

Peter Senge (2012) Schools That Learn 抜粋

Systems Thinkingの第一人者Sengeは Learning Organisation (学習する組織)、組織内の一人ひとりが能力を伸ばす努力を続けることで組織全体が成長する、という理論を打ち立てました。その視点から、学校という組織もその中の成員、子どもたち・教職員・保護者・地域が同等に役割と責任を持つことで理想的な学習する組織に育つと主張しています。

Students are the only players who see all sides of the nested systems of education, yet they are typically the people who have the least influence on its design. In that sense, they are often (especially as they move on to middle school and high school) like drivers in a long traffic jam. They feel blocked by something they can't quite see, tempted to swarm past each other competitively, and unable to do anything about the problem.

“Too many have forgotten that they are teaching students as well as a subject.” In many schools, knowledge is treated as a thing—objectified, disconnected from other forms of knowledge and from the knower. “Banking education,” as the educator Paulo Freire has called it, is their dominant model for teaching and learning—teachers are supposed to “deposit” tokens of codified knowledge, discrete pieces of information, into students’ heads.

Fields of knowledge do not exist separately from each other, nor do they exist separately from the people who study them. They are living systems made up of often invisible networks and interrelationships. Indeed, they may be among the most complex of living systems. The ideology of the nature of knowledge and knowing, the teachers’ and learners’ underlying beliefs and values about the nature of schooling, and social interactions in learning environments are all part of those living systems—and all affect the ability of individuals and groups to learn.

Too often, classrooms, professional development in schools and other organisations, parenting classes, and teacher or school leadership preparation programs focus only on two factors in learning—what is covered and how it is delivered. Sadly, educators are making their jobs not only more difficult but probably less effective as well. “Good teachers bring students into living communion with the subjects they teach,” says Parker Palmer. “They also bring students into community with themselves and with each other.”

Consider the teachers who touched you as a student, not because they knew the answer but precisely because they didn’t know. Their curiosity inspired you, and their passion fired your imagination. They were so excited about what you might learn together that you loved them as teachers. You valued their experience. You knew they had thought about their subject a lot, and you were interested in their thoughts, but they didn’t give you “the answers” in any absolute sense. When they told you “This is what happened,” they were really saying “This is one view of what happened; here is something to think about.” Your questions were regarded as a valid way to link established ideas to your own understanding. In fact, they had their own questions, and it was this common questioning that made the two of you, ultimately, equals. By contrast, naïve realism fits neatly with and subtly reinforces the deficit perspective of learning. It reifies the view that children are deficient by establishing a caste of experts—teachers—who hold the answers. Because their answers are unquestionable, the superiority of the teacher’s knowledge, and the inferiority of the student’s, is institutionally established.