

resources perhaps we will have more time for the human aspects of education.

Below, some tactics are enumerated that might address this global challenge. Some may have already been implemented on various campuses. We should challenge each other to think of new and creative tactics to make an impact.

- (1) Encourage students to become campus leaders
- (2) Encourage agriculture faculty to become campus leaders
- (3) Give a 30-second commercial for agriculture any time you get the chance
- (4) Teach more science courses for non-science majors
- (5) Develop partnerships with industry
- (6) Organize faculty tours each year
- (7) Provide training/orientation for new faculty
- (8) Educate business managers about science and technology so they can institute innovations
- (9) Develop industry mentorships
- (10) Use technology to deliver/assist instruction

(11) Develop consortia for course development

(12) Share expertise across the U.S.

There are many useful models for addressing our educational, technical and international challenges. Share your ideas and models with each other so that all of education and agriculture will benefit.

References

- (1) Molnar, Andrew R. 1988. "Information and communications technology: Today and in the future." Speech delivered to the Royal Swedish Academy of Engineering Sciences (IVA), Stockholm, Sweden, October 27, 1988.
- (2) Newman, Frank. 1987. *Choosing Quality*. Commission of the States, Denver Co. 121 pp.
- (3) "Technology and the American Economic Transition: Choices for the future". Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), Washington, DC. 1988.
- (4) "Demographic trends and the scientific and engineering work force," OTA, Washington, DC. 1985.
- (5) "Power On!: New tools for teaching and learning". OTA, Washington, DC. 1988.
- (6) Kulik, James. Center for Research and Teaching and Learning, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- (7) Boyer, Ernest. 1987. The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the view of IBM. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*. Harper and Row, New York.

Facilitating Development of a Sense of Self

W. Lee Humphreys

I recently had the chance to talk with two students at a college I was visiting. We were discussing their experiences in certain key courses in their academic programs. Each began by stating that he or she got more out of this or that course than the grade received indicated. I asked what they meant, for I hear that from my own students sometimes and at times from others. They told me about how their experiences in these courses allowed them to grow, how affirmed they felt in their attempts to reach out in new directions or to try new skills. They spoke of new selves, richer and deeper, able more effectively to engage the world.

One told me how he came for the first time to value deeply his own heritage, the writings and customs and social patterns of his region. He spoke of coming to know them in ways that made him proud. And then he said that this allowed him truly to understand and value the heritage of others, to respect traditions and ways of life that he would before have held at arms length and even scorned as odd. "When you respect and understand yourself you can respect and understand others as well," captures the essence of what he said.

The other student told me of reading and writing about the world of one of her grandparents, whom the family rarely mentioned and of whom it seemed a bit ashamed. She said, "I can now imagine what she must have been like. And I like her, and like myself because I like her and find some of myself in her as I imagine

Humphreys is the Director of the Learning Research Center, University of Tennessee and presented this invited paper at the 35th Annual NACTA Conference at Knoxville, June 11-14, 1989.

her." As she discovered new roots she found a more fully nuanced self in herself.

I then asked each student what the grades were that they received. One was a B+ and the other a B. But they felt that what they got out of these courses was more than these grades indicated. In fact, it was of an order and type that cannot be neatly summed up in a grade.

I was struck that what these students spoke of was not simply information that they memorized, although they spoke of that. Nor did they center on basic skills attained, although these were mentioned as well. Behind the stuff and skills of course content they spoke of "self," of what they were and were becoming. They spoke less of the attainment of the basic skills and details of presentation needed for research papers. They talked of an "empowering," of being able to shape questions about our lives in our world, or to recognize and define problems, and then address them with answers or solutions.

For the last several years I have taught a course with UTK's Chancellor. It is called "The Sense of Self." In it we explore that slippery thing we call a "self." We look in the readings at some selves that are small, miserly, cramped; we look also at some that are expansive, rich, alive and enlivening. We look at some that seem stuck or frozen and at others that are growing and dynamic. And we explore what some of the factors are that shape and reshape, that expand or constrict, a self and sense of self.

Two things have struck me as we explore the sense of self in the readings and writing we do and as we talk

about our selves as well. First, a person is not fixed at age 16 or 18 or 21. We continue to grow and develop in profound and moving ways throughout the course of life. It is probably one of the most fundamental developments in psychology in the last twenty-five years that this has been recognized — at the popular level in the work of Gail Sheehy and others and at the more theoretical level in the work of Erik Erikson and the many influenced by his work.

The second striking thing is that educational experiences play a profound, and too often negative, role in the development of the sense of self. The two students of whom I just spoke point this out in a striking manner, and they show how positive a force education can be.

Too often the experiences in education that play a role in shaping a self are not as positive as those reported by these two. Too often they are experiences that cramp, limit, freeze. they are largely experiences of failure, or, as one student put it, "of feeling dumb." They are experiences of having brought home to you what it is you do not know, with little acknowledgement of what you do know, or what you cannot do, with little recognition of what you can do. Students speak of experiences of failure because of risks they took: an idea tried did not pan out, an experiment that did not lead to expected results. They tell how teachers respond by foregrounding how they fell short, while giving little recognition to the courage to risk or to what skill they may have shown.

I would like to explore some perspectives on our teaching that will allow our courses to be more positive forces in helping shape selves that are expansive, open, enlivened and enlivening. I am not going to suggest that we change the content — the stuff and skills — that are at the heart of our courses. I am interested rather in what we do with it, how our students encounter it. I am suggesting that we must be aware of the impact of our teaching on the sense of self of our students, and this for several reasons. First, it is in these terms that they often experience and speak of our courses. Perhaps of even more importance is the fact that mastery of content is profoundly interrelated with one's sense of self and the impact a course and teacher have on the development of that self.

Successful Beginnings

Beginnings are important, so I will begin with two beginnings. The first was devised by a colleague, and it sparked my own attempt.

His course is introductory Portuguese — first day, first term, first year. The class is waiting and the instructor is about five minutes late. Finally, in he strides, muttering to himself, clearly angry. He seems surprised to see the class. He turns his tirade on them as the mutterings become more audible — but they remain in Portuguese. After about two minutes of this he stops, smiles at them, and asks "What did I say?"

"How are we to know?" they reply, "It was in Portuguese." That's what they are here to learn, and its only the first day!

"How did you know it was Portuguese?" he asked.

"Well, that's what this class is, so we thought . . ."

"Good. Are you sure you can't figure out at least some of what I said? Wasn't a word or so like words you know?"

And so it went for fifteen or twenty minutes. Working first as a whole and then in smaller groups, and building on affect, gesture, cognates, and such, the class pieced together that he had an argument with his department head.

Of course he carefully planned and staged all this. But his message to the class was clear at the end of the experience: "You know more than you think and can do more than you suspect you can. Now let's build on that; let's deepen it and make it more systematic."

When I asked him why he did this he told me he wanted to begin the course with an experience of success, with what his students know and can do, and not with what they did not know or were unable to do. Beginning a language is a daunting experience for many students. Past experiences are often of failure. Foreign language study has made many feel stupid. Thus, to begin with presenting the syllabus was to set up requirements that from their perspective might seem like more chances to fail, to feel dumb. He wanted his students to begin feeling able, empowered, successful.

This conversation sparked my reflections on how I begin my courses. Like most I devote the first class to the course outline or syllabus. My intent is to present it as a set of opportunities and challenges, to set a tone of eager expectation and excitement. I now suspect that many students perceive it in a quite different manner. More hurdles to struggle over, more obstacles, chances to trip, falter, fail. "Moreover," they might reflect, "quite likely most of the others in the class are better than me, smarter than me; they will beat me out, they will win and I will lose." Or if the students are of a more suspicious or savy nature: "What are the real rules of this game?" What's his hidden agenda? How can I beat him out of an A?"

This insecurity, these suspicions, these self-doubts, are deeply ingrained, founded on too many experiences of failure in education, to many encounters with obstacles, with hidden curricula and criteria. The first session of any one course will not overcome them. However, there is no more effective place to begin, as long as the beginning sets a tone that will play through the course.

I recently attempted to build a new beginning of my own, for a course on the Jewish religious traditions that begins with the experience of exile and the destruction of the ancient nation of Israel by the armies of the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar. It is a course in which we spend a lot of time with specific texts, so what better way to begin than with a specific text. But I didn't want to have this experience be one of mystification and failure as they await or flounder toward a "right" interpretation that I alone possess.

I selected Psalm 137. I began that first class by saying that in this course we will read selected texts together, so the best way to give a feel for the course is to do that right on the first day. I gave them the following text as the one we would explore together in this class hour; together we would see how deeply and widely we could understand it.

By the waters of Babylon,
there we sat down and wept,
when we remembered Zion.
On the willows there
we hung up our lyres,
For there our captors
required of us songs,
and our tormentors, mirth, saying
"Sing us one of the songs of Zion!"
How shall we sing the Lord's song
in a foreign land?
If I forget you, O Jerusalem
let my right hand wither!
Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth,
if I do not remember you,
if I do not set Jerusalem
above my highest joy!
Remember, O Yahweh, against the Edomites
the day of Jerusalem,
how they said, "Rase it, rase it!
Down to its foundations!"
O daughter of Babylon, you devastator!
Happy shall he be who requites you with what
you have done to us!
Happy shall he be who takes your little ones
and dashes them against the rock!

I asked them to read it over alone several times. Then I asked them to jot down responses to a range of such questions as:

- What are the key themes of this text?
- What are key words that capture that theme for you?
- What is the mood of the text?
- How does it make you feel?
- Does the mood change, and if so where?
- What do you feel at the end of the text?
- What sort of situation or experience might provoke someone to write this psalm?
- When have you felt like this?
- What might you want to know about the person who wrote this or the events that sparked it that would help you understand it even more fully?

I asked them to reflect and write individually at first. Then I asked them to share their jottings in groups of three, and then with the whole class.

The questions are rather standard I suspect, but they are paired to move constantly to the students, to privilege them as readers making meanings in their encounters with this text.

Their response takes time, to my surprise the exercise fills the first hour. They are able to relate to

the text, to its expressions of grief — the hurt ("We sat down and wept"), the disbelief or denial ("If I forget you . . ."), to the dislocation ("How can we sing . . ."), the anger ("dashes them against the rocks"). Themes and key words emerge. They reconstruct out of their own experiences of loss and dislocation, the sort of situation that might have provoked this text: a death or other type of loss, a faith that no longer sustains, memories that haunt, pain and anger that makes one want to strike out in any direction.

If we take time with the responses to the last question, they in fact come up with most of the central themes that shape the course. The material on the board, which is my attempt to capture what they have said and asked, reflected, in fact, the course outline, its key topics, and at points offered a most effective way of construing them. They had engaged in creative and meaningful ways a text like many we would read. We would now try to deepen and systematize what they had shown they were able to do.

I felt the class a success — their success. It was a successful beginning.

Theoretical Groundings

From a range of perspectives there is a solid foundation for building on success if we wish to facilitate learning and a richer sense of self. Positive reinforcement is found to be more effective than negative; rewards more effective than punishment. A person who puts her hand on a hot stove, for *example*, learns not to do so again. But she does not learn what she might do with her hand. A graceful gesture is complimented and it will be repeated, perhaps with innovation. A student told that his argument is unclear may well be left with little direction for the future other than what to avoid. Elements that are identified as clean and compelling will be repeated and provide a base upon which one can build.

Of special interest is the theoretical grounding provided by a range of recent studies of patterns of human development in cognition, valuing, and other areas. Included are some that have attracted attention in higher education in recent years. Best known perhaps is the work of William G. Perry (1970) concerning what he terms "intellectual and ethical development" during the college years, especially among males. Related is the work of Mary F. Belenky and her colleagues (1986) in the development of ways in which women construct meanings and construe authority. Their work is at key points in conversation with that of Perry. There exists also the many studies in the area of moral judgment conducted by Lawrence Kohlberg and his associates (1981); recently this has been nuanced and critiqued from the perspective of woman's experience by Carol Gilligan (1982). There is also the work of James Fowle (1981) on stages of faith development. Robert Kegan (1983) has attempted to integrate a number of these studies in a metatheory of human development that incorporates a number of domains. Kegan builds on the roots of developmental

theory in the formative research of Jean Piaget and Erik Erickson.

While these studies present data and reflections related to several more or less distinct areas of human activity, there are broad similarities in the depiction they offer of the development of human beings in at least the dominant cultures of the western world. Critical for all these studies are questions of what constitutes meaning for an individual. How are meanings constructed? How does one learn? What defines truth? What is the nature of authority and where is it located? What is one to make of divergent points of view, of ambivalence? What is the relationship of the self to the other? At a minimum these studies provide heuristic scheme by means of which instructors can come to understand and appreciate the ways students encounter and experience the content of courses, the modes of instruction, and their instructors. (See, for example, Mullins, 1988.)

Most students begin by locating the sources of authority, meaning, morality or truth outside themselves in other powerful figures. Teachers have answers and are even the only ones who know the right questions; the student's role is to take down and in what they say and give it back when asked questions on tests. The moral is what others say is right; to be good is to obey. Who I am is found in how I am reflected in and related to others; I receive my identity from them and what they tell me of myself.

In time, for many, the locus of authority, morality, and truth will shift from outside oneself to within. Often at this point people appear to others as remarkably subjective, and they can annoy. Whatever one believes to be true, right, good is just fine. Everyone should do his or her own thing as long as they do not get in each other's way. I'll come up with my own answer or belief and I'm really not overly interested in yours. If in the earlier mode, students like science and math because they appear to give clear answers to tidy questions, and are usually taught that way. In the next stage, some come to enjoy literature or religious studies, because it appears that anyone can come up with interpretation that is as good as anyone else's.

In time, some people move into more complex stages in which authority, truth, the right and good emerge through complex interactions and conversations between self and others, the individual and the world.

It is recognized as possible and even desirable that "authorities" may differ in the answers they provide to significant questions or the approaches they take to key problems. Ambiguity is acknowledged in important areas of life, and often a person must make a commitment in the face of several attractive or viable options. Students begin to act more like genuine colleagues as they develop in this manner.

This is, of course, just a sketch of a complex process, and progress though it is not as smooth or as

even as an overview implies. I hope it suggests how important some understanding of patterns of human development is for teachers at all levels.

Characteristic of all of these patterns of development is an implied, if not explicit, value component in the trajectories they trace. From a range of perspectives the positions at the "higher" or more "advanced" ends of the trajectories (our very terms betray our valuing of them) are believed to be more mature, versatile, indicative of higher intrapersonal and interpersonal lives. Yet, also characteristic of most of these studies is reluctance to define or highlight this value component implicit in the trajectories (the work of Kohlberg is an exception to this), I suspect that his reluctance is more than a genuflection to the ideal of value-free objectivity that has dominated major areas of the sciences and social sciences (and even the humanities) for too long. This reluctance to underscore the value implications of these trajectories of development is rather rooted in a deep respect by these researchers for their data.

For, at root, their data is composed of individual human lives. At base, their theories are built on the ways individual men and women speak of significant experiences that have shaped them, of how they have changed and grown, of how they learn, of their experiences of self and others, of what and how they value and how judgments are made and justified, of the nature of truth and authority, of who they are. What many readers find most compelling in these studies are the extensive citations from the transcripts of conversations with these individuals. What we have before us in these studies are lives as they unfold and develop through a complex series of stages (and of course it is not as neat as the summaries or charts of the stages make it appear).

Each stage is an advance, a triumph, a new set of potentialities; each marks genuine growth. Each is apt in its time and to be valued in its context. Each is also a limit, a constraint, and a base for further growth. Both facets of the data, of these human lives, must be respected — the triumph and potential as well as the limits as basis for additional development. So to value the highest stage that those that come before are cast in its shadow is to deny them their own integrity. Valuing in this area must be contextual. Attainment of a level or state that from the perspective of those higher would appear limited and limiting may in terms of where one has come from be an impressive success. A student's initial challenge of an authority out there, which may appear to be off the wall and rooted in no more than whim, may also be a first important victory in finding one's own voice, in moving beyond dogged submission to voices out there. Success is as defined by where one has come from as well as where one might go.

Moreover, each of these studies found that success and consolidation at each stage is vital for additional growth and development. Each stage is the foundation upon which the next is built. If that foundation is not

secured and recognized as meaningful in its own right, it will either provide no base for additional growth or what growth there is will be stunted. Consolidation of the triumph that each stage represents is essential, both if one is to recognize its limits and for the additional development that may transcend them. In the terms made popular by Piaget, **assimilation** of the potential of each stage is the basis for **accommodation** of it to new possibilities and experiences, and then to further growth.

Some Implications

A number of more concrete implications seem to follow from this regarding instructors and instruction. I would like to highlight four areas.

1. To succeed, to grow, for a self to develop, people (including students) must do things; they must be active. It is vital that we seek alternatives to modes of instruction that leave students simply as passive receivers of information from instructors who carefully guard their own privileged positions. Of course, we know more and are more skilled than our students. An instructor's knowledge and position grant him or her remarkable power. It is tempting to dazzle students with what we know. It is, by contrast, sometimes painful to watch and allow students struggle to discover what we can so quickly tell or show them. I am convinced that so many instructors lecture so often because they deeply value active learning, and the lecture allows **them** to be active. Unfortunately it also generally demands that students be passive receivers of the fruits of our activity.

An instructor's power is most effectively used, however, to empower students. And that means allowing full exercise of the powers they already have as a base for further powers to develop. As a colleague recently put it: "When I look back on my own education, I do not remember much my instructors said, but I sure do remember what I said and did." The power grounded in our own knowledge and skills as teachers is most effectively used to empower others, and it is the remarkable thing about this sort of power that, when so used, it is not diminished. Learning is not a zero-sum game; to empower students not to give up one's own power.

2. As instructors we shall have to come to know more about students. I do not mean just a few items of information about them personally, although that can be quite helpful. I rather want to suggest that we cannot work with the assumption that one is equipped to teach simply because one knows one's subject well. We have learned a great deal in recent decades about how people learn, how different people learn differently, and how powers to learn develop and change over time. We have also come to a deeper appreciation of the interrelationship between abilities to learn and the development of a sense of self. How one perceives oneself shapes how one learns. Instructors need to equip themselves with some fundamental knowledge of learning theory, must know something about different

styles of learning, must have some grounding in ways learning and selves develop over time in different individuals. The best instructors gain this, if not in some formal study, then through thoughtful observation and reflection on their course and experiences of success and failure with students.

We can no longer assume or act, for example, as if a class of students is a homogeneous group. Each student is a distinct individual, different from others in basic ways that shape how they learn best.

Professor Alvin White, of Harvy Mudd College found himself constantly surprised that a number of students in his math courses did not do well and did not like math. He loved it and always had. He even worked math problems for fun, as recreation. How could so many people dislike and fear math? He was too sensitive to write them off as lazy or just dumb. So he began to talk to many students about their experiences of math and math classes. And he began to discover what Howard Gardner among others has to teach us. Intelligence is not unitary; it cannot be reduced to a simple number. Gardner suggests there are a number of intelligences, or "frames of mind" as he calls them (1985). And these frames of mind are not evenly distributed across all persons. Not all students in Al White's classes had his grace and abilities in logical-mathematical intelligence. Yet, they too can gain some facility in this area, and will need it for life in today's world. So Al White has made it an emphasis of his research to devise ways of helping those for whom math must come with some struggle, and whose past experiences with math have often been devastating, to develop in this area. It is an area of research as complex and as challenging, and as rewarding and formative in its impact on others, as any.

Each student is a distinct individual, quite possibly different from others in basic ways. How do individual students best learn? What are their individual horizons for growth? Upon what past experiences do they build? What do they now value? Ways of coming to know students in these terms are available and can be used.

Clearly in one semester it is not possible to come to know each student in a large class. Fortunately even first efforts with only three or four students will open instructors to something of the diversity within a single class. Start with four; meet with them once a week or so. Discuss the course with them. What appears most important to them? How are they studying? How do they find your and their activity most helpful? Where can things improve? You will find the time well invested.

3. We can be especially sensitive about just what qualifies as success for an individual student, and we can recognize it. This might be as basic as stressing what is right, effective, well done on an essay or test, as well as noting what falls short or is wrong. But we can move beyond this to recognize that what may appear as an opportunity to one student may to another seem one more chance to appear dumb. An opportunity for one

is a barrier for another, and the differences are rooted in each individual as he or she has developed and been shaped by past experiences. Success in learning is as contextual as each individual human life.

A colleague brought this lesson home to me not long ago. A student's first paper in one of my courses clearly indicated deferral to an authority outside. For a discussion of the historical grounding of a biblical unit she went to her pastor and provided me with a paraphrase of what he said and gave her to read. My response was clear: I wanted her efforts, her thoughts, and her attempts to work through the issues. The next essay contained a jumble of material selected from several books drawn from the shelves of the library. There was little apparent order, pattern, or line of argument. It took a colleague to help me see that for this student this was quite possibly a real stride forward. Her response to the first piece was an appeal to external authority. Answers lay outside of her, and if the teacher didn't provide them, she would turn to another authority in the realm of religion. The second paper seemed a shift to new authorities, the books, but was a marked development. Confronted with a wide range of authorities on the shelf, more than she could read and not all in congruence, she had to select. The basis for selection was not clear in her work. But it was her selection, however, and in conversations that followed we were able to make clearer and build upon the bases by which they were made.

4. If learning is not a zero-sum game, it need not be turned into a competition. In particular students need not be pitted against each other in competitions that produce only one or a few winners. Our grading practices too often tend toward just this. Grading on a curve — a practice with nothing to justify it (Pollio and Humphreys, 1988) — ensures that there will be few winners and a number of losers. We can also recognize that the human valuing of grades by both students and faculty is not evenly distributed across the scale, and that not all individuals value grades in the same way (Milton, Pollio, Eison, 1986). Just as different instructors grade in different ways — some use an absolute scale, some look to improvement, some (alas!) curve and thereby rank and compare student to student and not necessarily student to criteria — so students value grades differently. For some it is but one indication of their learning and other indicators may be more valued. Others have come to view the grade as a token in and of itself, its value unrelated to any other factor, a token to be attained in any way possible. For some a B is just fine (what used to be the gentleman's C), while for others anything less than an A is failure. At a minimum we can at least recognize this diversity in our grading and use we make of grades. More to the point would be to reflect in a more sustained way on the extent to which our grading practices, and the tests upon which grades are so often based, help or hinder teaching and learning.

I am sure you can come up with any number of

specific suggestions in these four areas based on reflection about your own experiences as students and instructors. Rather than extend such a list, I would like to end with two more beginnings as they are described by Belenkey and her colleagues (1986) that I and others have found especially telling. They allow me to conclude with two more beginnings.

Two Beginnings

We begin with the reminiscences of two ordinary women, each recalling an hour during her first year at college. One of them, now middle aged, remembered the first meeting of an introductory science course. The professor marched into the lecture hall, placed upon his desk a large jar filled with dried beans, and invited the students to guess how many beans the jar contained. After listening to an enthusiastic chorus of wildly inaccurate estimates, the professor smiled a thin, dry smile, revealed the correct answer, and announced, "You have just learned an important lesson about science. Never trust the evidence of your own senses."

Thirty years later, the woman could guess what the professor had in mind. He saw himself, perhaps, as inviting his students to embark upon an exciting voyage into a mysterious underworld invisible to the naked eye, accessible only through scientific method and scientific instruments, but the seventeen-year-old girl could not accept or even hear the invitation. Her sense of herself as a knower was shaky, and it was based on the belief that she could use her own first hand experience as a source of truth. This man was saying that this belief was fallacious. He was taking away her only tool for knowing and providing her with no substitute. "I remember feeling small and scared," the woman says, "and I did the only thing I could do, I dropped the course that afternoon, and I haven't gone near science since."

The second woman, in her first year at college, told a superficially similar but profoundly different story about a philosophy class she had attended just a month or two before the interview. The teacher came into class carrying a large cardboard cube. She placed it on the desk in front of her and asked the class what it was. They said it was a cube. She asked what a cube was, and they said a cube contained six equal square sides. She asked how they knew that this object contained six equal sides. By looking at it, they said. "But how do you know?" the teacher asked again. She pointed to the side facing her and, therefore, invisible to the students; then she lifted the cube and pointed to the side that had been face down on the desk, and, therefore, also invisible. "We can't look at all six sides of a cube at once, can we? So we can't exactly see a cube. And yet, you're right. You know it's a cube. But you know it not just because you have eyes but because you have intelligence. You invent the sides you cannot see. You use your intelligence to create the 'truth' about cubes."

The student said to the interviewer, "It blew my mind. You'll think I'm nuts, but I ran back to the dorm and I called my boyfriend and I said, 'Listen, this is just incredible,' and I told him all about it. I'm not sure he could see why I was so excited. I'm not sure I understand it myself, but I really felt, for the first time, like I was really in college, like I was — I don't know — sort of **grown up**."

Both stories are about the limitations of firsthand sense experience as a source of knowledge — we cannot simply see the truth about either the jar of beans or the cube. Both are also about a "sense of self." But there is a profound difference between the stories. We can know the truth about cubes. Indeed, the students did know it. As the science professor pointed out, the students were wrong about the beans; their senses had deceived them. But, as the philosophy teacher pointed out, the students were right about the cube; their minds had served them well.

The first professor maintained his privileged position, power, and knowledge. His students all failed in this initial encounter with him and his subject. Quite likely genuine learning took place in his class — we can and do learn from our mistakes and failures — but the tone of the recollection is telling: This student felt driven from the course and from science.

The second instructor privileged her students, allowed them to succeed, and recognized their success. Most forcefully she recognized their success by using it as a base for additional growth and learning. The tone of this recollection is telling as well: "Listen, this is just incredible." It was such a simple exercise, in some ways no more complex or profound than the jar full of beans. But the sensitivity displayed in its use can stand as a model and inspiration for us all. For we too can build into our teaching of our subject matters and skills patterns of instruction that will bring forth just such responses: "Listen, this is just incredible."

To facilitate the development of an enriched sense of self by building on success we need to see others, as they are, as they tell of themselves, how they came to be who they are, and as they can come to be. We need eyes and ears to see and hear their present courage and successes, as well as their limits and failures. I attach a warning to this challenge to see others — who they are and what they have and can become — in richer tones. As Robert Kegan states (1983) "what the eye sees better, the heart feels more deeply." We not only increase the likelihood that we will be moved by others and that we will care. We run the risk what being moved and caring entails. For we are moved more fully into life, into the lives of our students, closer to them, and closer to ourselves as well.

References:

- Belenky, M. F., et al (1986). *Women's Ways of Knowing*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fowler, J. (1981). *Stages of Faith*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Gardner, H. (1985). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple*

Intelligences. New York: Basic Books.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kegan, R. (1983). *The Evolving Self*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The Philosophy of Moral Development*. New York: Harper and Row.

Kohn, A. (1986). *No Contest: The Case Against Competition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Milton, O., Pollio, H. R., and Eison, J. (1986). *Making Sense of College Grades*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mullins, Phil (1988). "Cognitive Development in the Introductory Course: The Pedagogue's Typological Imagination." *Teaching-Learning Issues* 62. Knoxville, TN: Learning Research Center, University of Tennessee.

Perry, W. G. (1970). *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Pollio H. R., and Humphreys, W. L. (1988). "Grading Students." *Assessing Students' Learning*. J. H. McMillan, editor. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

NACTA Full Peer Review, Supports Publication Credit for Media Creations

Victor A. Bekkum

As teachers in colleges of agriculture in the United States and Canada, we are all aware of the tremendous effort required to develop excellent quality instructional materials. As members of NACTA we have the opportunity to have many of these media reviewed by our peers similar to research or book reviews. A goal of NACTA is to obtain "Publication Parity" for instructional media of merit.

What can be reviewed?

Only media developed in the last 24 months including: computer software, videotapes, 16mm films, transparencies, audio cassette or tape, slides, filmstrips or models.

Who can participate?

For the present, members only.

How do I initiate a media review?

Send the complete coupon below for the forms needed to accompany your submission of media. The rest is easy. The author of the material completes the forms and sends it to the chair of the instructional media review committee along with the media item. Related printed materials (documentation) must be included. If possible, three copies of the media are to be sent.

Victor A. Bekkum, Ag. Eng. Dept. 214a Davidson Hall, Iowa State University Ames, IA 50011	
Please send me instructions and forms to submit media for review.	
Name _____	_____
Address _____	_____
_____	_____ Zip _____