

Searching for a Prophetic, Tactful Pedagogy: An Attempt to Deepen the Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions Discourse around Good Teaching

Mark D. Vagle

Abstract

In this article, I attempt to deepen the Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions discourse around good teaching by appropriating Dewey's (1938) assertion that intelligent theorizing proceeds in a deep and inclusive manner. First, I highlight Darling-Hammond and Bransford's (2005) framework for good teaching and learning. I then locate pedagogical knowledge within this framework and draw upon Garrison's (1997) notion of prophetic teaching and van Manen's (1991a) notion of tactful teaching. I close by reflecting on how these notions are part of a larger project—one that strives to remain inclusive to dimensions of teaching that are not easily codified.

It is the business of an intelligent theory of education to ascertain the causes for the conflicts that exist and then, instead of taking one side or the other, to indicate a plan of operations proceeding from a level deeper and more inclusive than is represented by the practices and ideas of the contending parties.

—Dewey, *Experience and Education*

Introduction

In *Experience and Education*, Dewey is mindful of the pendulum swinging action that often marks arguments in education, in his case the traditional vs. progressive education dualism. Dewey suggests that intelligent theorizing resists either-or logic and embraces complexity and depth.

In this article, I assert that a course of action—resembling Dewey's—can be used to pursue an intelligent theory of good teaching. At this point in time, pursuing an intelligent theory of good teaching is different than Dewey's in that there

do not appear to be two distinct parties in contention with one another. Instead I suggest that theorizing about good teaching is dominated by one primary discourse—the identification and codification of knowledge, skills, and dispositions for teaching. The Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions (KSD) discourse is exercised and recapitulated by teacher accrediting bodies, most notably the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), as well as associations and organizations aligned with specific academic disciplines or age levels (e.g., National Science Teachers Association [NSTA], National Council of Teachers of Mathematics [NCTM], National Council of Teachers of English [NCTE], National Middle School Association [NMSA]). Moreover, this discourse has been established and maintained over the past two decades in teaching and teacher education scholarship (e.g., Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Shulman, 1986, 1987). The KSD discourse guides teacher licensure, teacher education programs, and professional development efforts.

To be sure, good teaching is marked by what teachers know, do, and believe. The primary issue for me is not whether sets of knowledge, skills, and dispositions should be identified; rather I am concerned with what gets to count and the extent to which the sets of knowledge, skills, and dispositions remain open and expandable. To that end, I do not offer an alternative or competing discourse, thus trying to avoid another dualism. Instead, I appropriate Dewey's assertion from *Experience and Education* by proceeding more deeply into particular dimensions of pedagogical knowledge that are often embedded in and at times obscured by the KSD discourse.

I begin by briefly highlighting a number of possible starting points in contemporary work related to teaching and teacher education. I then focus specifically on one starting point, Darling-Hammond and Bransford's (2005) framework for good teaching and learning. From this starting point, I locate pedagogical knowledge within Darling-Hammond and Bransford's framework and then proceed deeper by drawing upon Garrison's notion of prophetic teaching found in *Dewey and Eros: Wisdom and Desire in the Art of Teaching* (1997) and van Manen's notion of tactful teaching found in *The Tact of Teaching: The Meaning of Pedagogical Thoughtfulness* (1991a). I close by reflecting on how these particular notions of teaching are the beginnings of a larger project—one that strives to remain inclusive to particular dimensions of teaching that are not as easily codified.

Starting Points in Teaching and Teacher Education

Contemporary work related to teaching and teacher education over the past two decades offers a number of possible starting points for this project. Britzman's (1991) work on teacher identity is appealing, since it focuses on teachers' practice and imagines teachers as having identities that evolve through the practice of teaching. Cochran-Smith and Lytle's (1993) work related to teacher research could be invoked. Teachers then would be acknowledged not merely as recipients of knowl-

edge, but also as generators of knowledge through their practice. Schön's (1983, 1987) work on reflective practice could also be considered, as could a number of reflective practice scholars who have followed Schön (e.g., York-Barr, Sommers, Gh-ere, & Montie, 2001; Zeichner & Liston, 1996). In addition, work related to teacher decision-making (e.g., Feiman-Nemser, 1990), teacher's stories and narratives (e.g., Connelly & Clandinin, 1990), teacher change (e.g., Hargreaves, 1994), sociocultural influences (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 2001), and social conditions of teaching (e.g., Liston and Zeichner, 1991) could be used.

More recently, Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2005) have proffered a framework for teaching and learning that highlights three general areas of knowledge, skills, and dispositions important for teaching.

- Knowledge of learners and how they learn and develop within social contexts,
- Conceptions of curriculum content and goals: an understanding of the subject matter and skills to be taught in light of the social purposes of education, and
- An understanding of teaching in light of the content and learners to be taught, as informed by assessment and supported by classroom environments. (p. 10)

This framework contributes to the KSD discourse by providing a comprehensive view of good teaching in that learners, subject matter, content, and assessment are all considered within social contexts for social purposes. As a result, this framework also provides an opportunity—an opening—to deepen the KSD discourse. The third of Darling-Hammond and Bransford's three domains of teacher learning, understanding teaching, focuses on pedagogy. Moreover, Darling-Hammond and Bransford's framework contains four areas of knowledge and skill within this domain: pedagogical content knowledge, knowledge of teaching diverse learners, knowledge of assessment, and understanding of classroom management.

Pedagogical content knowledge links or, as Shulman would say, blends pedagogy and content together (1987). Darling-Hammond and Bransford use language such as "diagnose...difficulties and provide strategies for overcoming them" and "develop a storehouse of representations and other strategies for teaching specific topics to the range of students they will teach" (2005, p. 36) to describe pedagogical content knowledge. The range of students to which Darling-Hammond and Bransford refer represents the second area of knowledge and skill, diversity of learners. In this area, teachers are asked to incorporate their students' cultures in their teaching and to construct learning tasks based on evaluations of their students' strengths and difficulties. In like fashion, Darling-Hammond and Bransford describe knowledge of assessment as teachers having "tools for tapping into what students think and adapting instruction to their needs" (p. 37). Finally, Darling-Hammond and Bransford stress that teachers must view classroom management beyond classroom

behavior and consider the degree to which the curriculum is meaningful and the instruction engaging and motivating.

To me, Darling-Hammond and Bransford's image of pedagogy (e.g., the teacher diagnoses, strategizes, taps, and adapts) situates the teacher-student relationship as more dualized than coordinated. I use dualized here because it feels as though the teacher does something at one moment in time based on what the student does at another moment in time. In effect, the teacher and student appear to be in a stimulus-response relationship in which they each exist as separate entities. For me, Dewey's notion of coordination (1896) is helpful because it preserves the very fabric (i.e., pedagogy) that ties teacher and student to one another.

Dewey describes coordination between stimulus and response, stating that stimulus and response are not separate entities that exist as individual, isolated components. Rather, stimulus and response are in relationship with one another. Neither exists without the other. In fact, stimulus and response provide purpose and direction for each other. They are each a phase "of a coordination requiring attention" (1896, p. 368). To describe pedagogy as the coordinated relationship between teacher and student requires something more than language, such as diagnosing and strategizing. It requires a language that burrows deeper into what it means to become pedagogical.

Max van Manen and Shuying Li would say that pedagogical knowing is linked to what they term "pathic knowledge."

Teacher knowledge is pathic to the extent that the act of teaching depends on the teacher's personal presence, relational perceptiveness, tact for knowing what to say and do in contingent situations, thoughtful routines and practices, and other aspects of knowledge that are in part pre-reflective, pre-theoretic, pre-linguistic. (2002, pp. 216-217)

By pathic, van Manen and Li are referring to relational, situational, corporeal, temporal, and actional ways of knowing. These aspects of pedagogical knowledge may not be as easily observed as, for example, the implementation of a particular teaching strategy; however, the particular teaching strategy is often linked to pathic dimensions. The following fictional anecdote, while simple and straightforward, illustrates the relationship between teaching strategies and pathic dimensions of teaching.

While working with two grade 1 students, Billy and Tim, on how to use a dictionary, Ms. Johnson begins the lesson by posing a review-oriented question designed to access prior knowledge (an instructional strategy). "What can you tell me about the differences between a dictionary and an encyclopedia?" Tim, seated across the table directly in front of Ms. Johnson, quickly offers answers—all of which are accurate. While listening to Tim's responses, Ms. Johnson sees, out of the corner of her eye, that Billy is fidgeting in his chair and notices his face becoming flushed. Ms. Johnson turns to him and asks, "Billy, what do you think?" Billy hesitates and says, "I was going to say what Tim said. And now that he said it, I've

got nothin'." Sensing his worry, Ms. Johnson quickly glances to the Venn diagram which contains unique characteristics of both dictionaries and encyclopedias and the characteristics they share. Taking Ms. Johnson's cue, Billy looks to the Venn diagram and quickly offers an accurate response.

There were observable instructional strategies present in this anecdote. Ms. Johnson posed questions and referred to a graphic organizer. Both of these strategies were pre-planned and effective. Furthermore, Ms. Johnson appears to have strategized very quickly. But what else was at play here that is not quite as easily observed yet is important? There was perceptivity (e.g., noticing the fidgeting and flushed look), a sense of how the student may have felt at this moment, and a subsequent response that gave the student a chance to be successful. The goal, at this point in the lesson, was to access prior knowledge, and Billy was having difficulty doing so. One could argue that prompting Billy to look to the Venn diagram let him off the hook. However, there was a larger goal in this pedagogical situation—learning how to use a dictionary. Perhaps it was important for Billy to feel success early, so he could potentially be more successful later in the lesson. The glance to the Venn diagram included no words; rather, it included a quick, subtle movement of Ms. Johnson's body toward the Venn diagram. Billy noticed Ms. Johnson's body move and he then moved his body—his eyes in this case—to the Venn diagram.

I argue that these relational dimensions are one of many examples of pedagogical knowing that constitute pedagogy, the fabric of the teacher-student relationship. Moreover, there are other dimensions of teaching, namely Garrison's depiction of Dewey's poetic moral prophet (1934/1980) and van Manen's notion of tact, which can also be used to describe pedagogy as the fabric that keep teacher and student in a coordinated relationship with one another and, in turn, can deepen the KSD discourse around good teaching.

The Prophetic, Tactful Pedagogue

Garrison, in his description of the prophetic teacher, draws upon Platonic and Socratic thinking regarding intermediaries between emotion and reason, carefully acknowledging the value of Plato's and Socrates' thinking in this regard, but also resisting their focus on the supernatural. "There is...a natural alternative to Platonism for those who prefer to live in this imperfect world of becoming rather than the perfect world of Being" (1997, p. 6). The natural alternative for Garrison is Dewey's inquiry (1938/1986), for it "mediates between our ignorance and our coming to know" (p. 6) as we grow and become. This mediating is in keeping with Dewey's consistent rejection of dualisms, especially the danger Dewey saw in separating the practical from the theoretical. Garrison's views on living as a process of becoming are important to his argument for an education of Eros, as becoming signals the never-ending work Dewey's practitioner faces as he or she lives in an indeterminate, vague world that is always subject to change (Garrison).

Garrison also resists the simplistic logic that is pervasive in Western thought.

For instance, teachers tend to make determinations about their students in an either-or fashion. Billy, from the earlier anecdote, is either smart or he is not smart because he could not recall any differences between dictionaries and encyclopedias without being prompted. After all, this concept had been covered the prior day in class.

Rather than perpetuate such simplistic logic, Garrison invokes the idea of Eros "as a powerful and paradoxical passion that mediates a multitude of opposites and brings people together" (1997, p. 7). More specifically, Eros, the son of Poros (meaning plenty, craft, skill) and Penia (meaning unattractive, poor) serves as the combination (i.e., mediation) of the opposite traits his parents possessed. Garrison sees Eros as the union of the opposites, as opposed to another example of either-or logic. With this notion of mediation in mind, Garrison then beckons Dewey's inquiry (1938/1986), which includes a practical reasoning and creative intelligence that allows one to distinguish "objects of immediate desire from genuinely desirable objects" (p. 27). Dewey's creative intelligence is particularly important because it centers the meaning of intelligent on acts of creating possibilities that cannot be easily observed in present situations, but can be imagined and in turn sought in future situations. It is Dewey's creative intelligence that drives the ongoing project of becoming.

Van Manen situates pedagogy theoretically as "all those affairs where adults are living with children for the sake of those children's well-being, growth, maturity, and development" (1991a, p. 28). This is an expansive consideration of pedagogy, much like the becoming for which Garrison is interested. Pedagogy, for van Manen, is more about the good, the decent, and the beneficial in dealing with children, than it is about a predetermined rational set of responses to pre-existing truths. It is about a teacher living with his or her students in order to imagine what is possible (1991a, 1991b). In this sense, van Manen's pedagogy is one example of Dewey's creative intelligence.

Garrison and van Manen, in their resistance to technocratic notions of teaching, do not offer a whimsical image of teacher. Consider the task at hand for Garrison's teacher, the prophet. "Prophets have the passionate capacity to recognize the needs and desires of people and places, name them, and respond imaginatively by naming and striving to create the needful values" (1997, p. 136). Prophets have the ability to imagine and to create possibilities. For Dewey, this project involves, in part, a penetrating criticism that allows one to *see* possibilities that are otherwise hidden by the actual conditions present in given situations (1934/1980). Dewey's criticism allows the teacher, according to Garrison, to bestow the possibilities of love and freedom on his or her students. This is something much different than diagnosing a need and then going to a list of prescribed strategies to find the answer. The prophet does not operate this way.

That said, one must not reject an intuitive recognition or perceptivity on the part of the prophet and an appropriate response. Garrison thinks that prophets recognize the needs and desires of the individual student (not what someone else has said the student should desire), and then respond in a manner that helps the

student discern between the desired and the truly desirable. For Garrison, this response is aimed at a better destiny—a destiny where students become free authors of their own lives. The prophet must bravely exercise a creative imagination that confidently appraises the desirability of various courses of action. This means that teachers must set out to imaginatively create or reveal, "alternative possibilities...if those possibilities turn out, on appraisal, to be truly desirable...[and] to...imagine intensely beyond knowledge of established fact or any actual state of affairs" (Garrison, 1997, p. 134). Imagining beyond knowledge or established fact echoes Dewey's desire for a poetic, rather than scientific, way of living in the world because the former focuses on endless possibility and the latter on something fixed (1934/1980).

How would, for example, the prophet's passionate capacity be described in a KSD framework? Assuming that having a passionate capacity is disposition-like, one might consider writing it as a disposition statement. Interestingly, disposition statements such as "Middle School Teacher Candidates...believe that all young adolescents can learn and accept responsibility to help them do so" (National Middle School Association, 2005, p. 4), while important to include in a framework, tend to feel general and abstract. Using Garrison's description of passionate capacity could deepen the disposition. For me, adding Garrison's "recogniz[ing] the needs and desires of people and places...and respond[ing] imaginatively" to the existing statement, "believ[ing] all young adolescents can learn and accept[ing] responsibility to help them do so," accomplishes three things. First, it makes an existing abstract belief more specific. Second, it moves away from teachers being disposed to something and moves toward teachers making an active commitment to do something. Third, Garrison's utterance gives the learner agency and situates the pedagogue as one who envisions possibilities with the learner.

Like Garrison, van Manen describes his pedagogue as one who can recognize and respond imaginatively. For van Manen, teachers do not necessarily deal with clearly defined problems as much as they deal with emergent "situations, predicaments, possibilities, and difficulties" (1991a, p. 107). Such situations resemble Dewey's vision of democracy in that they are about a way of living that constantly changes based on circumstances. The pedagogue, to van Manen, is never done dealing with situations, because the situations are always changing. The pedagogical response to situations is focused more on understanding the meaning of the situation than on solving a problem with any finality. The pedagogue and his or her student are always becoming.

Pedagogical meaning questions...deal with the meaning of experiences [and] must be better or more deeply understood, so that on the basis of this understanding [one] may be able to act more thoughtfully and tactfully in this and future situations. (van Manen, 1991a, p. 108)

Naturally, van Manen's pedagogue is more interested in meaning and understanding questions than he or she is interested in problem-solving questions. The pedagogue is faced with many great challenges when he or she begins to see students' experi-

ences as possibilities rather than problems. One of the challenges the pedagogue faces is determining how "to stand close enough to the child to want what is best for the child, and to stand far enough away from the child to know what is best for the child" (p. 96), both of which involve Garrison's appraisal. One might imagine conscious decision-making here; this would be partially correct. However, van Manen's pedagogy is more than a decision-maker, primarily because the action-present of pedagogical situations calls the pedagogue to act tactfully and thoughtfully in these situations, without necessarily stopping to reflect and then deciding what to do. Van Manen's pedagogy acts:

Tactful action is thoughtful in that the educator shows appropriate sensitivity to what is good and required in a situation... Tactful action is an "instant thinking acting" that cannot be fully reflective—in other words, it is not really the outcome of a problem-solving process or a decision-making activity. (p. 118)

In sum, the prophetic, tactful pedagogue is one who leads the learner toward growth, has the passionate capacity to imagine and create, and focuses more on meaning and understanding questions than on problem-solving questions. With this image in mind, I now identify four ways in which a prophetic, tactful pedagogy can be described and, in turn, can deepen the KSD discourse around good teaching. I begin by describing how teachers should think about their teaching like they think about their living in the world. I then invoke Garrison's ideas regarding Dewey's notions of growth and deliberation to further deepen the KSD discourse. Finally, I discuss van Manen's notion of the pedagogical moment.

Teaching as Living

Teachers need to think about their lives as teachers as they might think of their lives in general. Garrison feels that "Everyone passionately desires to possess what is good, or at least what they perceive as good, and to live a life of ever-expanding meaning and value" (1997, p. 1). Teachers' lives, then, are a process of becoming, not a process of aiming at a prescribed target, and their own growth is also important in imagining their lives with students.

Of course, in classrooms teachers' lives are pedagogical. Teachers exist in order to help their students learn. Van Manen goes so far to say that teachers' pedagogical stances should be *in loco parentis* primarily because

parenting and teaching derive from the same fundamental experience of pedagogy: the human charge of protecting and teaching the young to live in this world and to take responsibility for themselves, for others, and for the continuance and welfare of the world. (1991a, p. 7)

Teachers must learn to live with their students in ways that allow for this growth. This is different than determining how students should live. This deterministic approach could be likened to a Freiran banking model of education, where the

teacher (as Plato's philosopher king) determines the way to live and then attempts to "deposit" these ways to live into his or her students' lives (1970/2002). This concerns Garrison, as "it would be arrogant, inhuman, and destructive for teachers to be like philosopher kings in their classrooms. We live better if we learn to live with loss. It is better to be vulnerable" (1997, p. 19). Dewey's poetic moral prophets are more appealing to Garrison, and perhaps van Manen, in that prophets aim to reveal the beautiful possibilities that lie underneath the predetermined factual ways of life. In fact, Garrison and van Manen might agree that it is most desirable for a teacher and his or her students to live together as teacher-student and student-teacher—learning from and with each other at the same time. The risk, of course, is that absolutists might determine that teachers are somehow abdicating their pedagogical (*in loco parentis*) responsibility. Teachers and students are not equals. Teachers have more power.

These statements would be reasonable. The teacher does have more power; the teacher has lived longer, experienced more, is expected to be wiser, and is expected to be the pedagogical prophet. The student does not and should not have these same pedagogical expectations. In other words, the student-teacher relationship is not reciprocal. "The relationship between teacher and student cannot always be entirely reciprocal. That would be an unfair expectation. Reciprocity in relationships need not be shown merely by simple mirror reflection" (Garrison, 1997, p. 74). Instead of a mirror reflection, reciprocity in the teacher-student relationship can be described in the same manner that I have described the larger idea of the pedagogical relationship—as a Deweyan (1896) coordination. Teacher and student are not equals, nor are they separate entities. Instead, student and teacher work with one another, toward particular ends, in particular ways, for particular purposes—always in relationship with one another. A curious dilemma then surfaces—how do teachers learn to live in this manner? Utilizing the KSD discourse, what knowledge and skills would a teacher need to learn in order to become prophetic and tactful?

The Paradox of Expansive Growth

Garrison's description of the "paradoxical logic of expansive growth" requires teachers, in part, to learn to care for others (their students) and allow others to care for them. Without this coordination, neither teachers nor their students will grow. "Those who need to be needed find their own good in caring for others and providing for the good of their charges. If they are wise they will also allow others to care for them" (Garrison, 1997, p. 47). The fulfillment that can be attained by participating in one another's lives was central to Dewey when he stated that "shared experience is the greatest of human goods" (qtd. in Garrison, p. 47). This participation, however, involves a growth that is marked by loss.

In order to grow, the teacher must embrace Garrison's notion of vulnerability—learning to live with loss. Living with loss allows teachers to live better lives, be more perceptive, and grow wiser in becoming aware of their students lives—their

needs, desires, and dreams. Teachers must embrace loss in order to help their students grow. This paradox of growth, while not explicit in van Manen's description of the pedagogue's perception, is present in a subtle way:

Excellent teachers are those who are both smart and yet who find difficulty easy to understand. Teachers need to be experts at alternative points-of-view, perspectives, outlooks, biases, orientations. They need to be able to see things from the child's viewpoint. (1991a, pp. 192-193)

Van Manen emphasizes that when a teacher recognizes a student's vulnerability, it weakens the teacher and calls the teacher to feel responsible for the child. The use of the word *weaken* does not necessarily mean the opposite of strong. Rather, it means the pedagogue allows himself or herself to let go and turn to the child's need. Garrison and van Manen both acknowledge that perception is not enough, however. As Garrison writes, "We must be able to reason well to obtain the values we desire for others or ourselves; it is necessary to know how to make, create, and bestow love. That requires *techne*, the skill and knowledge of making" (1997, p. 59). There must be action; there must be a response. There must be practical knowledge and skill. This presents another paradox—while perception is essential, it is also not enough. For van Manen, the pedagogue responds tactfully—not in a tactical application of theory-to-practice decision-making or problem-solving—but tactfully "as mindfulness that permits us to act thoughtfully with children and young people" (1991a, p. 128).

How does one come to experience tact in practice? For van Manen there is a number of ways that tact shows itself in the action of the pedagogue. There can be tact in the voice and speech of the teacher. The teacher might talk softly at times to gain attention or might talk loudly for emphasis. The teacher might make utterances that are more understandable for the perplexed student and make utterances that are more challenging for the sharp student. Tact might be experienced through silence. The teacher might not respond to a question because it can wait. The teacher might ignore a mistake in spelling (for the time being) because the ideas are so beautiful. Tact might be experienced through the eyes and gestures of the teacher. The teacher might show sympathetic eyes and open arms (literally). The teacher might frown or scowl at times.

These are all embodied ways that teachers and students experience the phenomenon of tact—more specifically, pedagogical tact. In other words, teachers live (or don't live) tactfully.

Vicarious Deliberation

Another way to envision a prophetic, tactful pedagogy is to invoke Garrison's portrayal of Dewey's imaginative moral reasoning and vicarious deliberation. For Dewey, the act of deliberation is situational and serves as the nexus among the past, present, and future (1922/1983). It is in the present situation that lessons learned from the past reside; that action takes place; and where imaginative forethought

keeps the action conscious to the individual. Through vicarious deliberation, then, teachers can safely try things out—take action in the present—without having to deal with the consequences.

Lensmire invoked a somewhat vicarious deliberation in response to one of his chief concerns with writer's workshop—that advocates of writers workshop want teachers to support "the direction of students' stories without asking them [teachers] to consider—and without asking students to consider—where these stories lead" (2000, p. 98). Drawing upon Dewey's (1922/1983) deliberation as "a dramatic rehearsal of various competing lines of action" (qtd. in Lensmire, p. 98), Lensmire felt that children's stories are imaginative places that allow students to experiment with their own and other's responses to their actions.

Garrison sees the dramatic narrative in much the same manner, although one is reminded that Garrison emphasizes how this type of experience can be more vicarious. "Dramatic narratives are excellent instances of vicarious experience, but not overt fact, wherein students may imaginatively indulge their desires" (1997, pp. 144-145). For me, the primary point is not whether deliberation of this sort is (or should be) considered more or less vicariously. Rather, the primary point is how Garrison and Lensmire draw upon Dewey's deliberation in ways that offer teachers and their students spaces to explore possibilities in imaginative ways. Dewey's deliberation situates teachers and students with one another in the vagueness and indeterminacy of becoming.

What does this mean for the pedagogical prophet? It seems that first and foremost it means that the prophet must create spaces for students to indulge. This requires knowledge, skills, and dispositions. This seems most apparent—taking Garrison's and Lensmire's lead—in writing classrooms where students have opportunities to share stories, imagine alternatives, add characters, let them take action, and so on. This might be less apparent in other classrooms—for example, in mathematics, social studies, and science classrooms—if it were not for the pedagogical prophet's imagination. These teachers also can imagine, can live vicariously, can play with alternatives, and can consider possibilities.

The teacher of mathematics might pose an analytic problem for his or her students that can be solved in multiple ways. The solution would involve organizing the problem and identifying which functions and algorithms might help solve the problem. However, the way in which the students proceed makes room for a number of potential responses. The teacher of science might ask students to conduct their own inquiry in order to deal with an issue in the community—this might include specific parameters of what a good inquiry includes (like a good story would)—but would then allow students to imagine possible solutions. The teacher of social studies might do the same around an issue in the community but take a sociopolitical stance on the issue. Better yet, the pedagogical prophet might adopt a stance like Beane does when he advocates for one of the hallmarks of middle grades teaching—curriculum integration; which Beane describes as "a curriculum design theory that is concerned with enhancing the possibilities for personal and social

integration through the organization of curriculum around significant problems and issues, collaboratively identified by educators and young people, without regard for subject-area lines" (1997, p. 19).

For Beane, the teacher is not the sole decision-maker. Beane asks the teacher to work alongside students to determine issues and problems that are of interest and that allow students to imagine responses. For example, the classroom might be a safe, somewhat vicarious place for students to address social concerns regarding race. The teacher and student might feel safe to play out their responses within the confines of the classroom. In this way, the experience is somewhat vicarious. However, as anyone who has worked in schools might attest, the classroom is not necessarily a safe haven; teachers and students experience very real issues in the classroom.

To summarize, the pedagogical prophet must dare to imagine. He or she must take risks. From a technical standpoint the teacher must plan to imagine, meaning that the teacher must literally write lesson plans in imaginative ways. The lesson plan—the intentional design of the educational experience—is a place to deliberate vicariously. Again, the beauty of Dewey's deliberation is that it is a place of imagination (1922/1983). In one respect, it is a temporary suspension of reality. Teachers can use this space to try out alternative ways of teaching, without having to suffer the consequences of overt action. It is a rehearsal to the degree that a teacher can reflect on past habit, welcome new ideas spurred by a Deweyan impulsion (1934/1980), and then consider what action might be taken.

However, once the teacher is with students pedagogically, the plan becomes lived. The plan now has consequences, very real ones, for the students and the teacher. The teacher may design the plan with his or her students in mind, carefully considering how Billy or Tim will engage in the activity, but in the pedagogical situation the teacher will not be able to control everything that happens. The teacher must let go and live with his or her students. The plan may be working as intended (and it may be a great plan), but now Tim poses a question that the teacher did not anticipate. In that moment, the teacher responds. The teacher does not pause, reflect upon possible solutions, and then respond. The teacher responds in the living situation, which van Manen terms the "pedagogical moment."

Pedagogical Moments

For van Manen, to recognize pedagogical moments and then take pedagogical action means that teachers first recognize that they are responsive to a child's calling for a response. "Feeling called upon is therefore the deeper significance, the life-meaning of being an educator, a parent, a pedagogue" (1991a, p. 97). As previously established, teachers should act as pedagogical prophets. Not yet established, is what these pedagogical moments might look like. Where are they? How do they happen? Better yet, can teachers make them happen?

Garrison believes these moments (which he terms "teachable") are basically

hidden from the research on teaching, because researchers "do not acknowledge the existence of the precognitive qualitative background, insightfulness, teachers' (and students') intuitions, or the importance of mood and feeling to intuition" (1997, pp. 118-119). Dewey stresses that the immediate existence of quality is the basis of all thinking (1930/1984). Sharing Dewey's feelings about the primacy of precognitive quality, Garrison states that if researchers researched these aspects (e.g., the intuitive, the imagined) of teaching one could actually create more teachable moments.

Tracing pedagogy back to its earlier roots, the pedagogue is seen as one who leads or accompanies the child and lives with the "child in such a way as to provide direction and care" (van Manen, 1991b, p. 38). The teacher might imagine moments in which he or she is called to provide this direction. It is at the point of this call to action that the pedagogical moment exists. One of van Manen's examples, when opened up a bit, illustrates this point quite nicely. "Rob refuses to participate in the science lesson since he feels repugnance toward killing a living creature and dissecting it" (1991b, p. 39). There are 25 other students ready to begin, but Rob sits with his arms crossed. What does the teacher do? Remember, the plan is to dissect; it is next in the scope and sequence of the curriculum. It is a local school system requirement. There is no policy for alternative assignments that will satisfy this requirement. There will most likely be a couple of questions on the standardized test about anatomical parts of the frog. What does the teacher do? There is no time to refer to (reflect on) any text or even prior experiences. The teacher must act. This is a pedagogical moment. Rob is living in a particular way, with particular desires. He is making a bold move to assert what he desires. What does the teacher do? The teacher must act.

Interestingly, Garrison's teachable moment not only involves the calling of van Manen's pedagogical moment, but also moves toward mutual growth for the student and the teacher. For Garrison teachable moments are times when spaces

open for the student and teacher to interact in a synchronistic and dynamic rhythm. It is like having a good dance partner. During these moments there is a special or enhanced quality of intimacy, openness, and creativity coupled with an experience of students or teachers having an "aha!" experience. (1997, p. 122)

The teacher and student, in relation to one another experience a moment of togetherness around the student's learning. The teachable moment is important because the teacher and student "share feelings of doubt, intuit qualities simultaneously, and initiate inquiries concurrently. What sustains the teachable moment is their creative exploration of imaginary possibilities together" (p. 122).

Intuiting qualities provides a bridge between Garrison and van Manen's work, primarily because these qualities are the prescientific, the prereflective, and the preknowledge to which van Manen refers. They are not "constructed" knowledge. Rather, quality "...is the immediate 'given'" (Garrison, 1997, p. 104). Husserl attempts to explain this realm of intuited givenness when he says we must

"go straight back to the supposedly immediately given sense-data, as if *they* were immediately characteristic of the purely intuitive data of the life-world. What is actually first is the merely subjective-relative" (1954/1970, p. 125) intuition of pre-scientific world-life.

Like Husserl, Dewey saw that we relate to the world primarily through the qualitative, contextual whole of the situations in which we find ourselves (1930/1984). Our knowledge of the world is something different, as it represents our conceptions of situations and not the intuited aspects of our experiences. In van Manen's *tactful* action, how one sees, hears, and feels tact is considered. These sense-data are given to the experiencer as are Garrison's intuited qualities. Teachers and students sense (hear, feel, see) these qualities. They may or may not discuss them in any satisfactory way, but this mutual intuiting may lead them to imagine possibilities together through the child's writing, through the child's story-telling, through the child's reading, or through the child's problem-solving in math and science. All of this involves a commitment to seeing the child and responding to the child's pedagogical call in the pedagogical moment.

Closing Thoughts

I have attempted to describe dimensions of pedagogy that tend to be embedded in or obscured by the KSD discourse. I have suggested that teachers should think about their teaching like they think about their living in the world. I have drawn upon Garrison's understanding of Dewey's desire, deliberation, and inquiry. I have entertained an image of the teacher as prophet and considered how story and narrative might open up spaces for students (and teachers) to explore possibilities—maybe even finding themselves in teachable moments with one other. I have also drawn upon van Manen's notions of pedagogy, action, thoughtfulness, and tact. I have invited his image of the teacher as pedagogue and considered how one might use sense-data to see (feel, hear) pedagogical responses to pedagogical moments.

Of course, this is only the beginning of a larger project aimed at deepening the KSD discourse. There are innumerable ways to proceed. In fact each time a rubric is created to measure a teacher's knowledge, skills, and dispositions there is opportunity for more depth. For example, what if Lesko's call for a discourse on adolescence that is recursive and contingent was used to deepen the KSD discourse? In other words, what if good teaching was described recursively and contingently? A teacher's knowledge, skills, and dispositions for teaching would grow and change over and over through particular situations, rather than in stages or steps along a fixed, predictable timeline.

It is challenging to work across more traditional (e.g., the KSD discourse) and more critical (e.g., Lesko, 2001) discourses of good teaching. Indeed, it feels more comfortable to rely on one discourse or another, but not both. At the beginning of this article, I asserted a dominant discourse around good teaching—one critical theorists would most likely label traditional in that it appears to reinforce "existing relations of power, by blindly accepting and transferring unexamined bodies of

knowledge as factual information" (Brown & Saltman, 2005, p. 1). While I consider my work more critical than traditional, I am equally drawn to Dewey's resistance to dualisms, and I see the traditional vs. critical discourses as a dualism. For me, it is not a problem to try to determine what knowledge, skills, and dispositions constitute good teaching. However, it is a problem to treat them as absolutes—void of context, difference, critical examination, expansion, contraction, culture, race, sexuality, politics, power, and so on.

The move I prefer, and one I have made in this manuscript, is the move Dewey would ask us to make: to avoid either-or logic and proceed more deeply. In this article, I moved from a framework of good teaching and learning that is more traditional than critical. From there, I went deeper into pedagogical knowledge by calling upon Garrison's and van Manen's images of good teaching. While these images do not settle anything in regards to pedagogical knowledge, I do think they provide a more robust image of the pedagogue. They place good teaching where it should be placed—squarely on the coordinated relationship the teacher has with his or her students for the good of those students.

With this relationship in mind, how might the KSD discourse around good teaching be deepened? Perhaps teacher education programs could draw upon Dewey, Garrison, and van Manen to craft a statement about good teaching that includes the following.

We would like our teacher candidates to

- know how to make, create, and bestow love;
- have the skill and knowledge of making;
- make wise choices about issues that have indeterminate possible responses;
- be prepared to deliberate (to imagine) with their students;
- be prepared to discern what is desired from what is truly desirable;
- to not only recognize the pedagogical moment, but to respond in a pedagogical manner;
- to experience the beautifully rhythmic dance of the teachable moment;
- to be prepared for the loss, for the vulnerability of not knowing how to respond but having to respond anyway;
- to be prophets;
- to be tactful;
- to be (and help their students to be) free authors of their own lives; and
- to be prepared to live pedagogically with their students.

References

- Beane, J. A. (1997). *Curriculum integration: Designing the core of democratic education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Britzman, D. P. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Brown, E. R., & Saltman, K. J. (Eds.). (2005). *The critical middle school reader*. New York: Routledge.

- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1993). *Inside outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Connelly, M. F. & Clandinin, J. D. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2-14.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dewey, J. (1896). The reflex arc concept in psychology. *Psychological Review*, 3, 357-370. Retrieved April 23, 2003, from http://spartan.ac.brocku.ca/~lward/dewey/Dewey_1896.html.
- Dewey, J. (1980). *Art as experience*. New York: Perigree Books. (Original work published 1934).
- Dewey, J. (1981). Experience and nature. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works of John Dewey, 1925-1953* (Vol. 1). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1925).
- Dewey, J. (1983). *Human nature and conduct: An introduction to social psychology*. New York: H. Holt and Company. (Original work published 1922).
- Dewey, J. (1984). Qualitative thought. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works of John Dewey, 1925-1953* (Vol. 5, pp. 243-262). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1930).
- Dewey, J. (1986). Logic: The theory of inquiry. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works of John Dewey, 1925-1953* (Vol. 12). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1938).
- Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier Books. (Original work published 1938).
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 212-33). New York: Macmillan.
- Freire, P. (2002). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc. (Original work published 1970).
- Garrison, J. (1997). *Dewey and eros: Wisdom and desire in the art of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hargraeves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teacher's work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Husserl, E. (1970). *The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology: An introduction to phenomenological philosophy* (D. Carr, Trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1954).
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Lensmire, T. J. (2000). *Powerful writing, responsible teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lesko, N. (2001). *Act your age: A cultural construction of adolescence*. New York: Routledge/Falmer.

- Liston, D. P. & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). *Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- National Middle School Association. (2005). *National middle school association initial level teacher preparation standards: Program standards for middle level teacher preparation*. Retrieved June 25, 2007 from http://www.nmsa.org/portals/0/doc/preparation/standards/NMSA_Initial_Standards_July_2005.doc.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *Reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 5-14.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, 1-22.
- van Manen, M. (1991a). *The tact of teaching: The meaning of pedagogical thoughtfulness*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- van Manen, M. (1991b). Reflectivity and the pedagogical moment: The normativity of pedagogical thinking and acting. *Curriculum Studies*, 23(6), 507-536.
- van Manen, M., & Li, S. (2002). The pathic principle of pedagogical language. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 215-224.
- York-Barr, J., Sommers, W. A., Ghere, G. S., & Montie, J. (2001). *Reflective practice to improve schools: An action guide for educators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1996). *Reflective practice: An Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mark D. Vagle is Assistant Professor in the Department of Elementary and Social Studies Education at The University of Georgia.
Email: mvagle@uga.edu