# Is There a Future for the Teaching Profession?
## By J. Wesley Null

### Abstract

In this essay, I raise the question “Is there a future for the teaching profession?”. I begin with a brief story that illustrates the difficulties that face teachers and teacher educators. Then, I address three topics that members of the teaching profession must face if the profession is to thrive: teaching and research within universities, the recruitment of teachers and teacher educators, and the renewal of true professionalism. I conclude with a discussion of several immediate steps that teachers and teacher educators can take to reinvigorate the teaching profession for the twenty-first century.

# Is There a Future for the Teaching Profession?

Is there a future for the teaching profession? I raise this question not so much to alarm teachers and teacher educators, but rather to challenge us to think together about what we should do to help our profession. Like you, I want the teaching profession to thrive, but we need to think seriously about some difficult questions if we expect to prosper in the decades ahead. Even to raise the question "Is there a future for the teaching profession?" indicates that I have some concerns—if not serious doubts—about the future of the teaching profession. By "teaching profession," I mean classroom teachers in K-12 schools and education faculty within universities who consider themselves teacher educators. These are the people who carry the banner, so to speak, for the teaching profession. In addition to asking "Is There a Future for the Teaching Profession?", I want to raise several additional questions that I hope will challenge us to think seriously about what we should do in the years ahead.

## Teaching and History

I made my decision to enter the teaching profession when I was a sophomore in college. I was like many other college sophomores. I was trying to decide what to do with my life. I knew that teaching was a likely possibility, but I still thought about other options, but only as a passing interest without much serious thought. I knew that I wanted to become a teacher once I completed my undergraduate degree, but, within teaching, I had no idea what I wanted to teach. I enjoyed all subjects. I knew that I had a desire to teach, but I wanted to teach everything. I also wanted to teach people. So, like many young college students, I was thinking about lots of possibilities for the future, and I was at an impressionable age. During the fall semester of my sophomore year, I was asked a question that, in retrospect, has shaped my life for many years. After telling one of my history professors that I planned to become a teacher, he asked "Why would you want to be a teacher when you could be a historian?".

Now I want you to think about that question for a minute. "Why would you want to be a teacher when you could be a historian?" I want you to think about the foolishness and the damage that lurks behind that question. I must admit that I have been angry at that question—and the person who asked it—ever since. I was too ignorant and afraid at the time to know how to respond, but I knew that something was not right. I knew that his question was wrong in a deep, profound sort of way, but I had no idea what to do about it. I have spent the last fifteen years trying to understand and do something about the problem that lurks behind that question. All of my work teaching and writing on curriculum and foundations of education is an extension of this defining moment in my life. I chose the teaching profession for moral reasons and because the professors in the College of Education respected my chosen profession. I also resolved that day to find a way to demonstrate that it is in fact possible—indeed essential—to be both a teacher and an historian at the same time.

With this brief story in mind, I want to raise three issues that I think we must address if we are to renew the teaching profession. They are 1) the appropriate relationship between teaching and research within universities, 2) the recruitment of high-quality teachers and teacher educators, and 3) the renewal of true professionalism in teaching. I would like to start with #1, and keep in mind that I will address these issues by asking lots of questions that I hope will stir others to ask them as well.

## Teaching and Research Within Universities

Issue #1—In practice, do modern universities demonstrate that they value good teachers and good teaching? If so, how? If teaching is not valued *in practice* within contemporary universities, why isn't it?

The future of the teaching profession is inevitably bound up with the future of higher education. Whether we like it or not, institutions of higher education set the intellectual and professional standards for our nation. Universities exert this influence through the power they have in our culture, and not always in a direct, policy-oriented way. In other words, universities bestow status by awarding degrees and legitimating what counts as professional status in society. What is valued in our nation's most powerful universities will be valued in the culture at large. Perhaps more importantly, what is *not valued* in our most powerful universities will not be valued in the culture at large as well.

One practical step that we can take as a profession is to learn more about our history. The battle over the appropriate relationship between teaching and research within universities takes on an entirely new perspective when we consider this issue from the perspective of history. The history of teacher education has much to teach us as a profession. As teacher educators, we have a very useful history if we will just learn this story and use it in the right way. As we can see in recent books such as *The American State Normal School: "An Instrument of Great Good"* by

Christine Ogren (2005), *The Trouble with Ed Schools* by David Labaree (2006), and, if I may say so myself, *Forgotten Heroes of American Education: The Great Tradition of Teaching Teachers* by Wesley Null and Diane Ravitch (2006), hundreds of universities across the United States were created for one purpose and one purpose only: *teaching*. By extension, these institutions were created for teacher education as well. Allow me to repeat this point: Every teachers college in the U.S. and in many other countries was created for only one profession—*teaching*—and with only one task in mind—*teacher education.*

This realization causes us to ask several significant questions. Why did these institutions change? Why did they not remain teachers colleges? Why did they choose to expand to other professions beyond teaching? And what has been lost now that we no longer have higher education institutions dedicated to teacher education? What have been the consequences of this transformation for the teaching profession? How has the status of teaching diminished in the last century, and is there a relationship between the demise of teachers colleges and the status of the teaching profession in America today? And why did America allow our teachers colleges to transform into multi-purpose regional institutions, whereas many other nations—for example Germany, France, Russia, Japan, and China—did not? I do not pretend to have answers to all of these questions, but asking and attempting to answer them is essential if we expect the teaching profession to thrive in the decades ahead. I think the changes that have taken place within our higher education institutions have not been good if our goal is to build and sustain a powerful teaching profession. Institutions specifically for teacher education in France, Russia, Germany, and China, for example, are known as pedagogical institutes, or normal schools. Perhaps the fact that these nations have continued to support higher education institutions specifically for teachers has something to do with the higher regard for teachers and the teaching profession in these countries compared with the United States.

Kappa Delta Pi members will be interested to know that William Bagley, the founder of Kappa Delta Pi, dedicated his entire professional life to supporting the teachers colleges that he thought were the appropriate institutions for building and sustaining a teaching profession (Null 2003). As a prominent educational philosopher and psychologist during the first half of the twentieth century, Bagley served as a teacher educator at both normal schools and universities in Montana, Illinois, and New York. He argued throughout his life that the most important task that any university faces is the responsibility to prepare high-quality teachers. Bagley would be appalled at the way in which teaching and teacher education have been radically marginalized within higher education institutions today. Read just one or two of Bagley's essays in *Forgotten Heroes* and this point will be painfully clear (Bagley 2006a; Bagley 2006b; Bagley 2006c; Bagley 2006d; Bagley 2006e). He made this point routinely in his books as well (Bagley 1912; Bagley 1937). We have much to learn from serious investigation into the teachers college model of curriculum for teachers. Bagley and Kappa Delta Pi pioneered and upheld this view of curriculum for teachers for almost fifty years. I am not advocating that we merely seek to return to some "golden age" of teachers colleges that never existed. I am, however, arguing that teacher educators have a great deal to learn from the curriculum philosophy that served as the foundation for preparing teachers within the teachers college model. This point leads me to the second major issue that I am convinced is crucial to our future—the recruitment and retention of high-quality teachers and teacher educators.

## Recruitment of Teachers and Teacher Educators

Issue #2: Are we recruiting the best and brightest young people into our profession? Are we recruiting the best and brightest to become teacher educators? If not, how can we recruit (and retain) *more* good teachers *and* teacher educators?

If we are to build and sustain a teaching profession, we must recruit high quality people. We need classroom teachers who are both liberally educated and professionally trained. We need teacher educators within universities who represent our profession well by connecting theory with practice, by producing interdisciplinary scholarship, and by building relationships with professors from various academic fields *and* with teachers in K-12 schools.

Teacher educators have an enormously difficult task in modern universities. American universities have been moving away from an emphasis on high-quality teaching and teacher education for at least a century. In today’s universities, integrating all of the factors that must be connected in order to nurture the teaching profession has become exceedingly difficult. The root of the problem can be found in hyperspecialization, vacuous conceptions of professionalism, and an obsession with status for the sake of status. Especially at research-controlled universities, faculty even within the same department or college often do not talk to one another, let alone have serious conversations, do research, or teach together. Building bridges across colleges in most universities has become almost an impossible task.

For a somewhat alarming account of how these problems can be found at Harvard University, read *Excellence Without a Soul: How a Great University Forgot Education,* by Harry R. Lewis

(2006). Lewis is a former Dean of the Harvard College of Arts & Sciences. His book demonstrates that we have much work to do to rebuild higher education, specifically higher education *curriculum.* Lewis dedicates almost no time to curriculum in the book, but reading his work makes clear that, in addition teaching, curriculum is the subject (and practice) that has been forgotten at Harvard and many other similar institutions. These trends are not healthy if our goal is to recruit and prepare a liberally educated *and* professionally trained body of teachers and teacher educators.

Unfortunately, the brightest students who enter our universities often seek careers in investment banking, medicine, law, and engineering—not teaching. This is not a new problem, but I do think the situation has gotten worse in recent decades (Molnar 2002). From the perspective of history, the difficulty with recruiting good people into teaching has become more difficult because of the many job possibilities that young people have today—especially women. Sixty or seventy years ago, the brightest young women in America—and elsewhere—had basically two options as far as professions were concerned: teaching and nursing. The brightest women in our culture often chose teaching because they were driven to teach, but also because they had very few other possibilities.

Today, however, women can pursue just about any profession they wish. Of course, all professions must and should be open to women. I am not interested in arguing that we should do something different. At the same time, however, we need to think about what these cultural changes mean for a profession that was shaped by women. The fact that more women are going into business, law, medicine, and engineering does not mean that we have thousands of young men who are now clamoring to begin their careers as elementary school teachers. An unfortunate—and I think largely unintended—consequence of opening up all professions to women has turned out to be an overall lowering of the status of the teaching profession. Teaching has gone from a prestige position for women to a prestige position for no one. This trend combined with what higher education has done (these two are no doubt connected) have put the teaching profession in a difficult spot. We must think of new ways to lure bright young *men and women* into our profession, despite the fact that it does not lead to economic power. We must draw people with something other than money. That is the only way that we can flourish. One major hurdle to achieving this task, however, brings me to the third issue that I want to raise. It has to do with the nature of professionalism. Our profession suffers from an impoverished conception of what professionalism means. We must think seriously about this problem if we hope to renew our field. This goal too, however, faces several significant hurdles, which I will address in the next section.

## The Renewal of True Professionalism

Issue #3—What does it mean to be a professional? What are the foundations of true professionalism? Has the obsession with No Child Left Behind and other supposedly "research-based" movements eroded true professionalism in teaching? And what about the moral foundations for the teaching profession? Have we forgotten what they are? If so, what must we *do* to revive them?

I ask these questions because I think we must revisit the way in which we conceive of *and practice* professionalism in teaching. By arguing that we suffer from an impoverished conception of professionalism, I mean that we have allowed our profession to be reduced to a hollow shell of what it truly is. The teaching profession is not alone, however, in this problem. As William Sullivan (2005) argues in *Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America* and as William May (2001) argues in *Beleaguered Rulers: The Public Obligation of the Professional*, professionalism across the board has come to be understood in shallow terms. Business, medicine, politics, law, engineering, teaching, and many other professions must change if they are to flourish. As Justin Oakley and Dean Cocking (2001) argue in *Virtue Ethics and Professional Roles,* the complexity of the problems that professionals face today cannot be addressed sufficiently if we only draw upon the empirically based, technical view that dominated the twentieth century. Due to forces such as immigration, religious pluralism, and cultural fragmentation, professionals in business, law, and teaching face problems that require sustained thought, skilled deliberation, and high levels of social awareness. Our view of professionalism in teaching, however, has not kept up with the challenges that teachers face.

Other professions, for example business and medicine, have undergone what some authors call an “ethics boom” (Davis 1999). The teaching profession, however, has remained largely disconnected from this broader discussion of ethics and professional practice (Glanzer and Ream 2007). The root of this problem is that we have allowed the teaching profession to remain dominated by technical and economic ends, rather than become re-connected with civic, public, moral, and spiritual ends (Palmer 2007). We see this problem in the language we use and the policies we create. As Sullivan (2005) puts this point in *Work and Integrity*, “We need a new professionalism adequate to the changed circumstances of American life. The first step toward this reinvention of professionalism, however, requires that professionalism be understood as a public good, a social value, and not the ideology of some special interest . . . The professions will not fulfill their promise, nor will the positive qualities of professional work reach more persons, unless professionals can reconceive their roles within enhanced civic interaction" (124, 150). Professionals have somehow come to be understood by the public as self-interested, purely economic creatures. We know this perception is not true in the teaching profession, but, unfortunately, the idea has become widespread in many parts of the country. As Sullivan makes clear, professionals must address this problem by demonstrating that we serve the public interest (not just our own), by communicating with people outside of one narrow specialization, and by drawing upon philosophical traditions that have been forgotten for decades. Without public support and a sound philosophy at its foundation, any profession will soon die. Beginning with the Progressive Era in the early twentieth century, the teaching profession attempted to build a foundation that was rooted only in empirical science. In doing so, we divorced the profession from the field of moral philosophy, which had served as the foundation for good teaching for centuries. Our task in the twenty-first century is to re-envision teaching as a moral practice, not just a technical skill (Pring 2001).

Again, history is useful in helping us to reconceive the way in which we think of ourselves as professionals. Around 1900, the teaching profession began to distance itself from the moral foundations that are the true source of real professionalism. Psychologists such as Edward L. Thorndike and William Heard Kilpatrick separated themselves from the moral basis of teaching. They simultaneously sought to create a purely technical profession that had nothing to do with the "traditional" basis for our field. The new "science" they attempted to create would have nothing to do with moral virtues such as practical wisdom, honesty, and courage—precisely the virtues that are essential to renewing the profession today (MacIntyre 1980; MacIntyre 2006). This new technical profession that Thorndike, Kilpatrick, and others like them sought to create was to be “scientific” in the sense that it was designed to “fix the problems” of bad teaching once and for all (Thorndike 1906; Kilpatrick 1906). As we argue in *Forgotten Heroes*, however, Thorndike and Kilpatrick were wrong.

Their obsession with a purely technical foundation for teaching (and a narrow conception of technique at that) has done irreparable damage to the teaching profession. We see echoes of this problem in much of what is found in No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Despite its positive elements, I see no way that a person can argue that NCLB has helped to improve the teaching profession. NCLB was written by lawyers. The primary author of the law was Sandy Kress, an Austin lawyer who has never taught a day in his life (Kress 2007; McQuinn 2006). Why are lawyers and law schools controlling curriculum and teaching? This state of affairs is unacceptable. Teachers, teacher educators, and other specialists who spend their lives studying and practicing in the fields of curriculum and teaching should be shaping educational policy, not lawyers. NCLB treats teachers as if they are technicians who implement someone else’s expertise. This is no way to build a real profession that serves our communities, as it should. Many teachers today feel as though they are micromanaged to the point that they have lost all autonomy in their classrooms. In the face of this, we must draw upon long-forgotten streams of practice and knowledge that can help us to face the future with confidence. One promising tradition views teaching and curriculum-making as practical arts, not technical skills. This is the kind of tradition that we must draw upon.

## The Role of Deliberation

The art that I want to emphasize in order to renew the teaching profession is deliberation (Reid 1999; Schwab 1982). Deliberation is the practice that has been forgotten in our obsession with top-down mandates, technique for the sake of technique, and shallow conceptions of science. True professionalism provides guidelines for teachers and then expects these teachers to exercise their own judgment as they make decisions that serve the public interest. True professionals must be encouraged to deliberate for themselves about what should be done in their individual schools and classrooms. Of course, good deliberation also takes into account the expectations of local communities, state agencies, and federal mandates. At the same time, however, good deliberation also must act on particular cases at specific times within specific contexts.

NCLB treats curriculum and teaching as if they exist in a vacuum in which no students, unannounced fire drills, broken copy machines, student newspapers, or announcements during the middle of class are ever found. The law ignores particularities and individual circumstances. Classroom teachers realize that curriculum and teaching are local, concrete acts that, at best, are only informed by encyclopedic legislation like NCLB. We will never build a true teaching profession unless legislators begin to pass legislation that acknowledges—indeed encourages—both the moral *and* the intellectual foundations for what we do. This means drawing upon empirical science, yes, but it also means drawing upon deliberation. Deliberation will help us to revive the moral foundations for our profession. NCLB may provide us with a great deal of high-sounding rhetoric about "leaving no child behind," but, in practice, it reduces teachers to technicians who are supposed to parrot the dictates of their supposed superiors. Attempted control of teachers by external mandates will only strengthen the resolve that teachers have to maintain dominion over *their own classrooms.* In other words, practical decision-making by teachers will always trump Byzantine laws passed by Congress (Tyack and Cuban 1995; Cuban 1993). There are other issues that we face, but those are three of the most pressing that I believe we must face and face wisely.

## Conclusions and Next Steps

To conclude, I want to put forward a few positive steps that I think we should take to rebuild the teaching profession. First of all, as teachers and teacher educators, we need to know what we are trying to do. Have a goal. Have a purpose. We need to think seriously about our purpose as teachers and teacher educators. As an end to put before us, I propose the ideal of a liberating curriculum for all. All students deserve a high-quality curriculum. The ideal of liberal education for all is once that can unite us as a profession. It is also the only defensible ideal in a democracy.

As I have mentioned several times, we must know our history better. We need to learn how teachers and institutions for teachers have been treated in the past and then draw upon this history to argue for what we believe in, for what we are trying to do, and for our purpose. Without history, we cannot think of promising new possibilities for the future. Knowledge of our history, however, is not enough.

We have to be three-dimensional people. As teachers and teacher educators, we have to look backward to know our history, we have to focus on the present so that we can make good decisions that impact students' lives every day, and we have to look forward to the future with a vision that helps us to anticipate future problems. We do not have the luxury of being one-dimensional people who only try to understand or explain the world around us. This is the path to hyperspecialization if not irrelevance, and this path does not serve the public interest, our students, or the curriculum we teach. As teachers and teacher educators, we have no choice but to do much more than simply explain. As Karl Marx and his friend Friedrich Engels (1998) put this point in 1845 when critiquing the prevailing philosophy of his day, "Philosophers have only studied the world in various ways, the point is to change it" (570). Even if we do not have Marx's socialist ends in mind, teachers and teacher educators exist to act and to change the world, not just to understand it. We are always trying to *do something* to students. There is no way around it. Patterning ourselves after university faculty who only explain the world is a dead-end street.

We must respect ourselves. As Kappa Delta Pi's founder William Bagley pointed out many times throughout his incredible career, a profession that cannot respect itself cannot expect to receive respect from the general public. We must take pride in our chosen callings as teachers and teacher educators. Respecting ourselves first can help us to engender respect from other people.

We must have high standards—both moral and intellectual—for ourselves, for our colleagues, and for our students. Too often in our past, we have chosen the path of least resistance instead of upholding high standards (Ravitch 2000). The teaching profession has been impacted strongly—and negatively—by the anti-intellectualism that has been well documented in American history, most notably by historian Richard Hofstadter (1963). High-quality teachers and teacher educators constantly must work against this drift toward anti-intellectualism, not in favor of it. True professionals in teaching will challenge Americans—students and parents alike—to have high intellectual and moral standards.

We need to think deeply and seriously about curriculum. Curriculum making is the practice that integrates all of the subjects that we must pull together as a profession (Reid 2006; Schwab 1969). Attention to good curriculum making helps us to avoid the extreme either-or thinking that has haunted us for many decades. Too often, curriculum has been viewed as a technical skill that can be supported from specific subject matters. Teachers and teacher educators must reject this view and see curriculum making as a holistic activity that has the end of liberal education for all as its goal (Miller 2007).

We must work together as university faculty and K-12 teachers to argue for high quality curriculum for all young people. Building relationships throughout the P-16 education community is essential for all parties involved. The best teacher educators work in two directions: 1) with K-12 teachers, and 2) with university faculty from the subjects they teach. This kind of work is difficult and time-consuming, but it is essential nourishment for the long-term health of the teaching profession.

We need to learn how to communicate with the general public about education, curriculum, and teaching. Our future as a profession depends upon public support. We need to do a better job communicating with the general public. Writing thoughtful, focused opinion columns for local newspapers is a good place to start when learning to communicate with the general public. Once we have this ability to communicate, we need to speak out, but be prudent.

We need to acknowledge that some members of our profession are part of the problem that we face. Some teachers want to be controlled. They want to be told what to do. They do not want to think. They want to be robots. They want a recipe that tells them what to do and how to do it. We cannot build a profession on robots. We must build a profession on human beings.

We need to recognize that our profession rests on a tension between knowledge and practice, between knowledge and action, and between principle and decision-making about particular cases. This is the same tension as the one that exists between intellect and morality. Many of our problems stem from our inability to negotiate these two aspects of curriculum, teaching, and professionalism. To be true professionals, we must constantly move back and forth between principle and decision-making.

Last but not least, do not be afraid. That message can help us to meet our challenges and indeed pave the way for a brighter future for the teaching profession. Faith in ourselves, our history, and the power of good teaching can help as well. Fourteen years ago, there are two primary reasons why I was unable to respond when I was asked “Why would you want to be a teacher when you could be a historian?”. Those reasons, I have come to believe, were *ignorance and fear*. We can address the first problem—ignorance— by studying curriculum and teacher education from the perspectives of history and philosophy. We can address the second problem—fear—only with courage and faith. Curriculum for teachers matters because it is the foundation for our communities, for our profession, and for American democracy (Null 2007). Any school—whether it be an elementary school or a university—is only as good as the teachers who teach in it, and teachers are largely the result of the curriculum they study. In the years ahead, I hope that members of our profession will have the knowledge, the courage, and the tenacity that it will take to restore dignity to the profession that gives rise to all others.

If William Bagley were alive today, he would recognize no better purpose for Kappa Delta Pi than for the Society to proclaim to the world that there is indeed a bright future for the teaching profession. More than a century ago, Bagley recognized the challenges that our profession faces. In one of the essays that he wrote just prior to creating Kappa Delta Pi, Bagley gave us one of the most brilliant, insightful, and memorable quotations ever from the field of education. When speaking to a graduating class of teachers in 1907, Bagley (1912) asked, "When will the public cease to insult the teacher's calling with empty flattery? When will men who would never for a moment encourage their own sons to enter the work of the public schools cease to tell us that education is the greatest and noblest of all human callings?" (10). These questions go to the heart of what it takes to build and sustain a teaching profession. Bagley's challenge remains as relevant and profound today as it was a century ago. My hope is that the Society that Bagley worked so hard to create and nurture, Kappa Delta Pi, will be the foundation for the revival that we so desperately need right now.

# References

Bagley, William C. 2006a. The future of the training of teachers. In *Forgotten heroes of American education: The great tradition of teaching teachers.*, eds. J. Wesley Null, Diane Ravitch, 85-89. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

———. 2006b. The nation's debt to the normal schools. In *Forgotten heroes of American education: The great tradition of teaching teachers.*, eds. J. Wesley Null, Diane Ravitch, 125-131. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

———. 2006c. Optimism in teaching. In *Forgotten heroes of American education: The great tradition of teaching teachers.*, eds. J. Wesley Null, Diane Ravitch, 37-47. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

———. 2006d. The profession of teaching in the united states. In *Forgotten heroes of American education: The great tradition of teaching teachers.*, eds. J. Wesley Null, Diane Ravitch, 167-179. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

———. 2006e. A realistic attitude toward the teachers college problem. In *Forgotten heroes of American education: The great tradition of teaching teachers.*, eds. J. Wesley Null, Diane Ravitch. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

———. 1937. *A century of the universal school*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

———. 1912. *Craftsmanship in teaching*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Cuban, Larry. 1993. *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms, 1890-1990*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hofstadter, Richard. 1963. *Anti-intellectualism in American life*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Kilpatrick, William H. 1906. *Foundations of method: Informal talks on teaching*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Kress, Sandy. 2007. Confessions of a no child left behind supporter. *Education Next* 2, (Spring): 30-37.

Labaree, David F. 2006. *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lewis, Harry R. 2006. *Excellence without a soul: How a great university forgot education*. New York, NY: PublicAffairs.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. 2006. The end of education. *Commonweal* 133, (18): 10-14.

———. 1980. *After virtue: A study in moral theory*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1998. *The German ideology, including theses on feuerbach*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

May, William F. 2001. *Beleaguered rulers: The public obligation of the professional*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox.

Miller, John P. 2007. *The holistic curriculum*. 2nd ed. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Molnar, Alex, ed. 2002. *School reform proposals: The research evidence*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Null, J. Wesley. 2007. Curriculum for teachers: Four traditions within pedagogical philosophy. *Educational Studies* 42, (1): 43-63.

———. 2003. *A disciplined progressive educator: The life and career of William Chandler Bagley*. New York: Peter Lang.

Null, J. Wesley, and Diane Ravitch, eds. 2006. *Forgotten heroes of American education: The great tradition of teaching teachers*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Oakley, Justin, and Dean Cocking. 2001. *Virtue ethics and professional roles*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Ogren, Christine A. 2005. *The American state normal school: "An instrument of great good"*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Palmer, Parker J. 2007. *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. Tenth Anniversary ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pring, Richard. 2001. Education as a moral practice. *Journal of Moral Education* 30, (2): 101-102.

Ravitch, Diane. 2000. *Left back: A century of battles over school reform*. New York, NY: Touchstone.

Reid, William A. 2006. *The pursuit of curriculum: Schooling and the public interest*, ed. J. Wesley Null. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

———. 1999. *Curriculum as institution and practice: Essays in the deliberation tradition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schwab, Joseph J. 1982. *Science, curriculum, and liberal education: Selected essays by Joseph J. Schwab,* eds. Ian Westbury, Neil J. Wilkof. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1969. The practical: A language for curriculum. *School Review* 78, (1): 1-23.

Sullivan, William M. 2005. *Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in America.* 2nd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Thorndike, Edward L. 1906. *Principles of teaching: Based on psychology*. New York, NY: A. G. Seller.

Tyack, David B., and Larry Cuban. 1995. *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.