy food, let him remain hungry. If he broke a window, let him remain in the cold and become ill. Besides suffering the discomforts of his illness, he would not be able to go outdoors to play. In all these cases, the child suffered either as a result of breaking natural laws or as a result of his own imprudent actions; no human authority, no rules and regulations imposed by society were involved here. From these experiences the child would learn by himself what he should do or refrain from doing. The point here is that natural laws are consistent, unlike man-made laws, and this is exactly how Rousseau wanted the child to be educated, on a consistent basis.

Pestalozzi saw self-discipline as an ideal which in effect meant discipline from within rather than from without. In the classroom "Pestalozzi expected the teachers to stimulate the children's interest sufficiently to absorb them in their work and thereby avoid the necessity of imposing discipline by external means."[55]

Being practical, Pestalozzi realized that there were times when children would commit offenses despite measures taken by their teachers to prevent their occurrence. On such occasions, he advised that it was best to let the child suffer the consequences of his actions--a procedure reminiscent of Rousseau's approach to discipline by natural consequences. "Let him see, hear, and find out for himself, let him fall, pick himself up and make mistakes,"[56] Pestalozzi counseled.

Froebel's approach to discipline in the classroom was based on the principle of self-activity. By self-activity he meant any activity which originated from the natural impulses of the child or one that was geared to his nature such as manual arts, drawing, and modelling. Such subjects lent themselves to free expression or creativity or education in the nature of play. He claimed that when a child is truly self-active he is so absorbed with the work he is doing that he cannot become a discipline problem. Furthermore, the type of discipline which resulted from self-activity was self-discipline, which in Froebel's assessment was ideal, since it did not depend upon the continuous presence of the teacher to maintain itself.

Suggested Reasons for Changes in Teachers' Roles in the Domain of Discipline

As noted earlier in this section of the chapter, classroom discipline was very severe in Ancient Times. This manifested itself in the frequent administering of corporal punishment for minor offenses. Plato suggested that corporal punishment should be meted out to the recalcitrant pupil in order "to break his will" for he believed that boys were characteristically stubborn and defiant. We saw that Quintilian and Isocrates adopted a more humanitarian approach in this matter. Though there was still severity in classroom discipline in many schools during the Sixteenth Century, there were forces which exercised moderating influences on the views of some educators relative to this question during this period of history, as the attitudes of our Sixteenth Century exemplars reflect. These forces included the following:

First, the growing influence of the Church. This was evidenced by the attitude of the Jesuits, who advocated mildness in disciplinary procedures. As Power noted, "they tried to avoid chastising the students put under their care, and if a boy could not be led, they refused to drive him."[57] On the whole, unmanageable students "were not beaten and forced to conform in either an intellectual or a physical sense."[58] Because of the teachings of the Church, the Jesuits believed that their attitudes

towards their pupils should manifest love and forgiveness rather than hostility and violence.

Second, the spirit of humanism, which was characterized by freedom for the individual and a tolerant attitude towards others. These features of humanism which the Sixteenth Century exemplars, Ascham and Montaigne, espoused were presumably responsible for the lack of austerity in their approach to teaching and their rejection of corporal punishment in favour of other more lenient disciplinary procedures such as, for example, admonitions and "praise and reproof," advocated by Ascham.

Third, the Reformation, which aimed primarily at correcting the abuses of the Church. In addition to this, the Reformation promoted the spirit of free inquiry, the rejection of unquestioning authority, and a re-examination of the traditions of the past which men accepted without reason. For example, corporal punishment was traditional, but the proponents of the Reformation rejected it in favour of corrective measures that were more compatible with Christianity.

Fourth, progress in the art of pedagogy from Ancient Times to the Sixteenth Century. Admittedly, this progress was not conspicuous on a widespread scale, judging from some of the objectionable practices customary in many schools. However, Mulcaster, our very enlightened exemplar, understood the basics of child psychology and

the rudimentary principles of teaching and even the concept of readiness. With this knowledge as a background, he had the perspicacity to see the flaws that were apparent in physical punishment and other severe disciplinary procedures which he rightly thought would lead to estrangement between teacher and pupil.

Changes in the role of the teacher relative to discipline in the Early Modern era were attributable to several factors, notably Naturalism in education. The rationale behind the administering of most forms of severe punishment was belief in the inherent depravity of the child due to original sin. "The devil being at the bottom of it all, many pious teachers thought it literally necessary to beat him out of their children."[58] Naturalism as espoused by Rousseau taught, on the contrary, that the child was inherently good; hence there was no reason to beat the devil out of him, but to protect him instead from society, the source of his corruption.

Rousseau rejected all forms of punishment in favour of natural punishment, which is synonymous with punishment by natural consequences as described in detail earlier in this section of the chapter.

The teacher's role in the Pestalozzian approach to the question of discipline is comparable to what it is in the Rousseauan scheme, for Pestalozzi also believed that the child should suffer the natural consequences of

his misdeeds. This is supported by Ramona Walch, who concluded that:

> Pestalozzi emphasized the need for teaching obedience by an example which impresses the child with the idea that disobedience and stubbornness result in unfavourable consequences to himself. He insisted that it was useless to teach obedience by means of verbal admonitions when action is possible.[59]

Froebel helped to change the teacher's approach to discipline in the classroom by his claim that order could be maintained when students were self-actively engaged in school work. Since the principle of self-activity was already described earlier in this chapter, the writer will not elaborate on it here.

Froebel did not subscribe to the view that depicted the child as totally depraved. Instead, he insisted that every child had an element of divinity in him. This led him to think that children preferred to do good rather than evil. He advanced the hypothesis that evil in the child originated when there was a "suppressed or perverted good quality--a good tendency, only repressed, misunderstood or misguided, lies at the bottom of every shortcoming in man."[60]

According to Froebel, the same elements in man's nature have the capacity of producing either vice or virtue. The responsibility of guiding and stimulating these elements of character correctly so that they would develop

into meritorious qualities is the disciplinary role of the teacher.

Role of the Teacher as Model in Ancient Times

In Ancient Times, the teacher was seen as a model for his pupils to emulate. This image of the teacher was also held in the Sixteenth Century by the Jesuits, who endeavoured to be models of the Good Shepherd. In Early Modern Times, imitation tended to be frowned upon; hence modelling gave way to freedom to express one's individuality. The writer will first describe conceptions of the role of the teacher held by exemplars of Ancient Times in the area of modelling versus the fostering of individuality and note changes made in the conception of this role in the Sixteenth Century and in Early Modern Times.

In Ancient Times, Isocrates saw the role of the teacher as pre-eminently a model for his students to emulate.[61] As such, he was expected to set a good example of sterling character as well as scholarship. In order that his good influences might have the maximum effect, Isocrates saw the need for a good relationship between teacher and student, since he believed that the instructor was in an ideal position to have the greatest influence on his students.[62]

Belief in the benefits that may be derived from imitation of great examples was not peculiar to Isocrates,

but was consistent with the Ancient Greek educational doctrine of association and imitation, and great stress was laid on this by such men as Socrates.[63] In his treatise on education, entitled Against the Sophists, Isocrates clearly enunciated this doctrine:

> The teacher, for his part must so espouse the principles of the art with the utmost possible exactness as to leave out nothing that can be taught and for the rest, he must in himself set such an example of oratory, that his pupils who have taken form under his instruction and are able to pattern after him will, from the outset, show in their speaking a degree of grace and charm which is not found in others.[64]

Isocrates was an examplar of his teaching in this regard. In keeping with his doctrine that the final inspiration of the pupil was derived from the work of the master himself, he presented his own written speeches, impeccably prepared as models for study, analysis, and imitation.[65]

Modelling as a role for the teacher was also advocated by Plato, based on his conviction that a great deal of learning was achieved through association and imitation. Plato was over-concerned with the tendency of pupils to copy the attitudes and behaviour of adults in their environment, especially those who held positions of influence, like parents and teachers, hence his insistence on having the child grow up among people who exhibited exemplary qualities. One remembers Plato's plan in the setting up of his hypothetical republic to send out of the

country the senior inhabitants so that their children under ten years old may be taken possession of and taught by guardians away from the contaminating effects of their parents.

Further evidence to support this conviction of Plato's could be found in his Apology, where Meletus claimed in effect that any good Athenian such as a senator or judge was able to improve youth by associating with them.[66] Plato was in accord with Greek pedagogy here, for as Beck noted, the Greeks believed that

> education is not purely mechanical but is largely a question of the development of habits and attitudes developed through the influence of good teachers.[67]

Incidentally, the Greeks recognized the fact that the influence may be also for evil, as Meletus stoutly affirmed that Socrates, by his influence, was corrupting the youth.[68]

Perhaps the exemplar who placed the greatest importance on the role of the teacher as a model was Quintilian, the Roman educator. It was for this reason that he expected teachers to be almost paragons of virtue, and required that they should display exemplary character, uprightness, and decorum when dealing with their students. His description of the good schoolmaster's virtues and the role he is expected to play for the edification of his pupils is worth quoting:

> Let him [the schoolmaster] be free from vice himself, and refuse to tolerate it in others. Let him be strict, but not austere, genial but not familiar; for austerity will make him unpopular while familiarity breeds contempt. Let his discourse continually turn on what is good and honourable; the more he admonishes, the less he will have to punish. He must control his temper, without however shutting his eyes to faults requiring correction; his instruction must be free from affectation, his industry great, his demands on his class continuous but not extravagant.
> . . . . . .
> In praising the recitation of his pupils he must be neither grudging nor over-generous; the former quality will give them a distaste for work while the latter will produce a complacent satisfaction.[69]

And again he wrote, "teachers must be strictly moral; they must be friendly, clear, patient, generous and ready to give praise."[70]

Undoubtedly it required a great deal of discipline and self-control on the part of the teacher to live up to Quintilian's expectation as a model, but his (Quintilian's) insistence on such high standards of conduct is understandable when one remembers that boys came to the teacher of rhetoric in early adolescence when they were very impressionable and remained under his charge until they were young men.[71]

Conceptions of the role of the teacher held by the Sixteenth Century exemplars with reference to modelling versus the fostering of individuality will now be examined.

Role of the Teacher as Model in the Sixteenth Century

Modelling in the Sixteenth Century was best exemplified by the Jesuits, who endeavoured to portray the Good Shepherd in their attitudes. They upheld the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity. They charged no tuition fees, so that poor and underprivileged students were not deprived of an education in Jesuit schools because of their economic position. The Jesuits were continually given support to maintain high moral standards and so serve as good models for their students. Sacchini, a famous Jesuit teacher, exhorted every member of the teaching congregation "to remember how honourable his office is, as it has not to do with grammar only, but also with the science and practice of a Christian and religious life."[72] This was endorsed by Jouvancy, another very highly respected Jesuit leader, who in addition urged that "the teacher should consider himself the shepherd of the tender lamb of the flock of Christ."[73] This tender portraiture of the teacher epitomizes Jesus Christ, the Good Shepherd, the perfect model of a Christian. The conceptions of the Early Modern exemplars in this area of teaching will now be examined.

Changes Made in Above Role in Early Modern Times

Rousseau's methodology catered to individual differences. In his educational scheme, freedom was given

to the student to express his own ideas and to be creative rather than imitative. Rousseau seemed to be against imitation or copying of any kind because he feared that the child would be merely parroting the views or opinions of others, without understanding. This was probably why he was against the child reading books at an early age. Hence, instead of advocating an education based on mechanically imitating the actions and expressions of other men, Rousseau proposed a plan in his Emile, whereby the child could be educated through "contact with nature, guided by his own natural interests, capacities and tendencies."[74] The role of the teacher, consistent with Rousseauan pedagogical principles, was that of a facilitator and guide rather than a model for imitation.

The pedagogical ideas of Pestalozzi and Froebel were antithetical to imitation of models because they were committed to the notion of the child as "unfolding" during the course of his development. Both educators firmly believed that all that the child was to become later in life was already pre-ordained at conception. For this reason, they thought it futile for him to imitate. The teacher was expected to allow his pupil to express his individuality in a free and supportive atmosphere.

Suggested Reasons for Changes in the Above Teacher's Role

One reason for the change in the conception of the teacher as a model for imitation was the impact of Rousseau's ideas on the subject. Rousseau's different orientation was traceable to his Naturalism, which encouraged the expression of individuality rather than imitation. A negative attitude towards imitation was entertained by Rousseau in the academic field, for he discouraged the scientific atmosphere in the classroom, maintaining that "the scientific atmosphere destroys science."[75] The apparatus Emile uses in his investigation is to be self-invented, because as Rousseau claims,

> I would rather our apparatus was somewhat clumsy and imperfect, but our ideas clear as to what the apparatus ought to be and the results to be obtained by means of it.[76]

The rejection of imitation and emulation in favour of allowing the child to express his unique individuality was recommended by Froebel, who believed that each child had a unique contribution to make to this world by virtue of the fact that he was different from all the rest of humanity. Imitation stifled creativity and precluded the child from making his specific contribution.

> For every human being has indeed but one thought, peculiarly and predominantly his own, the fundamental thought as it were of his life symphony, a thought which he simply seeks to express and render clear with the help of a thousand other thoughts, with the help of all he does.[77]

Role of the Teacher in the Child's Moral Training in Ancient Times

Plato's educational scheme was geared towards the teaching of morality. In other words, the product of his teaching was expected to be a moral person. His most famous educational treatise, the Republic, centered around the problem of securing justice in his hypothetical state. The cardinal virtues of temperance, fortitude, prudence, and justice were held in high esteem by the Ancient Greeks; hence Plato sought to maintain these virtues in his Republic by indoctrination and censorship. The subjects that were meticulously examined for material that was objectionable were literature, art, and music. Plato thought that they had a profound and lasting influence either for good or evil on the children who read or enjoyed them. The role of the teacher in the Platonic scheme was primarily to teach morality. As such, he was expected to contribute to the edification of his students at all times.

The other exemplars of Ancient Times, Socrates, Quintilian, and Isocrates, also upheld the cardinal virtues in high esteem and expected teachers to embody them in their lives. Socrates was obsessed with the question of whether virtue could be taught. His conclusion was in the affirmative, though this was denied by Aristotle.

Role of the Teacher in the Child's Moral Training in the Sixteenth Century

The Jesuits, our Sixteenth Century exemplars, believed that it was the role of the teacher to instruct the child in morals. The Jesuit superiors required their teachers to spend a great deal of time on moral and religious teaching. The methodology used was essentially indoctrination. Their reason for adopting this approach was their belief that the child was too young to understand the doctrines of the Church, some of which were rather complex. Hence the teacher was supposed to drill dogma into the minds of students through memorization of lengthy catechisms.

Like all humanist teachers, Ascham was deeply concerned with the moral growth of his students; hence he regarded the ethical and moral training of pupils as one of the roles of the teacher. His concern for morality is evinced in this passage, in which he laments over indiscipline and moral deterioration in his country, disrespect for age and authority, and the boldness of youth:

> But I marvel the less that these misorders be among some in the court for commonly in the country also everywhere innocency is gone, bashfulness is vanished, much presumption in youth, small authority in age; reverence is neglected, duties be confounded; and to be short, disobedience doth overflow the banks almost in every place, almost in every degree of man.[78]

Role of the Teacher in the Child's Moral Training in Early Modern Times

Rousseau's approach to moral training was very different from that practised by exemplars in Ancient Times and during the Sixteenth Century. It must be pointed out, however, that Rousseau's methodology differed with respect to the age of the student. In early childhood he advocated that the teacher should avoid verbal instructions in morals altogether. This suggested that he was averse to moral training through indoctrination. Rousseau's approach to moral training was based on his epistemological position that all knowledge was rooted in sensory experiences.[79] Aristotle, the Ancient Greek philosopher, applied this principle to the broad field of knowledge when he stated, in essence, Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu, all knowledge came by means of the senses. Rousseau likewise applied this theory to the realm of conduct. In other words, Rousseau believed that telling a child to refrain from doing a certain act or not to be unjust to others is like writing out for him Einstein's theory of relativity, $E = M C^2$, which of course is meaningless to him. The rightness or wrongness of his actions should be grounded in experiences which were more relevant to the child. Opportunities arose through daily common occurrences that the teacher could utilize to guide his pupil along the pathway to morality. It was Rousseau's

contention that the child who was taught adult values would form the habit of pretending to understand ethical principles when in fact he did not. Hence values should not be taught in the abstract as precepts.

Rousseau's approach came also in conflict with Locke's suggestion to teachers and parents that they should reason with their children when teaching them lessons on morality, for Rousseau always maintained that "childhood was the sleep of reason."[80] According to him, reason was the last of the faculties to be developed. Locke's approach was what Rousseau called "beginning at the wrong end," since children who were reasoned with following Lockean principles became exceedingly silly.[81] Moreover, in his attempt to reason with and offer explanations to the child, the tutor, Rousseau argued, would draw from his own experiences which were foreign to his charge.

The moral training Rousseau recommended at this stage of the child's life was similar to his training in discipline, which meant that it was to be based on natural consequences. Consistent with Rousseauan methodology, the tutor was viewed as an anti-teacher as opposed to moral theorist, indoctrinator, or teacher of precepts.

It may be advisable here for the sake of specificity to compare again Rousseau's approach to moral training with that of Plato, a representative of the teachers of Ancient Times, and the Jesuits, exemplars of

Sixteenth Century pedagogy. Plato would have the child indoctrinated by the tutor, allowing him to listen only to material that was acceptable in the teacher's opinion and excluding from his environment anything that would undermine his ethical training. The pupil would be taught how to act in certain hypothetical situations--what to do and what to refrain from doing. The child's experiences were not tapped for his moral training. It was a similar approach used by the Jesuits in the Sixteenth Century. Molding and indoctrination were again the methods used. As Monroe pointed out, "this teaching congregation gave to their schools a molding power beyond most others in the history of pedagogy."[82]

It should be pointed out, however, that Rousseau modified his position in the teaching of morals when the child reached adolescence. At this stage, instruction before experience should be the order now. The teacher's responsibility was to warn his student of the dangers and pitfalls that confront adolescents, especially in their relationships with the opposite sex, since mistakes were then irrevocable. Teaching morals through the use of fables was now acceptable with Rousseau. This was in contrast with the preceding stage of development when he cautioned the teacher not to use this medium for training in morality, since the child was likely to misunderstand the lesson intended to be taught and be corrupted by it

rather than be edified. Because of their maturity, the possibility of misinterpretation by adolescent pupils was not a problem.

Pestalozzi laid great stress not only on the intellectual and physical development of the child but also on his moral education; hence he saw the teaching of morality as one of the roles of the teacher. However, Pestalozzi preferred the teacher to teach morality through practising Christian virtues like love, faith, patience, charity, etc., rather than through the medium of discourses, exhortations, and the use of precepts. This was in keeping with his principle of Anschauung, which meant in essence that nothing came into the mind except by way of the senses. In other words, Pestalozzi believed that in order to know virtues truly, one had to experience them rather than hear them described only. As Gutek put it:

> Habituation to goodness was to be based on real experiences rather than on verbal prescriptions, homilies, sermons. In other words, morality was felt, rather than talked about.[83]

Pestalozzi himself put it plainly when he said:

> The moral, intellectual and practical powers of man must be nurtured within himself and not from artificial substitutes. Thus, faith must be cultivated by our own act of believing, not by reasoning about faith; love by our own act of loving, not by fine words about love; thought, by our own act of thinking, not by merely appropriating the thoughts of other men; and knowledge by our own investigation, not by endless talk about the results of art and science.[84]

Froebel advised that the best step for the teacher to take to ensure the development of moral character in the child was to create an atmosphere rich in love, acceptance, and understanding, in which the seeds of moral character would take root. Froebel cautioned educators to exercise care in their dealings with children so that their original good nature would not be defiled. This was his exhortation to educators:

> It is certainly a very great truth and failure to appreciate it does daily great harm--that it generally is some other human being, not unfrequently the educator himself, that first makes the child or the boy bad. This is accomplished by attributing evil--or at least, wrong motives to all that the child or boy does from ignorance, precipitation, or even from a keen and praiseworthy sense of right and wrong. Unfortunately, there still are such men of mischief among educators. To them, children and boys are always little malicious, spiteful, lurking sprites, where others see at most a jest carried too far, or the effect of too free an exercise of spirit.[85]

Suggested Reasons for Changes in the Teacher's Approach to Moral Training

Plato best represents the exemplars of Ancient Times in his conception of the educator as a teacher of morals, since his approach was typical of the Greco-Roman period. Depicting the boy as a mischievious sprite who constantly got himself into trouble, Plato's first recommendation to the teacher was to "break the will of the child which in its perversity represented the evil of human nature."[86] This was to be followed by molding and

indoctrinating the student, by presenting him with material the teacher thought was appropriate after strict censorship was observed.

During the Sixteenth Century, the approach to the teaching of morals was in accord with the direct method of ethical instructions as was seen earlier. Emphasis was placed on precepts, principles, and doctrine as opposed to the indirect method advocated by Rousseau.

The reason for the change in approach in Early Modern Times was in part due to the influence of Rousseau, who, in accordance with the fundamental teachings of Naturalism, advocated "the development of moral character from within, by experience, rather than from without by indoctrination."[87]

Rousseau was particularly averse to indoctrinating children under the age of twelve years because he believed that at this cognitive level of development they were incapable of reasoning. Memorization without understanding was the problem here. As indicated in the quotation above, Rousseau advocated the experiential approach to the teaching of morality. This was consistent with his stance in pedagogy.

Pestalozzi's influence also helped to bring about change. His approach to the teaching of morality was congruent with that of Rousseau's. This was due to his

fundamental agreement with the credo of Naturalism and also his principle of Anschauung, which stressed that all education, intellectual and moral, should be grounded in sensory experiences.

Froebel's approach, which was reconcilable with the other two Early Modern exemplars, had some impact as well in changing the teaching of morality in schools. This educator was not in favour of abstract methods of teaching, advocating instead concrete methods. He was never tired of emphasizing that words alone were meaningless to children for they tended to ignore and forget them soon.

Footnotes--Chapter IV

[1]Edward J. Power, Main Currents in the History of Education, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970), p. 155.

[2]H. G. Good, A History of Western Education (New York: Macmillan, 1960), p. 25.

[3]E. B. Castle, The Teacher (Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 31.

[4]Plato, The Republic, trans. Francis Cornford (Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 68.

[5]Ibid., p. 68.

[6]Ibid., p. 83.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Ibid., p. 72.

[9]Ibid., p. 73.

[10]Ibid., p. 70.

[11]Ibid., p. 90.

[12]John Brubacher, A History of the Problems of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1947), p. 171.

[13]Daniel Sullivan, An Introduction to Philosophy, rev. ed. (Benziger: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1973), p. 77.

[14]Homer Boroughs, Introduction to Secondary School Teaching (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1964), p. 222.

[15]Plato, Meno, in The Dialogues of Plato, trans. Benjamin Jowett (Chicago: 1971).

[16]Sullivan, op. cit., p. 59.

[17]Paul Monroe, A Text Book in the History of Education (New York: Macmillan, 1933), p. 420.

[18]James Mulhern, A History of Education (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1959), p. 323.

[19]Luella Cole, A History of Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 268.

[20]Monroe, op. cit., p. 461.

[21]Carl Rogers, "Freedom to Learn," in Foundations for a Theory of Instruction and Educational Psychology, ed. C. H. Patterson (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), p. 304.

[22]Ibid., pp. 306-10.

[23]Jean Jacques Rousseau, Emile, trans. Barbara Foxley (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Everyman's Library, 1976), p. 85.

[24]Ibid., p. 209.

[25]Ibid., p. 71.

[26]Ibid., p. 96.

[27]Ibid., p. 84.

[28]Ibid., p. 19.

[29]Friedrich Froebel, The Education of Man, trans. W. N. Hailman (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1895), p. 7.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid., p. 8.

[32]Ibid., p. 9.

[33]Frederick Mayer, The Great Teachers (New York: The Citadel Press, 1967), p. 199.

[34]Romana Walch, taken from "Rede an sein Haus an seinem 74 Geburtstage, den 12," in Pestalozzi and the Pestalozzian Theory of Education, p. 86.

[35]Froebel, op. cit., p. 8.

[36]Harry N. Rivlin, Encyclopedia of Modern Education (New York: F. Hubner and Co., Inc., 1943), p. 612.

[37]Plato, Laws 808, in The Dialogues of Plato, trans. Benjamin Jowett.

[38]Ibid., section 808.

[39]Ibid.

[40]Plato, The Republic, trans. Francis Cornford (Oxford University Press, 1967), Chapter X.

[41]Quintilian, Institute of Oratory, Book I, in Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom, ed. Robert Ulich, p. 110.

[42]Roger Ascham, The Schoolmaster, ed. Lawrence Ryan (New York: Cornell University Press, 1967), p. 16.

[43]Ibid., p. 20.

[44]Cole, op. cit., p. 263.

[45]Ibid., p. 264.

[46]Ibid., p. 272.

[47]Ibid.

[48]Ibid.

[49]Robert Quick, Essays on Educational Reformers (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1899), p. 48.

[50]Ibid., p. 53.

[51]Ibid.

[52]Ibid.

[53]Ibid.

[54]Ibid.

[55]Michael Hearford, Pestalozzi (London: Metheun and Co., Ltd., 1967), p. 70.

[56]Romana Walch, Pestalozzi and the Pestalozzian Theory of Education (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1952), p. 156.

[57]Power, op. cit., p. 405.

[58]Brubacher, op. cit., p. 186.

[59]Walch, op. cit., p. 156.

[60]Froebel, op. cit., p. 121.

[61]Harry S. Broudy, Exemplars of Teaching Method (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965), p. 22.

[62]Ibid.

[63]Frederick Beck, Greek Education 450-350 (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1964), p. 265.

[64]Ibid.

[65]Broudy, op. cit., p. 21.

[66]Plato, Apology, in The Dialogues of Plato, trans. Benjamin Jowett.

[67]Beck, op. cit., p. 218.

[68]Plato, Apology, op. cit.

[69]Quintilian, Institute of Oratory, Book II.

[70]Ibid.

[71]Power, op. cit., p. 187.

[72]Robert Schwickerath, Jesuit Education, Its History and Principles (St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1903), p. 639.

[73]Ibid.

[74]Monroe, op. cit., p. 568.

[75]Rousseau, op. cit., p. 139.

[76]Ibid.

[77]Froebel, op. cit., p. 142.

[78]Cole, op. cit., p. 264.

[79]William Boyd, The Educational Theory of Jean Jacques Rousseau (New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1963), p. xv.

[80]Rousseau, op. cit., p. 71.

[81]Boyd, op. cit., p. 53.

[82]Monroe, op. cit., p. 420.

[83]Gerald Gutek, Pestalozzi and Education (Chicago: Random House, 1968), p. 136.

[84]Monroe, op. cit., p. 612.

[85]Froebel, op. cit., p. 124.

[86]Monroe, op. cit., p. 567.

[87]Carter V. Good, ed., Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959), p. 360.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, EVALUATION, AND CONCLUSIONS

The writer's purpose in the study was first, to determine what the conceptions of teachers' roles were in Ancient Times, during the Sixteenth Century, and in Early Modern Times; second, to compare and note changes in conceptions of roles held by exemplars of each historical period with respect to such areas of teaching as methods of instruction, discipline, moral training of students, and modelling; third, to determine which conceptions of roles persisted throughout the periods under review; fourth, to evaluate these roles in the light of modern pedagogy.

A number of educators and one organization whose conceptions of the role of the teacher have had profound impact on pedagogy were selected as exemplars. These included Isocrates, Socrates, Plato, and Quintilian, who represented the pedagogues of Ancient Times; Ascham, Montaigne, Mulcaster, and the Jesuits, exemplars of Sixteenth Century pedagogy; and Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel, representatives of Early Modern Times.

Reasons for the choice of benchmarks, namely Ancient Times, the Sixteenth Century, and Early Modern Times, were advanced. In addition, an historical review of institutional forms, theories, and concepts affecting roles for the teacher in all three periods was presented.

It was seen that pedagogy in the Ancient Greco-Roman World was influenced by philosophers like Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Zeno and the philosophical schools which the latter three founded, and by rhetoricians like Isocrates and Quintilian.

Education in the Sixteenth Century was influenced as follows: first, by the Renaissance, which was a great revival of learning in the classics and the arts. Its humanistic aspect promoted the spirit of free inquiry and man's right to make decisions based on reason; second, by the Reformation, which aimed primarily at correcting the abuses of the Catholic Church but also to free its members from unquestioning submission to ecclesiastical authority.

In Early Modern Times, education was influenced by a number of ideologies, namely Naturalism, Romanticism, Humanitarianism, Rationalism, and Nationalism. The two which perhaps had the greatest impact on education were Naturalism and Nationalism. Naturalism denounced the artificialities of civilized man and promoted the idea that there was goodness in nature. Accordingly, it favoured education in harmony with nature. Nationalism

was a concerted attempt by European countries to foster pride and loyalty to the state. To achieve their goals, they placed emphasis on the study of the national language as well as the history, culture, and literature of the homeland.

Finally, the philosophical and pedagogical ideas of Pestalozzi and Froebel helped to influence education in Early Modern Times. Pestalozzi held the conviction (in agreement with Rousseau and Froebel) that man was inherently good, and that education could be psychologized. Pestalozzi also believed that the child was in the process of unfolding. His principle of Anschauung and his emphasis on education based on the natural development of the child had profound influence on his conception of the role of the teacher.

Froebel's teleological view of man, which claimed that all a person was to become later in his life was preordained at conception, shaped his image of the teacher. His laws of unity, self-activity, and development influenced the methodology he proposed for the teacher to carry out his roles.

Some persistent roles of the teacher were identified and described. Those discussed were as follows: first, providing the correct environment for learning; second, the teacher's role in taking the initiative in

establishing a close personal relationship with his students.

It was seen that Isocrates and Plato, two of the exemplars of Ancient Times, were advocates of the first role, which was supported by the Jesuits in the Sixteenth Century and by Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel in Early Modern Times. This role is important for reasons that are many and varied. In the first place, the environment determines what and how the student learns. In other words, an environment that is rich in excitement and challenges furnishes many learning experiences for the student, as opposed to one that is boring and lacking stimulation for learning. This is why Froebelian kindergartens are supplied with a great deal of material that stimulate children to learn.

Moreover, research findings have indicated that intelligence scores improved appreciably when children were moved from deprived environments to richer surroundings, where care and concern were shown and skillful teaching and audio-visual aids to learning were provided.

In the second place, profound concern for the environment had been shown by educators like Plato and Rousseau. So aware was Plato of the effects of the environment for good or evil that he cautioned mothers to exercise care in the choice of those they employed to work with their young, impressionable children. Rousseau

showed concern for the influence of the environment when he suggested that Emile be taken to the countryside away from the city.

The relative importance of the environment and heredity is still a controversial and debatable question. The proponents for the environment claim that it is of greater importance in shaping the child's behaviour, not to mention the contribution it makes to his general education. The opponents, on the other hand, have greater faith in the child's heredity. Nevertheless, both sides agree that a good environment is important in education. Since therefore there is common agreement about the effects of the environment on learning, it should be one of the roles of the teacher to provide the best possible.

The establishment of a close personal relationship between teacher and student was advocated by Quintilian and Isocrates, who believed that academic, psychological, and social advantages would accrue from it. This role was supported by Ascham and the Jesuits because of their belief in the teacher's influence for good or evil and by Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel in Early Modern Times, since their approach to teaching was based on a close relationship between teacher and student.

The establishment of a close association between teacher and student facilitates learning because it relieves the atmosphere of tension and anxiety that tend

to be present in a learning situation, thus providing the security that a student needs to develop to his potential.

The advantage of this role to the student is supported from research conducted by Ryan which indicates that warmth is the most important quality a teacher could possess.[1] Students consistently marked this characteristic of the teacher highest on the scale in a survey undertaken by the above researcher. Warmth develops when there is rapport between teacher and student.

A good interpersonal relationship between teacher and student helps to prevent or counteract discipline problems in the classroom. This is so because such a bond conveys to the child the interest and concern of the teacher. Psychological findings indicate that many behavioural problems arise when children feel neglected or have the need to get attention.

Finally, a pleasant classroom atmosphere characterized by empathy, caring, prizing, and accepting is promoted in such a relationship, allowing the student freedom to grow, to make mistakes, and develop his potentialities.

The writer showed that role conceptions have changed from Ancient Times to Early Modern Times, from the teacher as indoctrinator, dispenser of information, and authoritarian to the teacher as facilitator of learning, guide, resource person, and dialectical gardener. The

above conceptions will now be evaluated in the light of modern pedagogy.

Molding and indoctrination are not generally recommended today as approaches to teaching. These methods are based on the conception of schools as factories where all children are made to fit or conform to specific predetermined criteria, despite differences in their abilities, aptitudes, and dispositions, and without respect for their uniqueness and individuality. Molding and indoctrination stifle creativity and are therefore antithetical to current approaches to teaching, which encourage children to be resourceful and allow them freedom to learn and become self-actualized. In democratic societies, emphasis is placed on the principle of allowing individuals to think for themselves rather than having judgments and opinions forced upon them. The proponents for democracy have argued that it is fascistic to predetermine what people should think or believe. The role of the teacher should be to educate students in the effective processes of thinking, but decisions should be left to the individual.

Moreover, molding and indoctrination presuppose a static society where facts, morality, mores, attitudes, and opinions held by the community are permanent and not subject to change. It is not surprising that this approach to teaching is associated with the idealists, who believe

that ideas endure throughout the annals of time and that truth is changeless.

In order to function effectively in the rapidly changing world, children should learn how to adapt to change, to think critically and objectively, to distinguish relevant and irrelevant facts, to see relationships, and to draw their own conclusions. Molding and indoctrination tend to lead to ethnocentrism, which is divisive. The world is fast becoming the "global village" envisaged by Marshall McLuhan, due to rapid means of communication and advances made in technology. Hence it is important that people learn to dispense with their parochial or prejudicial views, which molding and indoctrination tend to foster.

Are there any advantages to these methods at all? It has been argued by conservatives that molding and indoctrination help children to know how to act in their society, what attitudes to adopt, what views to espouse, etc. This gives them a measure of confidence and security since one learns the behaviour he is expected to display. Moreover, traditionalists believe that children could be indoctrinated with favourable attitudes to patriotism, philanthropy, and altruism. There is some worth in this argument, though the demerits of this approach outweigh the advantages that may be gained. The term "indoctrination" is itself full of negative connotations which have

arisen as a result of its association with detested ideologies like Nazism or fascism. Hence it has been regarded unfavourably as an approach to teaching in democratic countries.

The conception of the teacher as a dispenser of information does not find favour with modern educators for a number of reasons. In the first place, this method of imparting information presumes children's heads to be receptacles in which knowledge is to be poured. As a result, it leads to cramming and memorization on the part of students with little regard to reasoning and understanding. Moreover, it does not promote creativity, a fault also associated with indoctrination as was indicated earlier. It must be pointed out that memorization has its place in education, especially in certain professional courses where the basic facts must be known "by heart" and so become second nature. But it becomes objectionable when it is overdone, when other approaches to teaching are more effective, or when it becomes an end in itself. Learning is viewed today as an active process because of the impact of educators like Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel, and more recently Dewey and Kilpatrick, who systematized the project method. On the other hand, dispensing of information suggests a teacher-oriented school where children are glued to their desks listening to the lectures of their teacher.

There are advantages to be derived from the maieutic approach to teaching advocated by Socrates. These center around the following. First, this approach forces the student to think and be intellectually alert, since he is asked a series of questions for which he has to provide thoughtful answers. Second, it tends to create a questioning individual rather than a passive one who takes ideas for granted. Third, it makes the student realize his own ignorance in areas where he thought he possessed wisdom. In other words, it helps him to know his strengths and weaknesses. This is consistent with the advice given by Socrates, namely "know thyself." Moreover, knowing one's self, especially one's limitations, is the first step to the acquisition of knowledge.

Despite the advantages associated with the maieutic role of the teacher, its disadvantages stand out. It seems clear that this approach does not lend itself to the teaching of content subjects like geography and history, and this was noted by Pestalozzi, who criticized it on the same ground. On the other hand, it seems appropriate for logical subjects like mathematics and physics. For this reason it could only be used successfully on a limited basis.

The writer agrees with the criticisms of this method raised by Barrow, namely:

> In the first place some basic instruction would surely have to take place in such matters as the meaning of terms, the use of material and so on. Second, there is not time to cover the ground by this relatively time-consuming method. Third, the method seems clearly more suited to some spheres of knowledge than others: specifically it seems more suited to those areas, such as mathematics and science, which are characterized by some fairly clear and determinate answers and which lend themselves readily to validation through direct perception, at least at a basic level, than to spheres of human activity such as the study of literature or history.[2]

The Socratic method was criticized by Skinner, the behaviourist, who described the scene in which it is illustrated in the Meno as "one of the greatest frauds in education."[3] He further claimed that "thousands of teachers have wasted their lives in application of the Socratic method."[4] His grounds for criticism seem to center around the fact that it is impractical because a student could never learn all he is required to know by this time-consuming approach. Lastly, the criticism levelled by Pestalozzi against the limitations of the Socratic Method is worth noting. The latter educator maintained that it could only be used with advanced students since young children do not have the linguistic skill to understand the questioning nor the ability to formulate the required answers into words.

The concept of the teacher as facilitator of learning, which was advocated by Rousseau, is widely accepted in modern pedagogy. Research findings indicate that the teacher does not play as great a part in the

learning process as was once thought. In other words, there may be much teaching and little learning. This was what prompted Carl Rogers, a humanistic educator and one of the proponents of the role of the teacher as facilitator, to state that teaching is "a vastly over-rated function."[5] Though Rousseau's conception of the role of the teacher was in accord with that of Rogers, the theories on which he based his arguments were not as well-developed as those of his more modern counterpart. At any rate, the same basic principles, namely that the curriculum should be made for the child and not vice versa and that there should be caring and trusting on the part of the teacher, are discernible in Rousseau's methodology.

Hopefully, when the teacher is cast into the role of facilitator of learning, he will see the child as a unique individual, striving to attain his potential in order to become self-actualized. Since there is caring, empathy, acceptance, and trust on the part of the teacher, the classroom atmosphere becomes rich in warmth and therefore conducive to learning. As indicated earlier, the importance of warmth as a characteristic of teachers was supported by research conducted by Ryan, who found that it was the most important quality a teacher could possess for the promotion of learning. Other conceptions of the role of the teacher in Early Modern Times will now be evaluated.

The role of the teacher as gardener is based on the principle of "unfolding" associated with Froebel and Pestalozzi. According to this approach, the teacher is compared to the gardener, whose duty it is to provide the correct nutrients for his plants, such as water, fertilizers, etc., for their successful growth. In the same way, the teacher is expected to provide the environment that would produce the maximum amount of learning in his classroom. This concept supports the principle that education does not consist of putting more into the child but allowing him to "unfold" according to his nature. This seems to be the true meaning of education, for the term was derived from the Latin word "educere," which means "to draw out," not "to put in."

The Froebelian and the Pestalozzian concept of the teacher as a gardener is approved in schools today with some modifications. For example, there is not such great emphasis on the "unfolding" principle, though nature is still used as a guide in teaching. The presence of the kindergarten or children's garden in so many countries of the world today attests to the acceptance of Froebel's pedagogical principles and his conception of the role of the teacher as gardener.

Two other conceptions of the teacher's role which have lost much of their appeal in recent times will be evaluated. These are modelling and imitation. The stress

in Modern Times is on catering for the self-actualization of the individual learner, and this could only be achieved when the student is given the freedom to be himself, to make his own mistakes and decisions in a nonthreatening atmosphere.

Imitation of scholarly works tends to stifle creativity and originality; hence it is not a preferred approach to teaching today. Admittedly, some teachers, by virtue of their scholarship and character, do provide good models for imitation and this fact should not be overlooked. Moreover, some educators regard imitation as useful, since by practising it on occasions, much time and energy could be saved when, for example, the accumulated knowledge of the past is copied. However, Monroe's comments with which the writer agrees are worth quoting here:

> The intellectual and moral progress of the human race have come through first tolerating and encouraging divergencies and diversities of thought,--the essence of individuality,--and through the conception that mere identity of thoughts is not an end in itself, but an incident in the accomplishment of other ends. More specifically, it is quite contrary to the spirit of a democratic and progressive society to set up as a conscious end the idea that one, even if he be only an immature child, shall repeat the acts of another so as to arrive at a state of passive acquiescence in the ideas of others. Whether as a psychological method or as a social standard, imitation occupies a subordinate position.[6]

Modelling of values and attitudes remains a controversial area in teaching. Because of the rapid means

of transportation today, which have facilitated the migration of people from one area to another, most modern communities are multi-cultural, which poses a problem for the teacher as a model. The question, of course, is which culture should the teacher model--middle class, upper class, working class? Subcultures are submitting proposals to school boards to employ teachers who can understand and model the values of their culture. The problem is more complex when there are various ethnic groups in a school or class.

More recently, rejection of imitation and modelling came from the existentialists, who argue that in the interest of authenticity, a basic tenet of their philosophy, the individual should not try to imitate others, but should "do his own thing," and be genuine to himself and others. Finally, changes in the conception of the teacher's role as it relates to discipline will be discussed and evaluated.

The old image of the teacher as a strict disciplinarian administering corporal punishment arbitrarily to his students does little good for the profession and for education as a whole. The ill-effects of physical punishment have been pointed out by Isocrates and Quintilian as alienating the child from the teacher and creating fears and anxieties which retard the learning process.

The use of praise and commendation as recommended by the Sixteenth Century exemplars Ascham and Mulcaster seems to be a better course for the teacher to take in disciplinary procedure. This method, essentially a type of reinforcement and punishment approach, is reminiscent of the modus operandi of the behaviourists.

Rousseau's discipline by natural consequences, described in detail in Chapter IV, has certain advantages but there are flaws in the system as well. The value of such impersonal discipline is that it protects the relationship between child and teacher, since there is no intervention on the part of the latter. Hence this procedure precludes the possibility of estrangement between teacher and pupil. Moreover, this approach gives stability to the child's character, for as Rousseau points out, natural laws are consistent and inevitable while rules and regulations made by human beings are subject to change.

There are several disadvantages inherent in Rousseau's system. In the first place, the child may not always see the connection between the misdeed committed and the punishment since there may be a lengthy interval separating both. In the second place, this type of punishment is based on the child's ability to reason, that is, to see relationships between cause and effect. Hence it could only be applied to students over twelve years of

age, for Rousseau maintained that children under twelve are incapable of reasoning. "Childhood is the sleep of reason."[7] In the third place, the damage done to the child might be irreparable, not to mention the inconveniences other innocent people may suffer as a result of the child's misdeeds. However, with certain modifications, Rousseau's system could be satisfactorily implemented.

Self-discipline, effected through the use of self-activity as advocated by Froebel, seems to be the ideal type of discipline to foster and contrasts strongly with the old practice of physical punishment. Its advantages are that the self-respect of the learner is preserved, and it does not lead to alienation from the teacher nor the school system since it precludes the arousal of feelings of hate and antipathy towards authority. For this reason self-discipline is the highest form of discipline.

The role of the teacher as a guide or resource person was advocated by Rousseau, as was seen earlier. This approach is based on the principle of self-directed learning. The child is supposed to learn through his own experiences with the teacher as a guide or resource person, ready to help when the situation warrants it. The advantage that may be derived from the teacher as guide or resource person is that the child learns to discover knowledge for himself, which is a joyful experience. The

psychological benefit that accompanies discovery learning is the self-confidence that it builds in the learner. At the same time this method teaches the student how to learn. The project method, advocated by John Dewey and systematized by William Heard Kilpatrick, is based on the role of the teacher as a guide. It is recommended in education today because in this approach, the child is involved as an active agent in his own education and as a result he learns by doing. Moreover, this approach is consistent with the view of education as a process rather than a product.

One problem with discovery learning is that it seems more suitable for use with brighter students, or for those that are more motivated to learn, since these individuals tend to experience the joys of discovery more frequently than their less intellectually able peers or those lacking motivation. Guided discovery methods that are in use today in some schools may solve the problem.

This study reveals that despite inadequacies in their general approaches to teaching, exemplars of Ancient Times had insights into the psychology and methodology of teaching beyond what one would expect for educators of their day. For example, Quintilian made provisions for individual differences among his students, he knew the rudiments of child psychology and how to use praise and blame as a strategy in motivation. Both Isocrates and

Quintilian helped lay the foundation for change in pupil-teacher relationships by advocating that teachers take the initiative in establishing rapport with their students. In addition, both educators rejected severe disciplinary procedures that were customary during the time in which they lived.

Another observation is that there was not always consensus of opinion regarding conceptions of roles for the teacher even among educators who represented the same historical period. For example, Socrates saw the teacher as midwife, while Plato saw him as a figure of authority. In addition, the study showed that there were also differences in teaching methodology among the exemplars of Ancient Times. Plato's advocacy of strict disciplinary methods, including the use of corporal punishment for recalcitrant students, contrasted strongly with the more lenient measures supported by Isocrates and Quintilian. Undoubtedly, severity in school discipline was the status quo in Ancient Times, and this has been supported overwhelmingly by educational historians, which make the humane methods adopted by Isocrates and Quintilian even more surprising.

Some of the same observations made about exemplars of Ancient Times are applicable as well to those who represented the Sixteenth Century. To elaborate further, methods of instruction adopted by the Jesuits contrasted

with those practised by Ascham and Mulcaster. The Jesuits practised indoctrination, which led to much rote memorization, while Mulcaster adjusted material to be learnt to the cognitive level of his students in order to promote understanding rather than cramming.

Ascham and Mulcaster were familiar with some of our modern concepts in education though unfortunately their knowledge of pedagogy did not seem to make much impact on approaches to teaching. It is possible that the time was not yet ripe for implementing their ideas; hence many changes were not made in approaches to teaching during the Sixteenth Century. To be more specific, Mulcaster was familiar with the concept of readiness, even though his knowledge of it was only rudimentary. Ascham recognized that the establishment of a friendly relationship between teacher and student was conducive to learning; he considered the nature of the child in his choice of teaching methodology and rejected corporal punishment as a method of discipline.

The impact on pedagogy made by Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel in changing role conceptions of the teacher seemed to have been more forceful. The efforts of these educators were strengthened by the philosophical, religious, and social changes that were taking place in Europe during the time in which they lived.

It should be pointed out that while conceptions of teaching roles have changed, pedagogical practices have not changed at the same rate, creating a lag in the implementation of ideas. The many educators who have followed the principles of Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel have helped to modernize education. Others who have rejected their doctrine still resort to ancient practices of authoritarianism, indoctrination, and teacher-centered education. One realizes the difficulty in getting some educators to implement methodology in democratic countries where individuals are allowed the freedom to accept or reject suggestions for change. Another reason for resistance to change seems to be that some educators tend to perpetuate the image of the teacher that they held in their childhood and as a result teach according to the methodology by which they themselves were educated.

Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel undoubtedly held conceptions of roles for teachers which were far in advance of the time in which these educators lived. It is hoped that in the course of time their many brilliant suggestions for changing the system will be found acceptable to all educators so that there would be even more widespread implementation of the roles these educational reformers conceived for the teacher.

Footnotes--Chapter V

[1]David G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers (Wisconsin: George Banta Co., Inc., 1962).

[2]Robin Barrow, Plato and Education (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976), p. 37.

[3]C. H. Patterson, Foundations for a Theory of Instruction and Educational Psychology (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1977), p. 223.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid., p. 304.

[6]Paul Monroe, A Cyclopedia of Education (New York: Macmillan, 1925), p. 390.

[7]Jean Jacques Rousseau, Emile, trans. Barbara Foxley (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Everyman's Library, 1976), p. 106.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Ascham, Roger. The Schoolmaster. Edited by Lawrence Ryan. New York: Cornell University Press, 1967.

Froebel, Friedrich. The Education of Man. Translated by W. N. Hailman. New York: D. Appleton and Co., Inc., 1895.

_____. Pedagogics of the Kindergarten. Translated by Josephine Jarvis. New York: Appleton, 1895.

_____. Education by Development. Translated by Josephine Jarvis. New York: Appleton, 1909.

_____. Froebel's Chief Writings on Education. Rendered in English by S. S. Fletcher. New York: Longman's Green and Company, 1912.

_____. Friedrich Froebel--A Selection From His Writings. Compiled by I. Lilley. London: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Luther, Martin. Luther on Education. Excerpts from the writings of Luther, compiled by F. V. N. Painter. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1928.

Mulcaster, Richard. Positions. New York: Columbia University Teachers' College Press, 1971.

Pestalozzi, Heinrich. How Gertrude Teaches Her Children. Translated by Lucy E. Holland and Francis Turner. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1915.

_____. Leonard and Gertrude. Translated by Eva Channing. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1892.

Plato. The Republic. Translated by Francis Cornford. Oxford University Press, 1967.

_____. Protagoras. In The Dialogues of Plato. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Chicago, 1971.

_____. Laws. In The Dialogues of Plato. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Chicago, 1971.

_____. Apology. In The Dialogues of Plato. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Chicago, 1971.

_____. Meno. In The Dialogues of Plato. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Chicago, 1971.

Quintilian. Institutes of Oratory. In Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom. Edited by Robert Ulich. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. Emile. Translated by Barbara Foxley. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Everyman's Library, 1976.

Secondary Sources

Anderson, L. F. Pestalozzi. New York: A.M.S. Press, Inc., 1970.

Barlow, Thomas. Pestalozzi and American Education. Univeristy of Colorado Press, 1977.

Beck, Frederick. Greek Education 450-350. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1964.

Boroughs, Homer. Introduction to Secondary School Teaching. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1964.

Boyd, William. The History of Western Education. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1950.

_____. The Educational Theory of Jean Jacques Rousseau. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1963.

Broome, J. H. Rousseau: A Study of His Thoughts. London: Edward Arnold Publishers, 1963.

Broudy, Harry. Exemplars of Teaching Method. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965.

Brubacher, John. A History of the Problems of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1947.

Bruner, Jerome. The Process of Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Butts, Freeman. A Cultural History of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1947.

Castle, E. B. Ancient Education and Today. Suffolk, England: Richard Clay (The Chaucer Press), Ltd., 1965.

_____. The Teacher. Oxford University Press, 1970.

Claydon, Leslie. Rousseau on Education. London: Macmillan, 1969.

Cole, Luella. A History of Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Compayre, Gabriel. The History of Pedagogy. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1913.

_____. Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi. New York: Thomas Crowell and Co., Publishers, 1970.

_____. Montaigne and Education of the Judgment. New York: Thomas Crowell and Co., Publishers, 1908.

Cubberley, Ellwood. Readings in the History of Education. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1920.

Davidson, Thomas. A History of Education. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1908.

Donohue, J. W. Jesuit Education. New York: Fordham University Press, 1963.

Downs, Robert. Friedrich Froebel. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1978.

Duggan, Stephen. A Student's Text-Book in the History of Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1948.

Durant, Will. The Story of Philosophy. New York: Simon and Schuster Publishers, 1930.

Eby, Frederick. The History and Philosophy of Education, Ancient and Medieval. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1940.

Frost, S. E. Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Western Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill Books, Inc., 1966.

Gage, N. L. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.

Good, Carter, ed. Dictionary of Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Good, H. G. A History of Western Education. New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Graves, F. P. A History of Education. New York: Macmillan, 1923.

Green, J. A. Life and Work of Pestalozzi. Baltimore: Warwick and York, Inc., 1912.

Guimps, Roger de. Pestalozzi: His Life and Works. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1896.

Gutek, Gerald. A History of the Western Educational Experience. New York: Random House, Inc., 1972.

_____. Pestalozzi and Education. New York: Random House, 1968.

Hall, John. Rousseau. London: Macmillan, 1973.

Hearford, Michael. Pestalozzi. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1967.

Hoyt, Charles. Studies in the History of Modern Education. New York: Silver, Burdett and Co., 1908.

Hughes, James. Froebel's Educational Laws for All Teachers. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1903.

Hughes, Thomas. Loyola. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1892.

Krüsi, Herman. Pestalozzi: His Life and Influence. Cincinnati: Wilson Hinkle and Co., 1875.

Lawrence, Evelyn, ed. Friedrich Froebel and English Education. London: Routledge, 1969.

Livingstone, Richard. Plato and Modern Education. New York: Macmillan, 1944.

Lodge, Rupert. The Philosophy of Plato. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1956.

_____. Plato's Theory of Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1956.

Marrou, H. A History of Education in Antiquity. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1950.

Mayer, Frederick. The Great Teachers. New York: The Citadel Press, 1967.

Misawa, Tadasu. Modern Educators and Their Ideals. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1909.

Monroe, Paul. A Cyclopedia of Education. New York: Macmillan, 1925.

_____. Source Book in the History of Education. New York: Macmillan, 1953.

_____. A Text-Book in the History of Education. New York: Macmillan, 1953.

Mulhern, James. A History of Education. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1959.

Nakosteen, Mehdi. The History and Philosophy of Education. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1965.

Nettleship, R. D. The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic. London: Oxford University Press, 1955.

Patterson, C. H. Foundations for a Theory of Instruction and Educational Psychology. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1977.

Power, Edward. Main Currents in the History of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.

Quick, Robert. Essays on Educational Reformers. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1899.

Reisner, Edward. Historical Foundations of Modern Education. New York: Macmillan, 1938.

Rivlin, Harry, ed. Encyclopedia of Modern Education. New York: F. Hubner and Co., Inc., 1943.

Rogers, Carl. "Freedom to Learn." In Foundations for a Theory of Instructions and Educational Psychology. Edited by C. H. Patterson. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

Rusk, Robert. The Doctrines of the Great Educators. London: Macmillan, 1962.

_____. A History of Infant Education. London: University of London Press, 1967.

Ryans, David. Characteristics of Teachers. Wisconsin: George Banta Co., Inc., 1962.

Sahakian, William. Rousseau as Educator. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1974.

Schwickerath, Robert. Jesuit Education: Its History and Principles. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1903.

Smail, S. Quintilian on Education. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1938.

Smith, Samuel. Heinrich Pestalozzi. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1975.

Sullivan, Daniel. An Introduction to Philosophy. Rev. ed. Benziger: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1973.

Ulich, Robert, ed. Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Walch, Romana. Pestalozzi and the Pestalozzian Theory of Education. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1952.

Weber, Evelyn. The Kindergarten. New York: Teachers' College Press, 1969.

White, Jesse. The Educational Ideas of Froebel. London: Cambridge University Press, 1907.