Chapter 2

The Broad Conception of Learner-Centered Teaching

*DRAFT*

 Learner-centered teaching (LCT) is a relatively recent term, dating probably from the 1970s.[[1]](#footnote-1) The term evolved as education reformers and theorists struggled to formulate a suitable way of capturing their orientation to pedagogy. Antecedents and cognate approaches include student-centered teaching (which is still a relatively popular term), learning-centered teaching, and (from John Dewey) child-centered teaching.

 With this kind of vague and fuzzy history, we shouldn’t treat LCT as an educational *theory*, in the sense that it represents a cohesive set of concepts used to explain how people learn or what education is. Indeed, Maryellen Weimer identifies five different educational theories that are at the root of LCT.[[2]](#footnote-2) Rather, it is best thought of as a *framework* for teaching, in that learner-centered teachers have a coherent perspective from which to plan and conduct their teaching. They know what questions to ask when trying to decide among pedagogical choices. They know how to systematically think about problems they encounter in their teaching.[[3]](#footnote-3)

 Actually, learner-centered teaching is best thought of as *two* frameworks for teaching, because a careful study of the literature on LCT reveals that educators work with two different conceptions of LCT. The two frameworks are related, as we shall see, but they do need to be distinguished.

 In this chapter I focus on the first of these frameworks: the *broad* conception of LCT, as I shall call it. Before articulating this framework, however, I want to explore (for the purposes of contrast) the framework under which I was educated (throughout my K-12 and undergraduate education from 1965-1982) and which I implicitly adopted when I began teaching in the early 90s. But it is more than a historical artifact; as far as I can tell, it is still the dominant framework in higher education.

 Call it the *traditional framework*.[[4]](#footnote-4) In broad strokes, according to this framework the purpose of education is to transmit knowledge from the teacher to the student.[[5]](#footnote-5) The job of the teacher is to communicate the knowledge; the student’s job is to internalize the knowledge, usually by memorization. Since the teacher’s job is to communicate, the best teachers are those who can communicate most effectively—that is, the ones whose communication is *knowledgeable,* *clear* and *interesting*; these are therefore the three most important characteristics of good teaching.

 Thus, training for teachers focuses on mastery of the content they will be teaching and on how to be clear and interesting when communicating this content. For new teachers, the goal of content mastery is achieved by graduate training in the discipline; the goal of communicating in clear and interesting ways is achieved by the new teacher copying the style and methods of the teachers they have had who were clear and interesting. Professional development for teachers (that is, continuing to develop teaching skills after embarking on the career) is mainly a matter of keeping up with new content by pursuing your scholarly research interests and (for courses you have never taught before) using your research skills to study new topics or philosophers. Professional development of the ability to be clear and interesting in communicating the content consists mainly of accumulating an arsenal of tips and tricks for teaching especially difficult content. This arsenal is acquired mainly through trial and error, though an important secondary source is the occasional conversation about teaching that you have with colleagues who teach the same courses.

 The central insight of learner-centered teaching is to reconceptualize learning. In the traditional model, learning is a matter of replicating the teacher’s knowledge in the student. Thus, the dominant metaphor for education is making an exact copy in the student of the knowledge that is in the teacher. In learner-centered teaching, learning is conceptualized as a type of change that occurs in the student (the student changes from knowing less to knowing more). Education then becomes a question of what it takes to effect the desired change.

 Thus, at its heart, LCT can be defined as teaching that is guided by the fundamental question, “What do I (the teacher) need to do in order for the students to change in the desired ways?” Another way of putting this is that LCT is driven by learning goals or outcomes—the ways that students should be different at the end of the learning experience, whether it be a class meeting, course, or program. This moves the focus from the act of teaching (that is, transmitting the knowledge) to the act of learning (that is, changing in the appropriate ways). Thus, LCT is aptly named, because it is centered on learning in a crucial way that traditional teaching is not.

 However, it’s important to recognize that, even in the traditional framework, faculty have always had learning goals for their students. To see this, take a few minutes to complete the following exercise developed by Dee Fink:

Imagine yourself teaching in a perfect situation, where the students will do anything and everything you ask of them. They will read everything and write everything you ask them to. They will do it on time and do it well. In this special situation, you can do anything you want as a teacher and have any kind of impact on students that you desire. The only limitation is your own imagination.

Question: In your deepest, fondest dreams, what kind of impact would you most like to have on your students? That is, when the course is over and it is now one or two years later, what would you like to be true about students who have had your courses that is not true of others? What is the distinctive educational impact you would like for your teaching and your courses to have on your students?”[[6]](#footnote-6)

 If you have taken this exercise seriously, I am certain that you—who are probably a novice at learner-centered teaching—have answers to Fink’s questions. I say this because I have been conducting Fink’s “Dream Exercise” in workshops and faculty learning communities since his book was first published in 2003, and I have never encountered a teacher who did not desire to have some kind of impact on their students or was unable to articulate that desire.

 Thus, what is distinctive about LCT is not that teachers have goals for how they want their students to change as a result of their teaching. What is distinctive about LCT is that this is explicitly the grounding for the practice; instead of teaching with the hope that you are having an impact on your students, your teaching is structured around maximizing the probability that you do have an impact on your students.

One consequence of conceiving of teaching in this way dictates that course design should be driven by the learning goals for the course. Courses should, in other words, be subject to *backward design.*[[7]](#footnote-7) This is a three-stage approach to course design:

Stage 1: Identify the desired results (the appropriate student learning goals or outcomes[[8]](#footnote-8)).

Stage 2: Determine acceptable evidence. Commonly called “assessment,” this stage asks the teacher to decide what will demonstrate achievement of the student learning goals.

Stage 3: Plan learning activities. What will it take for the students to be able to achieve the learning goals and demonstrate their achievement? What will need to be taught and what is the best way to teach it in order for the students to be successful in changing in the ways that are desired?

 These three stages should not be thought of as separate stages in planning, such that a prior stage must be accomplished before one can move on to a subsequent stage. Rather, it’s better to think of them as three foci of attention that occur in roughly that order. That is, begin with identifying the student learning goals, but be prepared to modify these goals once you think about the evidence that you will gather to demonstrate achievement of the learning goals and the optimal learning activities to support this learning. A goal might not be achievable, for example, in the space of a single course, or it may require more time and energy than is justified by the importance of the goal. Many times in backward design you get clarity on the true goals you have for a course.

 The process of backward design is simple enough, but it is also powerful in helping you focus your teaching. Suppose, for example, I am teaching a class on how to ride a bike. Stage 1 of backward design tells me that I first have to think about what, within the context of the course, is meant by riding a bike. Being able to operate a bike? Being able to *safely* operate a bike? Being able to repair and maintain a bike so that you can continue to ride it for many years? Once I decide this, I can generate my student learning goals.

 Note that answering this question will require me to pay attention to the students who are in my class. Are they all 8-year-olds, in which case being able to repair and maintain a bike probably isn’t one of my student learning outcomes? Is it only a one-day class, or does it meet multiple times? (If the former, then probably all I can manage is teaching them to propel the bike without falling over.) Is it one course in a series, where another course is called “Basic Bike Safety?”

 Let’s assume, then, that I am teaching a daylong course, so that I identify one learning goal: students will be able to operate a bike. Stage 2 asks me what will students do so I know that they can ride a bike? Note that there is all kinds of evidence that I could collect to measure student proficiency at bike riding: I could have them sign a form stating they have learned how to ride a bike, but that likely won’t be very good evidence. (They might lie, or they might think they know how to ride a bike when they really don’t.) So I decide the best assessment would be to monitor them as they ride a bike.

 This leads to a new question: What standards will I be using to evaluate whether they can ride a bike? This will help me identify what they will need to do in order to demonstrate they can ride a bike. I decide that successfully riding a bike in this course means that a student can operate the bike for at least 2 minutes without losing their balance and falling over, including changing directions, starting from the stop position, and coming to a complete halt on command.

 Note that thinking about assessment in Stage 2 of backward design helps me to clarify the nature of my goals in Stage 1. The student learning outcome of “operating a bike” is fleshed out to include a range of skills that are necessary to operate a bike.

 Now comes Stage 3: planning the learning activities that will be necessary for the students to demonstrate mastery of the goal using the assessment instrument I have decided on. (“Learning activities” should be understood in a very wide sense to include anything that the students need to do in order to achieve and demonstrate mastery. Note that the activities here are *student* activities, not instructor activities. Sometimes the instructor needs to do certain things in order for the students to successfully engage in their activities, but sometimes they require nothing from the instructor but careful set-up and then staying out of the way.) What do students need to do in order to be able to ride a bike successfully in the assessment task? Anything that does not optimize the achievement of this end has no role in this class.

 Consider, for example, what factual information I will want to include in the class. I will probably need to teach the students the names of some parts of the bicycle so that I can refer to them during skills instruction (“Put your hands on the handlebars!”), but students can ride a bicycle without knowing much about the machine or how it works. So while I will consciously teach them words like “seat,” “brake,” and “pedal,” I will not bother with “rear derailleur,” “spoke,” or “hub.”

 Thus, the learning activity I design to teach the vocabulary might look something like this: I give the students a diagram of the bike, having labeled the parts I need them to know. Their job is to memorize these parts. A second learning activity would be to assess their knowledge at the next class meeting by naming a bicycle part and having them identify it on another bicycle diagram with the parts unlabeled. (Note, by the way, that it would be a less effective assessment if I pointed to a part of the bicycle and asked them the name. Why?[[9]](#footnote-9))

 In LCT, the standard of good design is *transparent alignment*.[[10]](#footnote-10) A design is *aligned* if the learning activities and the assessments contribute appropriately to the achievement of learning goals.[[11]](#footnote-11) In other words, the goals in Stage 1 are clearly identified, the assessments in Stage 2 accurately measure the achievement of those goals, and the learning activities from Stage 3 provide the students with all they need in order to achieve the learning goals and to demonstrate their achievement of the learning goals. A design is *transparent* if the students understand that the design is aligned—that is, the students can articulate the learning goals and can perceive the assessments and learning activities contribute appropriately to achieving those goals.

 There is one final important element in LCT: learner-centered teaching is *scholarly teaching[[12]](#footnote-12)*—that is, LCT is an evidence-based practice informed by scholarship. Because LCT is oriented toward optimizing student learning, designers make use of the relevant research literature (primarily from the fields of psychology and education) to make sure they are using best practices. In LCT, pedagogy is a discipline to be studied and mastered like any other discipline, built upon a knowledge base that you can also contribute to. (For more on this, see Chapter 7 on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.)

 In the hypothetical bicycle-riding class, for example, I would recognize that my student learning outcome of riding a bike is a skill, rather than a set of information or an attitude (for more on this, see Chapter 4). A review of the literature shows that skills are most effectively taught by modeling and practice. (However, both of these must be designed very carefully—not just any modeling and any practice is effective in mastering a skill.) So my bicycle-riding class would have a lot of carefully designed modeling and a lot of carefully designed practice opportunities built into its structure.

 I want to summarize the main features of LCT by contrasting it with the traditional teaching framework that I outlined at the beginning of this chapter.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Broad conception of LCT | Traditional teaching |
| **The goal of teaching** |
| Teaching is measured by student learning. The goal of teaching is to produce desired changes in the student. | Teaching is independent of student learning. The goal of teaching is to present correct information clearly and in an interesting way. Learning the information that has been presented is the student’s task. |
| **Course design** |
| In order to achieve this goal, teachers use backward design to plan their courses, beginning by identifying their student learning outcomes and then planning how students will achieve these outcomes and demonstrate their achievement. Well designed courses demonstrate *transparent alignment*. | “Course design? What’s that?” Course design is mostly a matter of listing the topics, units, periods, etc. that will be covered in the course and the reading that students will do to learn about each topic, and scheduling the major exams, papers, and projects. |
| **Teaching methodology** |
| LCT is scholarly teaching, relying on evidence-based best practices to achieve the goal. Pedagogy is a discipline to be mastered. | Learning to teach is primarily a matter of mastering your discipline. Pedagogy is essentially communicating information well. This is mostly learned by copying your most memorable teachers (i.e., replicating the tradition). |

 One important and (in my view) gratifying consequences of adopting the LCT framework is that it changes a teacher’s attitude toward her students. Learner-centered teachers do not complain about their students—about, for example, their underpreparedness for higher education or their failure to invest time and energy in class. . Learner-centered teachers are *aware* of situational factors like these that will affect student learning in their course, but they do not *complain* about them. Because their success in teaching is measured by student learning, if students are not learning (especially if many of their students are not learning), learner-centered teachers think about what changes they need to make in order to improve student learning.

Of course, not all traditional teachers complain about their students, either.[[13]](#footnote-13) But, when they do, it is not because their framework militates against it. Indeed, I would argue it encourages complaining about students; if my job as a teacher is to communicate, and I am speaking knowledgeably, clearly and interestingly, then it is the students’ fault if they fail to learn. After all, it is their responsibility, not mine.

 We are now in a position to extend the argument from Chapter 1. Recall that the conclusion from that chapter is that there are effective and ineffective teaching practices—that is, some teaching practices promote learning more than others. What remains to be proven is that learner-centered teaching (in this case, the broad conception of learner-centered teaching) is an effective teaching practice.

 Articulated thusly, the question almost answers itself. LCT is designed to optimize student learning. Indeed, it is essentially practical rationality applied to learning. After all, practical rationality tells us that the best way to achieve a goal is to try to achieve it. As Aristotle famously pointed out in Book 1 of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, if you know what your target is, you are much more likely to hit it.

 (This is not to deny that there are some goals better arrived at when we do not aim for them. Happiness is the most plausible candidate for such a goal. But this is because of some special facts about the goal; for example, the special fact that happiness tends to be a fortunate byproduct of achieving other goals. There doesn’t seem to be anything special about the goals of learning that imply it is best pursued indirectly. Indeed, if this were so, we wouldn’t have schools.)

 Thus, I take it as quite clear that the broad conception of LCT gives us a good strategy to pursue student learning. If we want our students to learn, we have good reason be learner-centered teachers.

Chapter 3

The Robust Conception of Learner-Centered Teaching

 As we have seen, LCT is characterized by the fact that it organizes teaching around learning goals for students. This naturally suggests the question, “What should the students learn?” or (more formally) “What should be the learning goals for students?”

 There are, I think, three basic answers that teachers give to this question: Student learning goals can be teacher-centered, discipline-centered, or student-centered. Each of these types of learning goals is defined by who benefits from student achievement of the learning goal. That is, the fundamental question in the course is, “How will the students be different at the end of the course in a way that benefits X (where X is the teacher or the discipline or the student)?”

1. *Teacher-centered learning goals* are designed so that student mastery of the goal will benefit the teacher in some way. Here are some examples of teacher-centered learning goals:
2. Sometimes student learning goals contribute to the teacher’s research project. For example, when I was in graduate school, it was not uncommon for faculty to offer graduate seminars focusing on the faculty member’s current area of research that allowed them to explore a new topic or to subject their conclusions to critical scrutiny before trying to publish their results. Thus, in one class on Kant’s moral philosophy, each seminar participant read one booklength work on Kant’s moral philosophy and led a critical discussion of the work in class. By the end of the class, the professor had critically examined a dozen of the most prominent Kant critiques, which was very useful to him in subsequently writing and publishing a book on Kant’s moral theory.
3. Some student learning goals are adopted not to further a research agenda, but to make the teaching life easier. Thus, if I include a favorite philosopher in a course because I like them, my student learning goals are teacher-centered. Similarly, if I focus on particular topics because I know them very well and will have to do minimal preparation to teach them in a course, then I am also being teacher-centered in my student learning goals.
4. In *discipline-centered learning goals,* student learning meets some need of the discipline. My experience is that generally discipline-centered learning goals are aimed at perpetuating the discipline. This can be blatant, as when the undergraduate philosophy curriculum is designed to prepare students for graduate study in philosophy (thus producing future philosophers to practice and teach the academic discipline of philosophy).

It can be more subtle, as when student learning is directed at perpetuating the *status quo* in philosophy. If a modern philosophy class has the goal of having students master the epistemological and metaphysics theories of the Big Three Rationalists (Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz) and the Big Three Empiricists (Locke, Berkeley, Hume) because in contemporary Anglo-American philosophy they are the most prominent philosophers from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, then the content of the course functions to preserve the mainstream of one particular philosophical tradition.

However, some discipline-centered learning goals are directed at disrupting the current tradition on the assumption that this is what the discipline needs. Thus, if I focus on nontraditional figures in my courses because I think philosophy needs to be opened up as a discipline, my learning goals are still discipline-centered.

1. Finally, *student-centered learning goals* are designed to benefit the student. This does not necessarily mean that the students value the learning goals, since they might not realize that mastering this set of goals benefits them.

It is important to understand that these categories are not mutually exclusive; that is, it is possible (maybe even likely) that a student learning goal might benefit two of the three, or even all three. For example, the graduate seminar on Kant’s moral philosophy quite plausibly benefited me, the student (because it’s been helpful to me as a philosophy teacher to know Kant’s moral philosophy) and the discipline (because Kant is a central figure in the analytic tradition), as well as benefiting the teacher. What makes a goal fall into a particular category is that the goal’s benefit is the reason why the particular student learning goal is included in the course. In other words, what make a goal teacher-centered is not that it benefits the teacher, but that the fact that it benefits the teacher is the reason why it is a goal for the course. That is, the benefit provides the criterion for inclusion as a goal in the course, rather than being merely an incidental benefit. The reason why the Kant graduate seminar was teacher-centered was because if the students’ learning Kant’s moral theory had not been in the teacher’s interests, it would not have been a student learning outcome for the course.

 As a matter of empirical fact, most learner-centered teachers have student-centered learning goals, at least in my experience. A typical example is Weimer’s claim that “the goal of learner-centered teaching is the development of students as autonomous, self-directed, and self-regulating learners.”[[14]](#footnote-14) These learning goals do not benefit the teacher or discipline in any significant way, but they are of great benefit to the student.

 Indeed, I believe that the majority of learner-centered teachers in philosophy have *transformative* student learning goals for their courses. First articulated by Jack Mezirow,[[15]](#footnote-15) the goal of transformative learning is for students to change their worldview at a deep level in response to ideas, experiences, and viewpoints that challenge their current worldview. Weimer calls this “learning that transforms, that changes learners in deep, profound, and lasting ways,” where they change “taken-for-granted beliefs, unchallenged assumptions, and habits of the mind never before questioned.”[[16]](#footnote-16) Thus, when our philosophy students begin to question assumptions that they have taken for granted all their lives (“I have free will.” “God exists.” “Morality is a matter of following the set of rules I was raised with.”), they are engaged in transformative learning.[[17]](#footnote-17) Fink calls this kind of change in students “significant learning,” where a learning experience results in “something that is truly significant in terms of the students’ lives.”[[18]](#footnote-18)

 In a similar vein, Meredith Baxter Magolda focuses on student “self-authorship” for traditional-aged college students. Defined as “the internal capacity to construct

one’s beliefs, identity, and social relations,”[[19]](#footnote-19) the move to self-authorship is the move away from accepting external authority as the source of identity, values, and beliefs to a “well-founded, solid belief system.”[[20]](#footnote-20)

 Look at the “dream exercise” from Fink that you were asked to do at the beginning of Chapter 2. Is your dream for your students transformative? Does it lead to students being more responsible for developing, articulating and defending their own beliefs? Does it encourage student independence and autonomy? Then you, too, have student-centered learning goals.

 It is, I think, unsurprising that learner-centered teachers favor student-centered learning goals. LCT is focused on student learning. Student-centered learning goals are the natural extension of this focus, because it is a simple move from caring about your students’ learning to caring about your students. (Indeed, one sees this transition reflected in the terminology. When I first began studying LCT around 2001, it was commonly called “learning-centered teaching.” Now it is more widely called “learner-centered teaching,” reflecting the shift from focusing on learning to focusing on the people who are learning. In general, we care about learning because we care about learners.)

 Thus, much of the current work on LCT presupposes student-centered learning goals. Let us call this the “robust conception of LCT,” defined as:

1. Teaching is evaluated according to the degree of student learning achieved (the broad conception of LCT).
2. Desirable student learning is determined by the benefit to the learner (i.e., “student-centered learning goals”).

The rest of this book will assume the robust conception of LCT, though much of what I say will be applicable to teachers with the broad conception of LCT.

 We are now ready to finish the argument that engaged us at the beginning of this book: Is robust LCT an effective teaching practice? That is, will robust LCT lead to more student learning (compared to discipline-centered or teacher-centered learning outcomes)?

 There is some reason to think so. Student motivation is a significant factor in student learning, and it is likely that students will be more motivated to learn with student-centered goals for the following reasons:[[21]](#footnote-21)

1. One of the three great intrinsic motivators for students is if they see and accept the purpose of the learning. That is, when student see the value of what they are learning, they are more motivated to learn it. This is not a surprise, but it is also a robust research finding.[[22]](#footnote-22) Students are more likely to be motivated to learn what benefits them than what benefits the discipline or the teacher. Thus, student-centered learning goals will be intrinsically more motivating for students to achieve.
2. An important factor in motivating students to learn is how supportive the learning environment is. That is, students are more motivated to learn in an environment which they perceive to be supportive of their learning.[[23]](#footnote-23) While teacher-centered and discipline-centered courses can still have supportive learning environments, I would argue that *ceteris paribus* students are more likely to feel supported in a student-centered class because they know that the teacher values them. The learning goals in the course are adopted in order to benefit them, not the teacher or the discipline. Thus, from the outset they know they are of value to the teacher.

Thus, there is a case to be made for student-centered learning goals. But there is also a case to be made for the claim that we should not have to make a case for student-centered learning goals. That is, for many learner-centered teachers, there is no need to argue about the suitable learning goals for their course, because they love their students, and wanting to benefit the students is the best expression of that love.

For me, it makes about as much sense to demand an argument that I should love my students as it does to demand an argument that I should love my children. I do love them; I can’t help but love them. And that love must be expressed in desiring to improve their lives. So I don’t *decide* after much deliberation whether my student learning goals will be teacher-, discipline-, or student-centered; rather, I do not consider including a student learning goal that is not student-centered. *Ich kann nicht anders.*
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