Débat / Discussion Notes

Stewart on Teaching versus Facilitating: A Misconstrued Dichotomy[1]

Roland Case
Ken Harper
Susan Tilley
John Wiens
simon fraser university

If you misrepresent your opponents, your arguments cannot tell against them. (Beattie, 1982, p. 643)

Careful analysis of educational slogans is a welcomed contribution to public debate. Slogans are ubiquitous in education, and too often we accept them at face value. In a recent article in the *Canadian Journal of Education,* Douglas Stewart (1993) takes on what he believes to be a serious threat to the enterprise of teaching. Alarm bells ring for him when he hears the slogan, "We facilitate learning, we don't teach." Stewart argues that it is mistaken to contrast teaching and facilitating as mutually exclusive concepts; such a contrast creates a false dichotomy. We concur with this observation and agree that some educators may characterize facilitating in opposition to teaching. From there on, however, we part company with Stewart.

Stewart categorically dismisses proponents of facilitating for espousing an "alarming idea" (p. 1) that is "misleading and dangerous" (p. 2), that will "play havoc" with educational thinking (p. 1), and that "puts at risk the education of children" (p. 8). We reject this wholesale condemnation of the notion of facilitating on the grounds that Stewart's account seriously misconstrues what credible proponents advocate.

We begin our rebuttal by summarizing Stewart's position and the reasons he offers in support of his interpretation of facilitating, then explain why and in what ways Stewart misrepresents the position of at least some of those who view teachers as facilitators of learning. In concluding, we outline and defend four principles that represent a more sensible interpretation of facilitating learning. Contrary to Stewart's alarms, these principles may serve the cause of good teaching.

STEWART ON FACILITATING AND TEACHING

Stewart's point of departure for his explication of the concept of facilitating is the supposed rallying call of the "facilitating movement" (p. 8)—the slogan "We facilitate learning, we don't teach" (pp. 1–2). We emphasize *supposed* since he offers no reference to those who actually use the slogan. Furthermore, although he purports to describe what proponents of facilitating claim, he provides only four short quotations (pp. 1, 2, 8) from documents that use the term and none of these quotations refers directly to what proponents mean by facilitating learning. Significantly, only 3 of his 24 references represent advocates of facilitating—two Saskatchewan Education documents, and a University of Regina Master's thesis on learning styles and teaching strategies relating to First Nations students. Stewart's scant attention to proponent's actual claims is regrettable; assuming that the slogan captures the essence of their understandings of the concepts, he interprets "facilitating" by contrasting it with "teaching."

Stewart's analysis of teaching builds on a classic division of teaching activities into intellectual (or logical) acts and strategic acts.[2] Intellectual acts, which include explaining, defining, justifying, and demonstrating, are conceptually tied to teaching—explaining, for example, is by definition a form of teaching. Strategic acts refer to such actions as motivating, planning, encouraging, guiding, disciplining, and evaluating. These acts need not take place in a teaching context although they are frequently used as means of supporting or conducting instruction. Stewart suggests that the most distinctive feature of strategic acts is their concern "to expedite or to improve the external practical conditions that make the occurrence of learning more likely" (p. 4). In light of this, he announces that intellectual acts are at "the core of teaching," whereas strategic acts are "secondary to the teaching enterprise" or "subsidiary to teaching proper," and concludes that the performance of strategic acts solely "would not actually be teaching" (p. 4). Stewart's distinction between actual teaching and actions that expedite learning grounds his account of facilitating.

Stewart begins his analysis of facilitating by resorting to the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* which defines "to facilitate" as efforts to make something less difficult or easier to achieve. To facilitate learning is, therefore, to engage in activities that make it easier for students to learn but without which, Stewart stipulates, students could still learn, though perhaps not as easily (pp. 6–7). Stewart concludes that facilitating is limited to strategic teaching acts and he offers the following list as typical of the activities of a facilitator of learning:

> displaying various curriculum or other related materials in the classroom; constructing activity centres; making oneself accessible to students, advising them about projects—how students might get started and might proceed; establishing co-operative learning groups or other social contexts that favour problem-solving approaches and (or) discovery learning; setting individual or group learning contracts; having students access information

for themselves, or use resources on their own; offering words of encouragement, inspiration, praise, or caution, and so on. (p. 6)

Thus, for Stewart, to facilitate learning is merely to provide or arrange a set of external material conditions or social circumstances that make learning easier; a person who is facilitating learning is understood not to be actually teaching. In other words, *qua* facilitator of learning, an educator would not engage in explaining, justifying, illustrating, or questioning.

Apparently, proponents of facilitating also endorse child-centred education. Without providing evidence and by ignoring fundamental ambiguities in this slogan, Stewart asserts that as "a hand-maiden to child-centred principles," facilitation aims "to free children from adults' instruction and intervention, from what is seen to be an unnecessary and unhelpful preoccupation with instruction, and to give children latitude to manage their own learning independently" (p. 6). Accordingly, facilitating is seen to marginalize teaching and to be "designed primarily to make learning less demanding, more fun, and ostensibly more significant" (p. 7).

Again without references or evidence, Stewart identifies and immediately discredits four reasons why teachers *might* be attracted to the idea of facilitating (p. 7). First, Stewart claims that although facilitating is reputed to be a more "humane" approach to learning (since it is non-interventionist and respectful of students' autonomy), teaching need not be authoritarian or heavy-handed. Second, proponents are said to claim that facilitating is superior to any learning that results from teaching, since it is more likely to engage students' minds. Stewart counters that we should be sceptical of these claims since the low teacher profile implied by facilitating is likely to produce "fairly minimal and simplistic kinds of learning" whereas the intellectual acts of teaching (particularly those of questioning, probing, illustrating, comparing, and explaining) are "intrinsically mind-engaging." Third, some advocates of facilitating apparently claim that the "knowledge explosion" implies that most of the knowledge and information taught in school is quickly dated and, therefore, of little value to students. For his part, Stewart believes that there is a "core of knowledge" that is both central to the general education of children and remarkably endurable. Fourth, according to Stewart, a seldom-acknowledged reason for the appeal of facilitating is that it is easier than teaching. Supposedly, it is less stressful because teachers need not be in front of students and it does not require that teachers possess the level of understanding of subject matter that they would need if they were actually to teach.

Finally, Stewart advances two general arguments in defense of teaching. First he dismisses those who characterize teaching as telling and imparting on the grounds that they are committing the straw person fallacy, since, on analytic grounds, the concept of teaching implies more than the mere transmission of pieces of information (p. 8). Second, Stewart observes that education is centrally

concerned with developing the mind, which requires mastery of conceptual structures and forms of understanding. These goals can be achieved systematically and meaningfully only through "informed and dedicated instruction" (p. 11). For Stewart, this requires "teaching," since children cannot independently acquire theoretical concepts through "facilitative" means—"theoretical or conceptual frameworks do not lie about waiting to rush sensibly and coherently into untutored minds of children, nor are they readily mastered in some random and off-hand manner" (p. 10). He suggests, for example, that mathematical conclusions must first be " 'demonstrated' and 'proved' " by someone in-the-know; natural phenomena should initially be " 'identified,' 'illustrated,' and 'explained' " in light of scientific laws; and artistic and literary works must be " 'interpreted' " for students in light of aesthetic criteria (p. 11).

For these reasons, Stewart concludes that it would be a "tragic irony" for teachers to accord greater importance to " 'facilitating learning' " than to "actual teaching" (p. 12).

STEWART'S MISCONSTRUAL OF FACILITATING

We do not doubt that some individuals interpret facilitating as Stewart describes and that dubious educational practices operate under the banner of facilitating learning. The same can be said of many popular, but potentially valuable, educational innovations. For example, some interpretations of authentic assessment, curriculum integration, and global education are clearly misguided. We are not entitled, however, to dismiss these ideas in their entirety merely because some, or even many, of the ways they are interpreted are educationally unsound. Yet this is what Stewart proposes. Despite the occasional qualifying remark,[3] Stewart's central thesis is not simply that some conceptions of facilitating are flawed, but that, generally speaking, the so-called "facilitating movement" is wrong-headed (p. 8) and that the very idea that the " 'role of the teacher is changing from disseminator of knowledge to facilitator of learning' " is "misleading and dangerous" (pp. 1–2). As suggested above, he reaches this conclusion because he believes that his interpretation of the slogan "We facilitate learning, we don't teach" embodies the sentiments of those who conceive of teaching as facilitation.

Slogans are notoriously slippery (Komisar & McClellan, 1974; Popkewitz, 1980). Characteristically, they have an emotive function—slogans shed more heat than light—and consequently they should not be assumed to provide conceptual clarity. For this reason it is regrettable that Stewart did not survey the ways teachers and theorists intend facilitation to be interpreted. Although we cannot track the intended interpretations of the slogan itself, since we know of no one who uses the phrase (and Stewart provides no help in this regard), we believe that many educators interpret "facilitating learning" differently than Stewart and in a way that is educationally promising. Thus, Stewart's blanket

condemnation of teachers-as-facilitators appears to commit the very fallacy he attributes to those who equate teaching entirely with direct telling. And like all critics who characterize an opposing position in a manner that is less than complete and charitable, he is in danger of arguing against a straw person.

As indicated above, Stewart explains the false dichotomy between teaching and facilitating by relegating the latter to a sub-set of acts peripheral to teaching. In our view, this analysis fails to recognize that, for many proponents, facilitating is not an alternative *to* teaching, but an alternative view *of* teaching. In other words, facilitating learning is not in opposition to teaching, it is a way of understanding the teaching role. Facilitation, on this account, does not imply that teachers never teach, nor for that matter that they never tell or explain things to students. Rather, the implied dichotomy is between rival conceptions of the teacher's *primary* role or function. One view sees teachers essentially as expediters, guides, or coaches to help students come to know, the other sees teachers essentially as presenters, transmitters, or disseminators of knowledge to students.

Ironically, all three sources Stewart mentions as referring to facilitating support this way of casting the dichotomy. For example, Stewart cites a 1984 Saskatchewan Education document that suggests the teacher's role is changing from "disseminator of knowledge" to "facilitator of learning" (p. 1). A document from the technology branch of British Columbia's Ministry of Education also supports this interpretation. Teachers are seen as "facilitating the direct interaction of students with information" by "shifting from a packager of knowledge and information for groups of students, to being a learning coach and guide, working with individual students to help them learn how to learn" (Hoebel & Mussio, 1990, p. 5). An indication of the sense to be made of the slogan "We don't teach, we facilitate" is found in Stewart's own comments on how facilitators conceive of teaching:

> Teaching is characterized pejoratively as the act of direct "telling" or "imparting" facts to children (invariably described as passive and indifferent recipients), or as the act of "dispensing," "transmitting" or "disseminating" knowledge (see Saskatchewan Education, February 1984), as if knowledge were all of a piece and to be handed out as a block. (p. 8)

Whereas Stewart dismisses this characterization of teaching-as-telling as an instance of the facilitating movement attacking a straw person (i.e., as a caricature of the concept of teaching), we see it as proponents of facilitating stressing that there is more to teaching than telling. The call to facilitate learning is not, on this version, a repudiation of the very notion of teaching, but merely a repudiation of a *de facto* perspective on teaching seemingly shared by many teachers.[4]

A more current document from the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education (Saskatchewan Education, 1991), which would have been available to Stewart, further confirms that facilitating implies modifying, not supplanting, teaching. The

document emphasizes instructional approaches and refers to teachers as facilitators of learning (pp. 1, 38). Teachers are encouraged to move from "teacher-directed transmissional, to student-centred and transactional" instruction (p. iv). More specifically, five interrelated instructional strategies are identified and discussed: direct instruction, indirect instruction, interactive instruction, experiential learning, and independent study (pp. 15–19). Included in these strategies are acts that Stewart would recognize as "actual" teaching (i.e., as intellectual acts). For example, the document discusses the potential merits and limitations of two types of direct instruction: lecture and didactic questioning (i.e., questions directed at securing specific information). More specifically, the document suggests that didactic questions can serve several purposes effectively, and that they can be counterproductive to the extent they are simplistic, encourage guessing, and discourage insightful answers (p. 21). In other words, asking didactic questions may or may not facilitate student thoughtfulness and insight. Questioning is not, as Stewart claims, "intrinsically mind-engaging" (p. 7).

Significantly, none of these references juxtapose facilitating and teaching. Rather, facilitating is more appropriately seen as a perspective on teaching or, if you will, a particular philosophy of teaching.

TOWARD A MORE CREDIBLE CONCEPTION OF FACILITATING

What more can be said about facilitating beyond that it is an approach or philosophy that conceives of teaching as expediting student learning rather than disseminating knowledge to students? On strictly analytic grounds, little more can be inferred. A number of ideas, however, although not unanimously endorsed or defined, appear to be associated closely with the talk about facilitation. In this section, we present four central and, we think, educationally promising principles of facilitation: (1) facilitating presupposes an intellectually active learner; (2) facilitating endorses a "dynamic" view of school knowledge; (3) facilitating is not quintessentially a matter of telling or explaining; and (4) facilitating values learner control and self-direction. To counteract Stewart's insinuation that facilitation is a foolish craze without theoretical or empirical grounding, we cite some of the literature supporting these principles.

Facilitating Presupposes an Intellectually Active Learner

Arguably the most fundamental assumption of teaching-as-facilitating is that for learning to occur students must actively construct their understandings and make their own sense of the world. Although the nature and parameters of the constructions that learning requires may be contested, there is general agreement on the inadequacy of the *tabula rasa* or empty-vessel metaphors of learning, where knowledge is imparted to supposedly blank-minded students. A recent Ontario Ministry of Education (1993) document asserts: "Learning is not a passive process of soaking up information; it is an active process that involves a constant

search for meaning" (p. 7). For meaningful learning to occur, students must be intellectually active. Lauren Resnick (1989) believes that much recent work in cognitive psychology supports this claim:

> learning occurs not by recording of information but by interpreting it. Effective learning depends on the intentions, self-monitoring, elaboration and representational constructions of the individual learner. The traditional view of instruction as direct transfer of knowledge does not fit this constructivist perspective. We need instead instructional strategies that place the learner's constructive mental activity at the heart of the instructional exchange, that treat instruction as an intervention in an ongoing knowledge construction process. (p. 2)

Others stress the need for students to think seriously about matters at hand if significant learning is to occur. For example, James Mackenzie (1988) argues that students are too willing accept claims merely because their teachers or textbooks tell them that the claims are true (p. 60). Mackenzie's concern is not that the information is incorrect, but that unless students engage with the material, they are unlikely to understand it. He warns that students frequently accept an idea "verbally but without its becoming a reality to them. That much teaching in practice fails to avoid this danger is known to most of us who do it" (p. 61). Among other sources, Mackenzie cites research on the "surprisingly large proportion" of students who have passed examinations in Newtonian physics and yet continued to provide non-Newtonian answers to simple real-world problems, such as which of two balls, one heavier than the other, would hit the floor first when dropped by an experimenter. In concluding this point he refers to remarks by teacher-author Richard Feynman (1985), who notes: "After a lot of investigation, I finally figured out that the students had memorized everything, but that they didn't know what anything meant" (cited in Mackenzie, 1988, p. 61).

Although Stewart recognizes that there is neither a necessary nor a sufficient connection between teaching and learning, he stresses teachers' role in interpreting, explaining, and demonstrating conclusions for their students. This emphasis on teacher-directed instruction overlooks the important point that understanding and other complex forms of learning occur only through each learner's own assimilation and integration of ideas. This shift away from the teacher and toward the student as the central figure in student learning (with the teacher as facilitator of each student's learning) stems in part from recognition that students' mental activity, not teachers' "intellectual acts," is the *sine qua non* of learning.

Facilitating Endorses a "Dynamic" View of School Knowledge

Closely associated with an emphasis on each learner's active intellectual engagement is a dynamic view of the knowledge to be promoted in schools. Proponents of facilitating typically oppose conceiving of knowledge primarily in terms of a fixed, unproblematic, universally accepted, and premeditated collection of facts.

For example, a recent British Columbia government document, which referred to teachers as facilitators, argued against viewing students as recipients of "prepackaged knowledge" (Hoebel & Mussio, 1990, p. 5). Education is not, at heart, the passing on of factual information or the reproducing of a single, correct perspective. Even for those who are not epistemological relativists, much of what we want students to come to learn through school is not preordained, and depends, to some extent, on the individual and the context. For example, although it is true that 1808 is the year in which Simon Fraser embarked on a trip down the river now bearing his name, this fact is relatively inconsequential. More important, educationally speaking, are such questions as: Was he a *bona fide* hero? Did he really *discover* the Fraser River? In light of nineteenth-century norms, was Simon Fraser's treatment of the First Nations people morally reprehensible or morally admirable? If it were judged by contemporary moral standards, would our verdict be different? The answers to these questions are not foregone conclusions — students should be guided in reaching their own thoughtful conclusions based on their assessments of the available evidence in light of defensible standards of historical inquiry.

Many proponents of facilitating argue that if school knowledge is, to a significant degree, to be the product of students' critical thought, and not merely a package of predetermined beliefs, then teachers must increasingly see themselves as guides to critical student inquiry and not as providers of answers.

Facilitating is Not Quintessentially a Matter of Telling or Explaining

As suggested earlier, the impetus for teaching-as-facilitating is a perceived preoccupation with teaching-as-telling. Consequently, most discussions of facilitating emphasize either an indirect instructional role for the teacher or student-directed learning. This does not imply, however, that direct instruction is necessarily incompatible with the teacher-as-facilitator. Some proponents of facilitating, including the 1991 Saskatchewan Education document mentioned above, contradict Stewart's claim that facilitating is limited to strategic acts. Teacher explanation, illustration, justification, and other intellectual acts are consistent with viewing teachers as facilitators of learning. Because this point is contentious, it may be helpful to explain the connection.

Stewart suggests that, as many scholars have noted, teaching is a polymorphous concept. This means there is an open-ended range of actions that qualify as teaching. The dominant criterion for characterizing an action as teaching is an overriding intention to bring about learning. As Paul Hirst (1971) explains:

> What a particular activity is, what a person is doing, depends crucially on how he himself sees the activity. To take a standard example, if a person is seen to place a glass of liquid to his lips and slowly drain it, what is he doing? He may be quenching his thirst, committing suicide, or engaging in a religious ritual. Which of these if any it is, depends on the point, purpose or intention that lies behind the physical movements. (p. 8)

Facilitating, as a particular view of teaching, is also a polymorphous concept—and seemingly similar teaching acts may qualify as facilitating or as transmitting, depending on key characteristics of the intended learning. Crudely put, teaching acts are facilitative when the primary intention is to empower or support students so that students may learn something; teaching acts are transmissive when the primary intention is to effect the desired learning directly, with minimal student mediation. For example, if the overriding purpose in explaining to students the concept "inference" is to impart vocabulary for students to remember, then the explanation is essentially transmissive. On the other hand, if the teacher's explanation has an overriding instrumental aim, say, to help students learn how to think for themselves by fortifying them with concepts needed to think critically, then the explanation is appropriately seen as facilitating student self-reflection. Recognition of the role of direct instruction in facilitation is implied in recommendations by a team of researchers that students receive "direct training in particular skills" to assist them in becoming more competent self-directed learners (Thomas, Strage, & Curley, 1988, pp. 316, 322). So too, in the case of questioning. Socratic questioning, where the aim is to help students think through an issue for themselves, is consistent with teaching-as-facilitating, whereas so-called didactic questioning, whose focus may be regurgitation of discrete facts, is more likely to qualify as transmissive teaching.

These examples illustrate why we see no necessary incompatibility between intellectual (teaching) acts and facilitating learning. That the concept "explaining" is logically connected to the concept "teaching" has no bearing, however, on the important empirical questions surrounding successful teaching. The more significant link is the contingent relation between direct instruction and student learning. For many students in many contexts explaining things to them contributes relatively little to their understanding of the material. In science class, for example, creating dissonance with students' existing, often naïve beliefs about natural phenomena is an alternative method of teaching abstract concepts—one that may be more successful than direct explanation in precipitating student understanding. The pedagogic potential of "experiential" and "self-directed" learning, and of the many other strategic acts of teaching, to evoke student learning, suggests Stewart's assertion that strategic acts are not "actual" teaching is largely a matter of conceptual sophistry. Despite the alleged subsidiary conceptual status of guided inquiry, teachers may be better advised to have students explore complex questions through guided inquiry than attempt to impart the answers directly to them. For this reason, facilitation is typically, but not exclusively, associated with non-didactic teaching strategies.

Finally, Stewart appears to deprecate facilitators' concern with the learning environment—those external material conditions and social circumstances influencing students' ability and desire to learn. There is considerable evidence that school and classroom factors significantly affect student learning. For example, researchers have documented the role of learning environments in promoting

critical thinking (Barell, 1991, pp. 60–95; Newmann, 1991) and in political socialization (Daniels & Case, 1992, pp. 19–21). One review of civic education literature concludes that creating a classroom environment where students feel free to express their opinions is the most positive contribution a teacher can make to students' acquisition of democratic values (Ehman, cited in Torney-Purta, 1983, p. 31). This factor was found to be more important than any particular curriculum content on democratic rights that might be explained to students. Although creating an environment conducive to learning is not a sufficient condition for successful teaching, proponents of facilitation are, in our view, warranted in stressing its profound influence on learning.

Facilitating Values Learner Control and Self-Direction

A final theme in discussions on teaching-as-facilitating is that of the value of sharing control with students over what they learn and the conditions for their learning (Holborn, 1993, pp. 65). Many variables must be considered in deciding upon the type and degree of student autonomy and when such autonomy is appropriate. Although space does not permit an adequate discussion of these issues, it may be worth responding to several of Stewart's disparaging claims about student self-direction.

Stewart implies that facilitators are "deluded" in their belief that students can *independently* master the complex understanding required for a sound education. He also suggests that facilitators are preoccupied with "creating amicable learning environments" (p. 11) at the expense of sound educational practice. Perhaps some educators view self-directed learning as an opportunity to abandon their students, but credible proponents of teaching-as-facilitating clearly recognize the need for extensive and thoughtful teacher direction (Marshall, 1992; Newman, 1990, 1991). For instance, teacher-as-facilitator advocate Hermine Marshall (1992) laments the insufficient teacher guidance that occurs when teachers resist exerting any control over student learning or are overly enamoured with the benefits of making learning fun for their students (p. 21). That proponents of facilitating raise these concerns confirms, however, that Stewart's wholesale characterization of facilitators as *laissez-faire* educators is unjust. Abandoning students to their own devices and putting fun above all else are neither inevitable nor desired features of facilitating. On the contrary, the extensive teacher commitment and effort involved in nurturing students' disposition and ability to take greater responsibility for own their learning, prompted one team of researchers to conclude that "fostering self-directed learning is a challenging goal for teachers and schools" (Thomas, Strage, & Curley, 1988, p. 324).

So too, in her book, *Finding Our Own Way,* Judith Newman's (1990) discussion of "learner-directed" language teaching provides a significantly more demanding portrait of life as a facilitator of learning than the one Stewart describes. She emphasizes that to be learner-directed does not mean abandoning

objectives or working without a curriculum and she rejects the view some educators hold, that learner-directed implies disregard for standards and conventions. According to Newman, such conventions as organization, punctuation, grammar, and spelling are important—learner-directed means caring about when and how standards are addressed, not *if* they are addressed (p. 22).

Finally, a word about Stewart's bleak prognosis on the educational value of greater student control over learning. Newman (1990) identifies the following instructional benefits of giving students opportunities to make their own connections:

> by observing the children as they engaged in the various writing and reading activities, I was able to determine just what sort of assistance I might offer. The children showed me which of them were ready to engage with particular aspects of reading and writing. I was taking my lead from them. (p. 15).

Other writers cite research suggesting that students' inclinations to think for themselves depend heavily on them seeing themselves as being, to some extent, in charge of their learning, as opposed to relying exclusively on someone else—typically a teacher—to direct them (Barell, 1991, p. 71; Resnick, 1989, p. 9).

CONCLUSION

We do not presume to have captured the full range of principles and underlying issues associated with talk about facilitating. Our modest goal is to counteract an unfounded, categorical dismissal of this admittedly vague and ambiguous notion. Although we recognize that some educators' understanding of facilitation is unsound, we reject Stewart's conclusion that the very idea of reconceptualizing the teacher's role as a facilitator of learning is the product of foolish thinking. On the contrary, the idea of teacher-as-facilitator raises many issues that warrant serious attention, some of which hold great promise for improved teaching.

NOTES

[1] We thank Glenn Brown and Julie Zilber for thoughtful comments and editorial assistance.

[2] Stewart ignores a third type of teaching acts, called institutional acts (e.g., collecting assignments, distributing textbooks, taking student attendance).

[3] In several places Stewart uses conditional language, for example, "if 'facilitating' is just a euphemism for" (p. 7) and "to the extent that 'we facilitate learning, we don't teach' opposes the intervention of teaching" (p. 11). The overall tone of the article, however, exemplified in the abstract, implies a more sweeping condemnation of the notion. Significantly, Stewart does not refer explicitly to possible alternative interpretations of facilitate.

[4] Numerous researchers (e.g., Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989; Cuban, 1986; Goodlad, 1984) claim that didactic teaching is the dominant methodology in schools. Many lament what they see to be a prevalent misconception of the nature of teaching, namely "that teaching is telling, that teaching is delivering lessons or dispensing knowledge. This is a tiny part of teaching and yet in myth it is elevated to the whole of it" (Ayers, 1993, p. 14).

REFERENCES

Ayers, W. (1993). *To teach: The journey of a teacher.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Barell, J. (1991). *Teaching for thoughtfulness: Classroom strategies to enhance intellectual development.* New York: Longman.

Beattie, C. (1982). [Review of *The philosophy of teaching*]. *Teachers College Record, 83,* 639–644.

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher, 18*(1), 32–42.

Cuban, L. (1986). Persistent instruction: Another look at constancy in the classroom. *Phi Delta Kappan, 68,* 7–11.

Daniels, L., & Case, R. (1992). *Charter literacy and the administration of justice in Canada.* Unpublished report to the Department of Justice, Ottawa, Ontario.

Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hirst, P. H. (1971). What is teaching? *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 3*(1), 5–18.

Hoebel, M., & Mussio, G. (1990). *Education reform and tools for change.* Sidney, BC: Education Technology Centre of British Columbia.

Holborn, P. L. (1993). *A case study of university coursework as a support to in-service teacher development.* Unpublished master's thesis, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia.

Komisar, P., & McClellan, J. (1974). The logic of slogans. In B. O. Smith & R. H. Ennis (Eds.), *Language and concepts in education* (pp. 195–215). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Mackenzie, J. (1988). Authority. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 22*(1), 57–65.

Marshall. H. (1992). *Redefining student learning.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Newman, J. (1990). *Finding our own way: Teachers exploring their assumptions.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Newman, J. (1991). *Interwoven conversations: Learning and teaching through critical reflection.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Newmann, F. M. (1991). Promoting higher order thinking in social studies: Overview of a study of 16 high school departments. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 19,* 324–340.

Ontario Ministry of Education and Training. (1993). *The common curriculum: Grades 1–9* (Version for parents and the general public). Toronto: Queen's Printer.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1980). Global education as a slogan system. *Curriculum Inquiry, 10,* 303–316.

Resnick, L. B. (1989). Introduction. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser* (pp. 1–24). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Saskatchewan Education. (1991). *Instructional approaches: A framework for professional practice.* Regina, SK: Saskatchewan Education.

Stewart, D. (1993). Teaching and facilitating: A false dichotomy. *Canadian Journal of Education, 18,* 1–13.

Thomas, J. W., Strage, A., & Curley, R. (1988). Improving students' self-directed learning: Issues and guidelines. *Elementary School Journal, 88,* 313–326.

Torney-Purta, J. (1983). Psychological perspectives on enhancing civic education through the education of teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(6), 30–34.