



4-1-1973

### Educational Considerations, vol. 1(1) Full Issue

Charles E. Litz  
*Kansas State University*

Warren I. Paul  
*Kansas State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/edconsiderations>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 License](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Litz, Charles E. and Paul, Warren I. (1973) "Educational Considerations, vol. 1(1) Full Issue," *Educational Considerations*: Vol. 1: No. 1. <https://doi.org/10.4148/0146-9282.2161>

This Full Issue is brought to you for free and open access by New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Considerations by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. For more information, please contact [cads@k-state.edu](mailto:cads@k-state.edu).

**spring  
1973**

# **educational considerations**

**published at kansas state university college of education**



## From The Editor's Viewpoint

# an invitation

Knowledge begets knowledge. Whatever we hear, see, experience increases our own awareness and comprehension and can help us help others learn. What you selectively or generally encounter in **Educational Considerations** is intended to inform you, provoke you, or make you think. Or maybe all of these.

Why a new professional education magazine? Two reasons. The first—information/stimulation—has been mentioned. The second is to provide another forum for writers about education who have something worth considering. Literally hundreds of education-oriented periodicals are being published at this time. (The **Current Index to Journals in Education** alone covers 700 of them, according to its March 1973 issue.) Not all, however, are “refereed” — that is, have some procedure by which manuscripts are reviewed for professional quality and credibility by knowledgeable educators who recommend unconditional acceptance, conditional acceptance (e.g., with suggested revisions), or rejection. Also, many of these publications have large backlogs of submitted and/or accepted manuscripts. (One well-known magazine, for example, has enough for the next 18 months, another enough for the next two years, while the new sponsor of a quarterly journal inherited more than 400 manuscripts!) As one result, a number of journals publish only solicited articles, which eases their review load but reduces publication opportunities for authors with unsolicited worthwhile subjects of interest. **Educational Considerations** will make room for unsolicited manuscripts of prime quality.

We are fortunate in the breadth and depth of our Editorial Board of Review members' experiential backgrounds. The excellence of Messrs. Bayles, Croft, Litz, McCain, and Wilhelms in their various professional endeavors establishes high standards for their evaluation of this magazine's potential publications.

At the moment, our audience is as vast as education itself. Naturally, its concerns will be diverse. We'll consider for publication any material submitted. But because our size and number of issues per year are limited, we will probably give a greater priority to broad-scope articles of more general interest than to highly specialized or technical submissions. One exception: Reports of successful learning experiences and how they were brought about—on any level. We can learn from such descriptions whether they occurred in kindergarten-college, adult or occupational education, military, non-school, or any other setting.

Whether teacher, student, administrator, or anyone else concerned with education, if you're an aspiring author with information to impart or a reasoned point to make—straightfacedly or with tongue-in-cheek—we invite you to let us see your manuscript. If you're a reader, we invite you to consider what our authors say. And if you've a comment on our content, write us a letter; we plan to establish a letters department in a near-future issue.

Knowledge begets knowledge. With that in mind, we offer you learning points for educational consideration.

W. I. P.



#### EDITORIAL BOARD OF REVIEW

Lewis A. Bayles  
Atlanta University  
Don B. Croft  
New Mexico State University  
James A. McCain  
Kansas State University  
Fred T. Wilhelms  
Lincoln, Nebraska

#### Co-Editors

Charles E. Litz  
Kansas State University  
Warren I. Paul  
Kansas State University

#### GRAPHIC ARTS DESIGN

Carol S. Winegardner, Graphic Arts  
Consultant  
Department of Art, Kansas State University  
Mary Collier, Cover and Inside Graphic  
Arts Design  
Kansas State University

#### PUBLICATION INFORMATION

*Educational Considerations* is published at the College of Education, Kansas State University. *Educational Considerations* and Kansas State University do not accept responsibility for the views expressed in articles, reviews, and other contributions appearing in this publication. In keeping with the professional educational concept that responsible free expression can promote learning and encourage awareness of truth, contributors are invited to submit conclusions and opinions concerned with varying points of view in and about education.

*Educational Considerations* is published three times yearly in fall, winter, and spring. Editorial offices are at the College of Education, Holton Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506. Correspondence about manuscripts and reviews should be addressed to the Editor. Unsolicited manuscripts should be accompanied by a self-addressed envelope with sufficient postage to insure its return. No remuneration is offered for accepted articles or other material submitted.

Material submitted to *Educational Considerations* can be as brief as a paragraph or as long as, say, 2000 words. All of it, including indented quoted matter and footnotes, should be typed double-spaced. Footnotes should be at the end of the manuscript. Headings should not be underlined. Please submit three copies of each manuscript. The author's complete name, address, and telephone number should be on a separate sheet attached to the original or one copy of the manuscript, not on any copies of the manuscript itself. Photographs, drawings, cartoons, and other illustrations are welcome. Authors should be prepared to provide, if requested, copies of permission to quote copyrighted matter. Queries about possible articles are certainly encouraged; however, a favorable reply is not to be considered a request for the article. For manuscript style other than specified above, be guided by the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 1967 Revision (1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036; 1972 printing, \$1.50). Please address questions about special styles to the Editor.

Subscription to *Educational Considerations* is \$4.00 per year, with single copies \$1.50 each. Correspondence about subscriptions should be addressed to the Business Manager, c/o The Editor, *Educational Considerations*, College of Education, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506. Checks for subscriptions should be made out to *Educational Considerations*.

Printed in the United States of America.

# educational considerations

Volume I, Number 1: Spring 1973

From The Editor's Viewpoint: An Invitation

Inside  
Front  
Cover

Career Education As An Educational Ideal

Philip L. Smith 2

The Learning Handicapped Child: With 'Friends'  
Like These, . . .

Sarah M. Sanderson 8

Selected National Trends In Educational  
Administration

Alfred P. Wilson 13

Women In The Public School: A Problem In  
Discrimination And Motivation

Laura J. Heinrich 15

The Louisville Urban Center: An Experiment  
In Facilitation

Herbert K. Heger 18

A Plausible Competency/Curriculum Approach  
To Improved Educational Programs

Arnold J. Moore 22

The Editorial Board Of Review


24



Educational philosopher Phil Smith critically examines the assumptions and arguments put forth by the advocates of Career Education. He questions the thinking behind the idea that the primary objective of the educational endeavor should be concerned with "the development of skills in an accepting job market."

## career education as an educational ideal

By Philip L. Smith



Dr. Smith is an Assistant Professor of Educational Philosophy in the College of Education, The Ohio State University. He is especially interested in moral philosophy and philosophical psychology.

During the past decade our schools have faced one crisis after another. The fact that those in charge have not always been up to the tasks before them hardly needs documentation. Many of the problems dealt with by schoolmen have simply been those recurring difficulties that confront every new generation attempting to educate its young. Decisions regarding curriculum content, teaching techniques and general school organization are, at least in part, contingent on existing social circumstances and for this reason must be reappraised constantly. But the issues with which these decisions deal are, nonetheless, manifestations of perennial educational problems. There are presently, however, a good number of difficulties within the field of education that cannot be easily explained as historically recurrent phenomena. Attempts to do so give the impression of misconceiving the nature of these difficulties, for they dictate responses that are ineffective as remedial replies. The magnitude of these difficulties justifies their being viewed not only as problems of crisis proportion, but as difficulties in great degree unique, requiring, perhaps, a new revolutionary mode of response if they are to be dealt with satisfactorily.

This, I think, is a position presently supported by a good number of educational policy makers and is not, therefore, to be taken as a one man declaration of war on my part. Indeed, I believe this viewpoint is oftentimes overstated, with the effect that any new proposal is considered desirable because it is new, and any historical correlation thought to be misleading because of the uniqueness of the present scene. To the degree present problems are different from those of the past it is a consequence of the fact that effective reform must be broad in scope and deep in constructive change.

One could responsibly argue that the present problems of the schools are not all that different from those of the past, but he would be much harder pressed to maintain that they have been as pervasive as they are now. The fact that many educators view the field with concern can be illustrated by the proliferation of sweeping suggestions for making the schools more effective in teaching and more suitable as socializing institutions. One of the most ambitious, and still influential, schemes so far proposed has been labeled "career education." This movement has accumulated a good deal of political power and continues to gather support from professionals and laymen alike. Simply in terms of financial backing career education deserves closer attention than it has so far received. In the last few years supporters claim to have gathered over \$100 million dollars to operationalize their programs.<sup>1</sup> One source insists that the amount received



from the federal government is closer to \$150 million, granted mostly from discretionary funds allocated by the U.S. Office of Education.<sup>2</sup>

Primarily because of its present prominence, I believe it important to examine the assumptions and arguments used to support "career education." I would like especially to evaluate "career education" in terms of its acceptability as an educational ideal, for it is usually inferred by supporters that it can meet ideal standards better than any other alternative. Both tasks require an examination of what might be called the "conceptual core" of the literature. I will proceed to lay out, as best I can, the basic concepts of career education which, together with their interrelationships, make the scheme intelligible as a theory. Now, this is not an easy task, for there are at least four factors which make explication difficult. (1) The concepts that constitute the scheme are admittedly vague and remain undeveloped in many important respects. Writers will admit frequently that terms lack precision and that the movement as a whole is not yet guided by universally accepted definitions.<sup>3</sup> (2) It is also a fact that advocates of career education differ on many important points. Frequently, those who differ will say this is a good thing and, in a sense, they might be right. But the result of this divergence commonly produces a form of ambiguity that appears as contradiction. (3) Supporters often make claims that appear so sweeping as to be all inclusive. But by appearing to claim everything, these proposals lose their meaning and appear to say nothing at all.<sup>4</sup> (4) The literature on career education is wide and various and, for this reason, hard to pull together. One has the feeling that no matter what he says he is doing someone an injustice. Recognizing all of these limitations and the pitfalls they create, I will proceed toward my stated objectives. I hope not so much to produce a definitive analysis as to start a constructive dialogue.

### Vocational Ancestry

Despite the many attempts of writers on career education to disassociate themselves from the more narrow conceptions of vocational training, it is the older vocational education movement out of which career education has grown. But whereas leaders in vocational education argued that vocational training is necessary, in many cases, if one is to have the best possible education for him, they never tried to argue that it is necessary in every case or that it is sufficient in any case. Proponents of career education are more ambitious than their forebears. They seem to argue that their scheme is both necessary and sufficient for all who are being educated. Thus, they insist that reflective effort in education ought always to be centered around the problems of gaining employment.<sup>5</sup> We have here a system that cannot be conceived simply as a portion of a student's education, nor as a separate subject field like that of vocational training. Career education provides the specific objective of successful career performance and employs it as the primary aim of all education.<sup>6</sup>

Career education, then, is proposed as a whole new paradigm for education.<sup>7</sup> Career concerns would be made a part of every student's course of study from the moment he

enters school. Every subject he takes would be related, ostensibly, to the various ways adults live and earn a living. The assumption here is that virtually everything the school teaches, or should teach, can be helpful in at least one type of career.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, career implications are said to be inherent in every learning experience from preschool to graduate school and beyond.<sup>9</sup> Such are the rationale for requiring every teacher in every course to emphasize the contribution his subject makes to successful career performance.<sup>10</sup> This stress is phased into every subject for every student, not just in separate classes designed for those who are "going to work."<sup>11</sup>

I think the extreme formulation of these claims can be questioned. It seems naive to deny that the result of trying to operationalize such a belief would be an artificiality of the most glaring sort. Most of what must be learned in life is not for the sake of getting a job, but for the sake of leading a good life. And schools have been set up to concern themselves at least as much with the problems of leading a good life as with the problems of getting a job. It should be obvious that not all of what is involved in leading a good life can be understood and achieved simply through successful job performance. Thus, a good deal of the school's curriculum has to do only indirectly, if at all, with the eventual selection of individual occupations, for such considerations are not always tied to a person's leading a good life. A good life is based in part on social participation in cultural and intellectual activities that are more inclusive than those found in one's occupation. Individuals ought to be able to engage in conduct that results in an ever increasing understanding of the world in which they live.

Limiting studies to career concerns makes it less likely, rather than more likely, that this objective will be achieved. If we are to demand that school subject matter be related directly to career performance when such a connection does not always exist, then we must admit to a certain amount of artificiality or else deny the appropriateness of much of what schools have been established to achieve.

### Proponents Persistent

Proponents of career education are, nonetheless, persistent in arguing that anything worth teaching can be related to occupation. They describe the curriculum, for example, as a series of experiences designed to enhance the job skills of students.<sup>12</sup> Such an orientation is thought to give each individual a self-concept in keeping with a work oriented society and assure his making a fair contribution to the group. It is through this somewhat devious approach to teaching that career education is said to make schools more relevant. Children are made aware of "the world of work" and their interests channeled into specific programs. Informal guidance and counseling, as well as instruction, are given throughout the school years. All students are encouraged to make a tentative career choice by the end of kindergarten and asked to modify or reaffirm that choice periodically throughout the period of their education.<sup>13</sup>

In the years up through grade school students are exposed to large and inclusive categories called "clusters" which serve



to reveal hundreds of separate occupations. For example, one will find a "transportation" cluster subsuming all of those jobs within the transportation industry. In all there are fifteen such categories from "personal services" to "marketing and distribution," each cluster representing hundreds of jobs and their interrelationships.

In the middle grades, 7 through 9, students begin to zero in on particular job clusters catching their eye. By the end of the 10th grade students are at work developing specific job entry skills that would make them employable if they decided not to finish high school. Those who graduate are in a position to accept a job or continue their education. In every case students have an opportunity to "enjoy actual work" during their high school years. Arrangements are made with business and industry to help give guidance and counseling. In this way, students are aided further in developing interests in potential careers.<sup>14</sup>

### **Influenced By Montessori?**

Without any conscious intention to do so, proponents of career education have apparently adopted many of the pedagogical principles of Maria Montessori. Like Montessori, they maintain that children are best taught by providing a certain amount of freedom within a precisely structured environment. Sidney P. Marland Jr. has said that career education, "implies a structured orientation and preparation program for every student as an integral part of his academic course work throughout the school and college years."<sup>15</sup> This claim appears to be founded on the belief that children require order and direction if what they learn is to be judged desirable, for such a belief underlies any justification of a rigid formulation of curriculum. Thus, when Marland and others describe teachers as facilitators and counselors, they are ignoring the fact that the curriculum, and those who formulate it, are predetermining the answers to the most important questions a student might ask. As Montessori was criticized by progressively minded educators in her own day, proponents of career education might likewise be denounced for ignoring both the ethics of imposition and established principles of learning.

The career education movement can be explained not only as a reaction against the way schools are presently being run, but against more radical proposals for change. Individuals in this movement view the alternative of "free schools" as irresponsible, and are especially offended by Ivan Illich's suggestion to "deschool society." Because of this view the career education movement can be best understood as a traditional reaction to revolutionary forces. One is reminded of the response of James Conant to the urban schools in the late 1950's. He said with alarm they contained "social dynamite." Most of his proposals were motivated by his desire to defuse the rebellion he foresaw and only indirectly to provide students with an adequate education.

Proponents of career education do not consider the possibility that schools could have problems for reasons other than a lack of career programs. But if our schools have problems it is not necessarily because they fail to focus on the learner's perception of himself as a worker. There are other possible explanations for the schools' failure to come

up to our standards. Indeed, it is likely that their failure is not solely the result of their internal organization. If the problems of schools emanate, even in part, from other than internal sources and if these problems are to be dealt with in an adequate fashion, then it is not enough for the schools simply to reform themselves. They must play a part in more fundamental social change. But the record of schools as institutions of social reform is less than impressive. There have been many to argue that schools will act invariably to preserve, not change the status quo.<sup>16</sup> Christopher Jencks has recently defended the view that our nation has asked too much of its schools, expecting them to solve problems that society as a whole is unwilling to attack directly.<sup>17</sup> The evidence he has gathered supports the conclusion that children are influenced more by what happens at home than by what happens in school. Once in school, the formal curriculum affects them far less than the intimate minute-by-minute contacts with classmates and teachers. And these, unfortunately, are so far beyond our control. Where there is some evidence of schools exerting an influence on students, the effect usually fails to carry over into adulthood. To assume that the problems of the schools can be remedied by imposing a rigid system of career preparation is not only naive, but makes the causes of school failure even more difficult to understand.

### **Purpose: Work Ethic**

Career education has been described as a philosophical commitment by the enterprise of public education to the values of a work-oriented society.<sup>18</sup> Its purpose is to establish a strong work ethic through the instructive functions of the school. "There ain't no such thing as a free lunch," is the cry.

Individual incomes and national strength still rest upon productivity. Some can live without work only by lowering the standard of living of all. . . . no society can survive without work. Moreover, he who does not contribute in some way to society's welfare is a parasite, a situation more harmful to himself than to the society. If the school prepares people for life, it must prepare them for work and for some type of worth ethic.<sup>19</sup>

In order to support the claim that career education would make schools more relevant, four assumptions are made and insisted upon: (1) That productivity per unit of population is directly related to a national commitment to the work ethic. (2) That the classical version of the Protestant work ethic is being eroded in American society. (3) That, historically, great civilizations have ceased to prosper after abandoning a commitment to the work ethic. (4) That career education will restore us to work ethic, adopted to reflect new social and economic realities.<sup>20</sup> Being aware of these assumptions, one can recognize the rationale of writers who assert that, "the work ethic should be taught to and accepted by all students."<sup>21</sup> As imposing as this demand appears, the same people who make it will then turn around and claim to be giving students more freedom, rather than less freedom, in making decisions about how and what to learn. The claim is



based on their belief that the best measure of a man is found in what he achieves and how he serves.<sup>22</sup> And one can neither achieve nor serve, so it is said, unless he is both willing and able to develop his work values in conjunction with the work values of his fellow men.<sup>23</sup>

#### A Lack Of Sincerity?

It could be maintained that there is a lack of sincerity in these statements as well as a lack of knowledge. As to lack of sincerity, it seems clear that, despite their misleading remarks intended to demonstrate their concern with morality, proponents of career education do not deal adequately with questions of value. The explanation of this fact might be found in their exhibition of a missionary zeal for propagating their ideas. They speak frequently of the need to "convert" the schools to the programs of career education.<sup>24</sup> Working with such an assumption, it is easy to understand how they might fail to appreciate the need to deal with questions that could undermine their beliefs. Operating on faith, they conceive of their function in terms of spreading a creed. And a creed cannot be questioned. Its truth is guaranteed and its worth is beyond reproach.

Hence, it is hardly surprising to find sponsors of career education putting forth a version of the Protestant ethic as the only rational alternative in a society of moral men. Reading the literature, one is reminded of the moral messages in each and every story of McGuffey's reader. The primary purpose of the reader was to teach children to read. But this purpose made possible another: the moral indoctrination of youth. It is not in itself condemnable that a movement would moralize in behalf of a certain way of life. What one could criticize in the writings on career education is the superficiality with which they make their moral pronouncements. An obvious objection to the programs of career education is that they appear to manipulate the lives of students in ways that could result easily in exploitation. If a certain amount of manipulation accompanies the implementation of career education curricula, it ought to be justified or else tempered with an adequate degree of student participation in decisions of program and purpose.

Older forms of vocational education were frequently criticized for ignoring, and sometimes supporting, an already corrupt and unjust social order. Despite disclaiming remarks, career education supporters fail to provide any assurance that they would not continue in this tradition. Students are asked to step into an already existing job market without thinking of their place in the overall scheme of things. They are asked simply to be realistic and prepare for life in the society into which they will be graduated.<sup>25</sup>

Unfortunately the emphasis on working within the system of existing social and economic relationships is not counterbalanced with a corresponding emphasis on developing an ability to think about the system in anything resembling a critical manner. In virtue of its failure to provide this critical capacity, it is hard to see how career education could be considered "ideal." The teaching of the ability to think, and to think free from institutional constraints, is a priority high on the list of any ideal educational scheme. The scheme must demand, among other things, that a person have the will as

well as the skill to evaluate and change the status quo when it no longer deserves to be perpetuated. John Dewey has been only one of many to point out that an education conceived exclusively in terms of securing a technical competency in specialized future pursuits becomes an instrument for perpetuating unchanged the existing social order instead of operating as a means of desirable transformation.<sup>26</sup>

The National Urban League has expressed great concern about the effects of career education on desired social reform. They have gone so far as to call it a potential threat to American blacks and the urban poor. They believe that minority students will tend to be channeled into low-paying service jobs without any control over their fate. Students must be guaranteed not only certain job skills, but the right to decide how and when to use them.<sup>27</sup> Public schools have not traditionally worked in the interests of minorities. Indeed, they have served the needs of dominant social classes.<sup>28</sup> In its present amorphous condition, career education could easily operate to continue this pattern. "Career education" could turn out to be just another label with effects similar to infamous labels in the past. "Career education" seems destined to the sort of interpretation given eventually to words like "vocation," "special," "slow" and "tracked." These terms were first employed with the best of intentions, but employment ended to the disadvantage of those to whom they were used to refer.

#### Applicability Questioned

Career education has grown out of the research tradition of career development and is fused with concepts of manpower training. But there is a serious question as to whether concepts evolved for the purpose of dealing with the limited concerns of career development can have application to the general interests of educational foundations. Even used metaphorically, the language of career education appears inadequate to deal with the problems of formulating an educational theory. For example, the literature is permeated with discussion based on cost-benefit and business analysis. The need to alter school organization is conceived as the need to "retool" education. Truly, we often speak of retooling a factory, even an entire industry. But when we talk of changing the organization of schools we usually recognize psychological and moral dimensions in our task that simply are not present when we speak of "retooling" an industry. Educational change is more than physical; it is dispositional as well. Conceiving of such change as if it were a process of retooling can distort important dimensions of educational enterprise. We could object similarly to conceiving the curriculum as a "delivery system," for such a conception brings to light only the tangible and measurable effects of teaching and learning. It is not unwarranted to expect the schools to deal with more than practical concerns.<sup>29</sup>

In the literature on career education one can occasionally find attempts to operationalize abstract ideas. But these attempts are usually totally ill conceived. "Intelligence" for example, is described in terms of "units." The overriding temptation of a discerning reader is to ask for the rationale of such a conceptualization. One cannot say that it is generally



recognized that such a reduction is possible. The suspicion is that the interpretation is for the sake of consistency and the argument that career education can be supported by every important educational consideration. Another example illustrating this point can be found in the not infrequent reference to human beings as human resources. Viewing people as resources allows their programs to be seen as a form of investment in human capital—an investment offering the promise of high economic returns.<sup>30</sup> I would contend that viewing education solely in terms of an investment in human capital, providing potentially high returns makes it more, rather than less, difficult to see what is at stake in the educational enterprise. Education is not simply a means to making individuals contributing economic producers and responsible members of society.<sup>31</sup> And a system of education with a demonstrated capacity to contribute to economic growth and national well-being is not necessarily a desirable system.<sup>32</sup>

### Relevance To Accountability

Perhaps one reason for using the language of cost-benefit analysis to describe an educational ideal can be found in the fact that it makes accountability an achievable reality. Indeed, supporters of career education see accountability as an extremely important feature of an ideal educational scheme. Their system "offers accountability because its objectives are clearly defined and its success or failure can be measured in the employment, earnings, and job satisfaction of its recipients."<sup>33</sup> As cost-benefit terminology is used to describe the advantages of career education, the language of medicine is used to depict the ills of contemporary schooling and to suggest further ways to remedy them. Their curriculum programs, or "instructional components," are referred to as "treatments." These treatments are applied after a proper "diagnosis" is made of each situation. "Prescriptive treatments" are then formulated and carefully evaluated against desired outcomes and, if necessary, "recycled" or improved upon. "The iterative cycle of diagnosis, prescription, treatment, assessment, accepting, rejecting, and recycling is the central project strategy."<sup>34</sup> And the strategy itself is conceived as nothing less than a "systematic research and engineering effort."<sup>35</sup>

Writers proclaim that education can at last have intelligible criteria of success; that is, criteria having the advantage of being practical, achievable, and measurable. But can the ideal be defined simply in terms of what can be made measurable? There are phenomena in education that cannot be ignored solely on the grounds they cannot be measured with existing instruments and techniques. If this is the case, the conclusion stands out that the criteria of success developed in the literature on career education are less than adequate. And if they are not adequate, we have sufficient grounds for rejecting career education as an educational ideal, for its acceptance is contingent not only on its being successful, but on the criteria themselves being judged satisfactory.

Almost a half a century ago John Dewey described a vocation as signifying any form of continuous activity that

renders service to others and engages personal power in behalf of some result.<sup>36</sup> He went on to warn us not to conceive of a vocation simply as an activity producing tangible commodities, or such that they are distributed in an exclusive way; one and only one to each person. He insisted that, "nothing could be more absurd than to try to educate individuals with an eye to only one line of activity."<sup>37</sup> To the degree an activity is isolated it loses its meaning and becomes merely a way to keep busy. We must all be conceived as having a variety of callings. No one has simply a single-role life. To the extent that a person approximates such a condition he is a kind of monstrosity. We naturally identify an individual by naming that particular vocation which distinguishes his personality. But in education we must not let this fact blind us to other essential activities and interests simply because they are commonly shared with others.<sup>38</sup>

In all of his educational writings Dewey described the dominant vocation of all human beings as an intellectual and moral expansion of practical capabilities. But he saw education as rigid and stifling when career guidance is thought of as leading up to a definite and all encompassing choice. One's calling must not fossilize him.<sup>39</sup> It is a conventional and arbitrary view which assumes that the choice of one's career is made once and for all at some particular point in time. Educators must periodically remind themselves of this seemingly obvious fact, for the history of education reveals a pattern of their ignoring it. Dewey himself recognized a general lack of technical proficiency in his own day and admitted that such a proficiency is desirable in its own right, as well as for the production of more and better goods. No one cares for what he cannot half do.<sup>40</sup> But it is important to distinguish a proficiency in a particular area of work and a competency extended to view it in a larger light. Giving one the skills to carry out someone else's designs is not as high on the list of educational priorities as giving one the ability to formulate his own. Despite an occasional acknowledgement of this latter concern in the literature of career education, the primary objective of the movement too often appears to be centered on the development of skills in an accepting job market. As important as this consideration can be, we can conclude unequivocally that a system of education is unacceptable if it ignores or consciously works against the paramount goal of freeing the mind from the forces that create it. The career education movement can make a valuable contribution to revitalization of our schools. But first someone must rethink its objectives and their place in the palace revolution.

### FOOTNOTES

1. Sidney P. Marland, "The School's Role in Career Development," *Educational Leadership*, vol. XXX (December 1972), p. 204.
2. Sally Spitzer, "Career Education: A New Name for an Old Game," *Education, Policy and Information Center Bulletin of the National Urban League*, vol. 1 (Summer 1972).
3. Keith Goldhammer and Robert E. Taylor, *Career Education: Perspective and Promise* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972), p. 5.
4. Kenneth B. Hoyt, et al., *Career Education: What it is and how to do it*. (Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Company, 1972) p. 2.



5. Goldhammer and Taylor, *Career Education: Perspective and Promise*, p. 2.
6. Hoyt, et al, *Career Education: What it is and how to do it*, p. 6.
7. Goldhammer and Taylor, *Career Education: Perspective and Promise*, p. V.
8. Hoyt, et al, *Career Education: What it is and how to do it*, p. 74.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
12. Goldhammer and Taylor, *Career Education: Perspective and Promise*, p. 6.
13. Hoyt, et al, *Career Education: What it is and how to do it*, p. 74.
14. "Career Education," U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW Publication # (OE) 72-39, 1971), pp. 7-8.
15. Marland, "The School's Role in Career Development," p. 203.
16. G. Max Wingo, *The Philosophy of American Education* (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1964), pp. 57-121.
17. "Can Equality be Taught?" *Newsweek*, vol. LXXX (September 11, 1972), p. 50.
18. "Career Education," U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, p. 4.
19. Hoyt, et al, *Career Education: What it is and how to do it*, p. 14.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 66-67.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
23. Goldhammer and Taylor, *Career Education: Perspective and Promise*, p. 10.
24. "Career Education," U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, p. 8, and Keith Goldhammer, "Alternative Educational Futures: The Choices Before Us" (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1972), p. v.
25. "Career Education," U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, p. 8.
26. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: The Free Press, 1966), p. 319.
27. Ermon O. Hogan, "Career Education in the Urban League Movement: Beyond Vocational Education," *Education, Policy and Information Center Bulletin of the National Urban League*, vol. 1 (Summer 1972).
28. Colin Greer, *The Great School Legend* (New York: Basic Books, 1972), and Henry J. Perkinson, *The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education, 1865-1965* (New York: Random House, 1968).
29. Gordon I. Swanson, "Career Education" (Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, 1971), p. 5.
30. Goldhammer and Taylor, *Career Education: Perspective and Promise*, p. 111.
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Ibid.*
33. Hoyt, et al, *Career Education: What it is and how to do it*, p. 6.
34. Goldhammer and Taylor, *Career Education: Perspective and Promise*, p. 8.
35. *Ibid.*
36. Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, p. 319.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 307.
38. *Ibid.*
39. *Ibid.*, p. 311.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 317.

"Education has never had an easy time of it. It is constantly the subject of a contest because it does not have well defined boundaries. The classicist argues persuasively that real education is cultivation of the mind. But the vocational voice, highly regarded in our culture, stresses the importance of job-oriented instruction. And the pragmatist seeks to reconcile these divergent views, often with little success. Small wonder that educational critics, a group to which all citizens belong by the very nature of their concern, disagree about educational goals. And because our society has not yet made up its mind about what schools should be about, it is not surprising that teachers sometimes question what it is they are trying to do."

—Donald J. McCarty and Associates  
**New Perspectives on Teacher Education**, pp. vii-viii  
 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973)



With righteous anger, a learning disabilities specialist with long experience in investigative reporting warns that the academically handicapped child is the one most hurt by the present political, sociological, and legal conflicts in and about special education. She describes several of the effects and suggests ways to resolve the situation.

## The Learning Handicapped Child:

# with 'friends' like these, . . .

By Sarah M. Sanderson



Mrs. Sanderson is Supervisor of Special Education for Camden, New Jersey, schools. She holds masters degrees in education and psychology from Rutgers University and is a certified Learning Disabilities Specialist and a Registered Nurse. During her more than two decades as full-time south New Jersey reporter for the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*, she found time to help found the J. F. Kennedy Memorial Hospital in Audubon, New Jersey, and the Audubon All-Girl Drum and Bugle Corps. She has taught classes in special education at Glassboro State College, helped develop, in Camden, the Catto School for emotionally disturbed children, and for four summers headed Camden's Head Start program. She is also President of the South Jersey Chapter of the Council for Exceptional Children.

Today's academically handicapped child has become the helpless pawn of politicians, special interest groups, educators, sociologists, physicians, psychologists, psychiatrists, and research scientists. Each has reasons and solutions for the other disciplines and groups to implement.

In turn, the educational system has become the scapegoat of each of these groups. Although they cannot agree among themselves as to the cause or the remediation of handicapped children's problems, or even if remediation is possible, the demand on the school is: Do something.

Nationwide lip service is given to uniqueness of the individual, yet no one seems willing to accept the fact that universal education produces differences, not sameness, or that equal exposure to learning experiences and facilities does not produce equal learning and education.

In recent years many youngsters with learning and/or behavior problems have been identified as perceptually impaired, neurologically impaired, emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, mentally retarded (in varying and hotly disputed degrees), or culturally deprived. Identifications, diagnoses, diagnostic labels, with regard to the "educationally disabled" are as varied and variable as the theoretical bents of the communities, school systems, sociologists, psychologists, physicians, special interest groups, and politicians expressing interest in such children.

Our culture puts a high value on perfection. We tend to deny the existence of a disability or handicap. Note the tendency by many persons to deny a hearing loss or a need for glasses. Yet, conversely, as a nation we tend to accept a visible deviation from the **physical** norm. Hence for many years school systems and society in general increasingly have provided programs for children who are halt, lame, blind, and/or deaf. Society, parents, and families have accepted these children with feelings varying from self pity to cheerful dedication. Parents and friends have banded together to share common experiences and problem solutions, and to obtain public and educational help, all of which make life more comfortable, happier, meaningful, "normal" for both the handicapped and his family. Physicians, scientists, technologists have combined their skills to aid them.

Tragically, we cannot seem to accept with the same grace and sympathy any deviation from the **mental** norm. We loudly proclaim that each individual is different and that we all can't be mathematicians, television stars, or astronauts. We just as loudly insist that every one is mentally alike. We accept that Johnny inherits father's nose and grandfather's walk, but never could he inherit anything from Uncle Joe who



never did learn to read a book but was the best darn mechanic in town. We too often retreat to guilt, and in turn project it onto others in the face of the unknown, the non-visual mind, brain, mentality.

The various disciplines, special interest groups, and politicians cannot agree that there is, or is not, a normal mental potential. A normal blood pressure, blood sugar, size, or weight—these are accepted. We have high or low blood pressure. We are tall or short, large or small for our age. We are over- or under-weight. We are brilliant, gifted, and have a high I.Q. But we cannot seem to accept that there can be a normal I.Q. or a low I.Q.

### Same Basic Needs

A mentally retarded child is considered educationally handicapped. But of course retard means to slow down, not stop. Certainly, except in the case of the seriously handicapped, our mentally retarded children show few physiological differences to the uninitiated. Their retardation spans as wide a degree of personality variation as the normal child's. All have the same basic needs for food, clothing, love, recognition by significant others, to be needed, and to have companionship. They laugh, cry, play, work, dance, and sing. They become frustrated, and angry, and their feelings can be hurt. They have the same life experiences, values, and cultures, and the same social, vocational, and life expectancies.

If they are so much alike, then how are they different? They aren't. It is those around them, too often, who refuse to recognize or accept the disabilities, who refuse to help learning disabled children establish realistic goals and to help them towards those goals.

Nevertheless, there has been progress. In recent years meaningful educational programs geared not only to the learning pace of the academically slower moving student, but also to his social, emotional, and vocational needs, have been developed in many school districts. Increasingly, educators and school boards are realizing that mental potential knows no geographic, municipal, social, economic, ethnic, or cultural boundaries.

Free, public school education is an integral part of the American culture. Our public school systems have long been viewed as the keystone of our form of government, social knowledge, and social change. Now, however, school systems across the nation are beleaguered by class action court suits demanding special programs and facilities for equal educational opportunities for handicapped children.

In response to these suits and to the repeated reminders that all children should have the right to an equal education, many school systems in recent years established special learning units or classes. Colleges developed programs to train new teachers, while thousands of experienced teachers returned to the college classroom to learn how to meet the specialized needs of these children. Legislators wrote bills and appropriated special funds to help underwrite the astronomical cost. Help had arrived.

Help was met, however, by disagreements and interdisciplinary theoretical arguments—still going on—concerning etiology, diagnosis, terminology, remediation,

and test validity. Ironically, many who campaigned the longest and loudest for special programs, special teachers, special classes, special legislation, and special funds now cry out against labeling, stigmatizing, segregating, and discriminating. The child, with all his special needs and helps, again is the helpless pawn.

There is increasing indication (e.g., through articles, letters to newspapers, statements by parents, legislators, professionals) that all these demands, claims, counter-claims, and criticisms are confusing and hindering efforts to help the educationally handicapped children in this country. The media are saturated with appeals to help the handicapped, hire the handicapped, contribute to the handicapped. Predictions of the number of handicapped children born appear frequently. Every segment of the population, it seems, condemns the school system for graduating high school students who "can't read past the third grade." Yet the same school system too often also is condemned for stigmatizing the handicapped child by identifying him or establishing special needs programs for him.

Tragically, a child with a learning disability problem is as hard for some parents, some groups to accept as is the concept of limited intellectual potential. For some, identification of the learning problem of some intellectually intact children was "proof" of the educators' fallibility. For certain special interest groups, it "proved" that their children were victims of discrimination, segregation, stigmatizing, and labeling.

### Semantic 'Cop-Outs'

Pressures for immediate action of some not-always-identified kind have had interesting, though not necessarily effective, results. For example, some educational systems, some psychological evaluators, swayed by the pressures, or perhaps by their own theoretical persuasions, have ignored the criteria of average or high intellectual potential, to find "depressed intellectual potential." Youngsters with limited intellectual potential suddenly became "learning disabled." It was a short step to lumping them all together as "educationally handicapped." (As one result, in recent years the term "educationally handicapped" has become as encompassing an umbrella as "culturally deprived." Both are semantic "cop-outs" devised by those who refuse to accept differences, identify them, and get on with the job of meeting specific needs.)

The current pressure to integrate the educationally handicapped student in a regular class and then send him to an instructional materials center for individual teaching for periods ranging from 50 to 90 percent of his school day accents the negative rather than the positive. It placates the parent or special interest group rather than aiding the student, the author has been forced to conclude. This pressure, coming largely from certain special interest groups which insist that such integrated or non-graded placement with chronological-age peers will be more beneficial for both his academic and social welfare, unfortunately tends to be based on inference or what is viewed as negative results in special class settings rather than on positive results in integrated classrooms. Rather than providing equal



educational opportunity, particularly at the pre-vocational training level, such integration insures a collision course with his chronological-age, but cognitively different peers. They both become increasingly aware of the ever widening academic gap, and many of the students with higher mental potential react negatively to what they consider the unfairness of receiving the same promotions, advancements, and diplomas for different academic achievement and cognitive skills. When this happens, school authorities are usually held responsible, and not so much because they attempted to avoid stigma by requiring similar learning experiences for chronological-age peers as, apparently, for not persuading all the students that all their educational rewards had equal meaning.

On the one hand, the child's disability is denied and on the other, blame for the existence of that disability is projected upon the educational system. Thus many of the demands of the special interest groups are contradictory in view of the needs of the handicapped child to be met.

### Legal Considerations

Courts and legislatures also provide arenas for advocacies. Special interest group plaintiffs argue that special programs do not meet the learning needs of children who are "first handicapped by their inherited or acquired mental, physical, behavioral or emotional handicap and secondly by arbitrary and capricious processes by which the defendants (schools) identify, label and place them . . ." (Michigan).<sup>1</sup> Minority group children are "inappropriately classified as educable mentally retarded" . . . a "stigma" which carries "a life sentence of illiteracy . . ." They should be placed in a "regular classroom with children of comparable age and provided with intensive and supplemental individual training . . ." (California).<sup>2</sup> There is also failure ". . . to advise retarded children of a right to a fair and impartial hearing . . . with respect to the decision classifying them as 'mentally retarded' . . ." (Louisiana).<sup>3</sup>

And in New York, where for several years the state had provided \$2,000 annually toward the education of each mentally retarded child, the legislature in 1972 acquiesced to the cries of special interest groups which argued that the term "mental retardation" stigmatizes a child. By legislative fiat, the term "mental retardation" disappeared and was replaced by "educationally handicapped," which raised a whole new question about state financial aid toward education for these newly labelled youngsters.

Interpretations of legislation affect federal aid, too. For example, large numbers of sociologists, psychologists, and special interest groups loudly insist that a multitude of educational handicaps are rooted in cultural deprivation. Yet special needs children in urban areas, where an inordinately high percentage of them are concentrated, are often barred from federally funded programs supposedly designed to help them. Millions of dollars are poured into city school systems. But if a school system receives financial aid toward the cost of special programs (as in New Jersey under the Beadleston Act), federal guidelines decree that those same children are ineligible for participation in the federally financed programs. Hence a handicapped child is often banned from

programs in which his own, more educationally able brothers and sisters can participate. An outstanding example is the federal Title I program\* supposedly designed to aid the culturally deprived child, particularly in urban areas.\*\*

### A Positive Aspect

A positive aspect of all this ferment has been diagnostic refinement, recognition, and differentiation of some of the subtle, complex, conceptual, or perceptual disabilities which result in academic achievement far below a child's intellectual potential. The intellectually, neurologically, psychologically, audilogically, or visually handicapped child may be given a clean bill of health. Yet this child too often cannot see words for the letters in them or sentences for the words in them.\*\*\* On standard intellectual examinations such as the WISC,<sup>4</sup> he shows a significant discrepancy between the verbal and performance scores: the

\* The Aid to Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-10), Title I. Basically (although the guidelines alone require several volumes and the Act has been amended several times), Title I funds are to be used to provide classroom teacher aides and teachers of remedial reading, music, art, physical education, and audiovisual education, and their hardware and software equipment, for designated elementary schools. (A school's eligibility can and does shift annually since it is based on a percentage of that school's population which falls in a federally designated income level category.) Also provided for are social, psychological, and community workers and personnel. All these persons, services, and equipment items must be provided in addition to any or all regular or special service programs funded by either and/or both the state and local school district of a given school, however.

\*\*One example: Joseph is one of four siblings of an eligible Title I family attending a Title I school in a Title I classroom with 20 children, a Master Teacher, and two teacher aides. He is taught art and music twice weekly and receives remedial or supplemental reading help daily. His school happens to be in a state where extra state funds are provided to help defray the costs of specified special education programs. Joseph is tested and found to be "P.I." or "perceptually impaired," so that he needs the specialized help of the state-supported specialized P.I. teacher. Joseph is moved to a class for perceptually impaired children. The class has 12 children (the usual number for a P.I. class). Each has some type of perceptual disability, so each child's daily program — including Joseph's — is designed specifically to meet his needs. But what of all the other services available to Joseph in his previous class? His P.I. class has no teacher aide. Music and art are now taught to him once weekly. None of the children has remedial reading except what the special P.I. teacher provides. Joseph is no longer eligible for guidance counseling or help by the community workers or social workers unless these assistances are provided by his particular school district as a regular service. Since Joseph's is one of the many districts — urban, in particular — which do not provide such additional help as a regular service because of the expense, Joseph is no longer eligible for that help despite his need for it.

\*\*\* More specifically, superficial observation indicates that his abilities seem intact. Classically he is often fluent, but his proficiency breaks down in the face of the printed symbol. Despite an extensive vocabulary, he may have difficulty with modality concepts of words which indicate auditory, visual, tactual, temporal, quantitative, or spatial relationships. He often shows perseverative thinking, disorganized or dissociative thinking, attention, concentration, and coordination problems.



capacity for learning and the functional level. On such tests as the Bender<sup>5</sup> and the Benton,<sup>6</sup> he often shows perseveration, reversals, difficulty with angulation, closures, shapes and spatial relationships, and peripheral figures.

Educators, teachers, parents have struggled to determine how to help this obviously intelligent child who can't read, or write, or spell, or do arithmetic; who has problems with encoding or decoding; who has perfect hearing acuity, but can't differentiate between a long A and a short A; who has 20/20 vision, knows every letter of the alphabet, can verbally spell his name backwards and forwards but can't recognize it when written in isolation.

Psychological and medical research have brought recognition of physiological and emotional factors which can block full usage of cognitive potential. The intellectual potential of these neurologically impaired or emotionally disturbed youngsters may range from either end of the continuum to any place in between. Unfortunately there is little acceptance of this deviation by parents and society until the child through utter frustration acts out or withdraws.

From Strauss<sup>7</sup> down through Kirk,<sup>8</sup> Cruickshank,<sup>9</sup> Kephart,<sup>10</sup> Johnson,<sup>11</sup> Myklebust,<sup>12</sup> and Vallett<sup>13</sup> (to name a few), facets of the extraordinarily complex sequence of muscle and nerve events needed for the information-processing and application for a specific learning task are being identified. Remediation for each is as unique as the problem.

### Learning Process Alteration

Gradually a definition has evolved. The basic tenet is that the child's learning process has been altered, possibly by neurological dysfunction or developmental lag, which has resulted in a disability, not an incapacity in learning. He has adequate motor ability, average to high intelligence, adequate hearing, adequate vision and adequate emotional adjustment. The homogeneity of the group is a deficiency in learning of perceptual, conceptual, or coordinative nature.

Psychologists, sociologists, neurologists, oculists, pediatricians, teachers, language therapists, early childhood developmental specialists, parent groups, and legislators have become involved. Each, it seems, has developed a causative theory for the schools to attempt to resolve.

Hundreds of surveys, tests, programs, theories have evolved. More than 70 educational supply firms have rushed into publication and production materials for correcting learning disabilities, each touted as the panacea. Experience, however, has shown that none works for all the handicapped.

In some states, as in New Jersey, a new crash program was born. Legislators decided that a child with a learning disability was and is perceptually impaired and decreed that each such child be evaluated by a Learning Disability Teacher-Consultant. (That title was changed from specialist to teacher-consultant in less than two years.) The fact that only a few persons had completed training for such highly specialized work was ignored. Start now!

Foresighted state teachers colleges continued to refine, modify, and expand the educational offerings for their teacher students; meanwhile, in schools and centers, speech

therapists, psychologists, guidance counselors, and reading teachers were thrown into the breach. Thousands of dollars for "learning disability materials" were spent. Private learning centers mushroomed. Parents either rejected the new classification and help or saw it as the solution to the problems of all children.

New Jersey is noted for the scope and depth of programs it provides for children who have special educational needs. Until recently its certification requirements for special education teachers were among the most stringent in the nation. Only teachers who had demonstrated success in the regular classroom were admitted to training programs in the specialties. In recent years, the previous teaching success criteria have been relaxed. New Jersey's state colleges now graduate students who are certified to teach both elementary grades and the "handicapped" without regard to any kind of specific "handicap" except for profound deafness.

However, at the same time, their graduate schools have moved to train teachers and specialists to work with the intellectually intact child who has a learning disability. In the past four years they have expanded their programs to meet the influx of special education teachers who have voluntarily returned to the college classroom. These are the teachers who work with the mentally retarded, the neurologically impaired, or the emotionally disturbed. Fortunately, there are school systems in which the special education division has adopted one of the basic tenets of the learning disability teaching prescription: identify the child's strengths and weaknesses. Then teach to his strengths. If his intellectual capability cannot be changed, he can at least be taught to use every bit of it to the fullest extent possible.

While many specialists accept and apply these basic tenets, programs intended to help the educationally handicapped child are too often inadequate, fragmented, or even conflicting. What can be done to promote the accord and consistency necessary for effective programming?

### Three Suggestions

First, all persons concerned must acknowledge that varying levels of educative potential do exist. They must also accept that identification of a child's learning handicap, while often initially painful—particularly for the parents—is essential if that child's special needs are to be met.

Second, the public, as well as those most directly involved in program implementation, must be persuaded and educated to accept the realities of learning disability. This can be achieved through broadly disseminated publicity, workshops, inservice training, civic group involvement, and individual counseling. Local, state, and federal agencies of education—as well as private foundations and organizations—should be encouraged to use their resources to support such efforts.

Third, legislative action must be coordinated with educative experience and competence if its application is to be both practical and effective. Researchers and other educators knowledgeable in remediation techniques should cooperate to develop long-range programs, to organize professional and civic groups in support of such programs,



and to seek legislative consideration of appropriate measures.

Such coordinated effort can be justified by more than the idealism motivating humans with vision: Over the years the internally educationally handicapped child who is helped to mature to his full potential can be a cheerful, participating member of society at considerably less cost—human or monetary—than if he is handicapped externally by self-interest forces. It's time we stopped working so stridently against each other and began to cooperate for the good of that child and our own society.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. "Benjamin Harrison, The Coalition for the Civil Rights of Handicapped Persons, et al. v. State of Michigan," U.S. District Court, Eastern Division of Michigan. *A Continuing Summary of Pending and Completed Litigation Regarding the Education of Handicapped Children* (Arlington, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, October 1972), p. 16.
2. "Larry P., M.S., M.J., et al. v. Riles, et al.," Civil Action, Northern Division, California. *A Continuing Summary, op. cit.*, p. 32.
3. "Lebanks, et al. v. Spears, et al.," Civil Action, Eastern Division, Louisiana, New Orleans. *A Continuing Summary, op. cit.*, p. 33.
4. David Wechsler, "Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)" (New York: Psychological Corporation, 1968).

5. Lauretta Bender, "Bender Motor Gestalt Test" (New York: American Orthopsychiatric Association, 1938). Sixteenth printing, 1971.
6. Arthur L. Benton, "Benton Visual Retention Test" (New York: Psychological Corporation, 1963).
7. Alfred S. Strauss is known as the "father" of the learning disabilities concept and is noted for his work with brain damaged and neurologically impaired persons.
8. Samuel A. Kirk is noted for educational research involving mentally disturbed persons and for his development, with J. J. McCarthy, of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA).
9. W. M. Cruickshank is noted for his research and work with emotional and psychological needs and attitudes of exceptional children.
10. Newell Kephart is noted for his work with brain damaged children and slow learners and for the development of remediation programs for the learning disabled through motor activities.
11. Doris J. Johnson is noted for her research concerning dyslexic and learning disabled children and her development of remediation programs.
12. Helmer J. Myklebust is noted for his research in and development of identification and remediation of learning disabilities in children.
13. Robert E. Vallett is noted for his development of psychoeducational resource programs for the remediation of learning disabilities.

"We have entered the era of **pluralistic models of schooling** for a universal population target for which we will need pluralistic models of evaluation thoughtfully matched. With different models of schooling, we will need to evaluate how well each succeeds in reaching its specific goals for its target population, at what costs—educational, social, economic—and in terms of the values and outlooks that arise from each model."

—Mary Alice White and Jan Duker

**Education: A Conceptual and Empirical Approach**, p. 162  
(New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973)



In the decade ahead, who will determine and teach the skills necessary for the administration of public education? What will be the future of school boards? These are two of the major questions this author sees as confronting teachers of educational administration if present trends continue.

## selected national trends in educational administration

By Alfred P. Wilson



Dr. Wilson is Head of the Department of Administration and Foundations at Kansas State University. Humanly adept with faculty development, he is also particularly interested in organizational analysis and change processes.

At a recent conference sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators, educators pondered the question, "What will schools be like in 1985?" The results showed a dramatic movement away from using Carnegie units for rewarding students. The "futurists" indicated that most of the schools would be year 'round, individualized, with about one third of the student's school program being completed in learning environments outside the school. The group agreed that differentiated staffing, adult and early childhood education, collective bargaining, and the replacement of the principal's role of decision-making with policy-making bodies of teachers would be commonplace.

A review of recent trends by the author suggests that school administrators will be directly affected as each of these and other changes are implemented. In addition, perhaps more than at any time in recent history, the administrator's decisions will be closely monitored and often held in suspicion by his many publics.

Attacks have been leveled at an ever increasing pace by reformers who never visit schools, university educators with sophisticated statistical treatments of old data, large foundations, and universities that give degrees without expecting even rudimentary competency. In addition, state departments, regional laboratories, and the federal government are beginning to parrot the complaints.

For the most part, educational administrators will be monitored by teachers, classified personnel, state departments, universities, legislatures, federal auditors, parents, taxpayers, and students. At times the various populations will work in tandem, yet at other times cohesion will be like old masking tape—just not there.

Administrators can expect increasing fluidity in money with more basic support coming from state and federal sources. They will need to adjust with flexibility to the changing state and federal guidelines in using funds. The pressures for expenditure accountability will increase and be many sided and more sophisticated than in past years, with federal and state auditors in the forefront.

The National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and local teacher groups will unite with other public employee groups into a strong united coalition to insure mutual benefits, and there will be hard bargaining for money. The dilemma of the changing professional associations will not be of major importance for most school superintendents. The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) has voted to dissociate in any



formal way from NEA. For middle management, however, the dilemma will be painful. Many middle managers, especially elementary principals and subject supervisors, desire to continue their professional memberships with teachers. Yet teachers, central office, and school boards are emphasizing the need for them to develop and perform in new roles.

The school administrator's level of training will increase at both the pre-service and in-service levels as his position becomes more sophisticated. Hucksters (which may mean not only private concerns but also some universities and state departments) are entering the training market. Some degrees will be cheap, given without extensive learning taking place. Skilled trainers will still be hard to find. Teacher training institutes without having the skilled staff will often attempt to train administrators in the same mold as teachers; business enterprises will attempt to train them without being able to relate to education; and private consulting firms giving superficial training and nonaccredited degrees will abound. Determining who can teach the skills administrators want and need to have will be one of the hardest decisions administrators will make.

One trend that will be of major consequence to school administrators will be the selection of competent school board members. As schools come under attack, school boards will have a more difficult time finding skilled people

to serve. There will also be many who will use the school board as a springboard for other public office or a sounding board for social reform without having the student's welfare as a primary concern.

Another trend becoming evident across the nation is that large school systems increasingly are hiring superintendents and middle managers from within or from other large systems. The small-school-district-to-large-school-district pattern of movement has almost stopped. This trend will cause almost an entirely new pattern of mobility for school administrators.

In this brief space the author has attempted to discuss some developing trends in educational administration. He has made no attempt to present all trends, and depending upon the reader's locality, some activities outlined may be presently in practice. However, administrators in any locality will be dramatically affected by one or more of the concepts presented. Increasing pressures from various publics; fluidity of money; accountability; changing relationships with staff; developing new skills; and new patterns of mobility—all are becoming realities.

The job of administration and the training of administrators are becoming increasingly complex, with the success of our future, in some measure, being the determinant of how well we have succeeded.

"The school itself, as custodian of ever-larger numbers of people, for increasing proportions of their life span, for an ever-growing number of hours and interests, is well on the way to joining armies, prisons, and insane asylums as one of society's total institutions."

—Everett Reimer

**School Is Dead**, p. 37

(Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1971)



Sex-typing wastes talent, contends the author of this outspoken article. Worse (she maintains), "Whereas men are unsexed by failure, women seem to be unsexed by success." Her solution is two-sided.

## women in the public school: a problem in discrimination and motivation

By Laura J. Heinrich



Dr. Heinrich wears two faculty hats at Kansas State University: Adjunct Assistant Professor of Administration and Foundations and Head Librarian, Education Division, Farrell Library. A former secondary school teacher, she holds two masters degrees (including one in library science) and a University of Michigan Ph.D. in educational psychology (interpersonal and organizational change) and counseling, and has attended a number of National Training Laboratories/Institute for Applied Behavioral Sciences laboratory sessions. Since 1970 she has continued to be extensively and effectively involved with human relations consultations and workshop presentations for school districts, universities, and federal programs (e.g., work incentive, Model Cities, Teacher Corps, U.S. Army race relations seminars) throughout the midwest. Dr. Heinrich will become Director of Training, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., at that organization's national headquarters in New York City on July 15.

The plight of women in the public school domain has been largely ignored to date by the Women's Liberation Movement. This lack of attention is understandable in that salary schedules on the surface do not discriminate and the women themselves have not complained in sufficient numbers. Those women seeking advancement and leadership positions in public schools accuse superintendents and school boards of discrimination only to receive in rebuttal a wide range of judgmental statements indicating their (the female applicants') inadequacy, lack of commitment, and/or incompetence.

The purpose of this article is not to place blame, for this can become a "chicken or the egg" debate, but to examine some behaviors, attitudes, and practices that constitute a tremendous waste of talent much needed in schools today.

In colonial and pioneer days, primary school teaching was a male occupation—"women did not have the stamina of mind to deal with the minds of small children." With the shortage of men during the Civil War and growing press of mass education, women were recruited and became predominant. Actually, women teachers have been in the majority since the 1870's and will continue to be so for many decades to come, with men constituting a slight majority only at the secondary level.<sup>1</sup> Between 1930 and 1960, the number of teachers at all levels increased by some 87%, with a larger increase in the percentage of men at secondary and college levels. During the 1950's and 1960's the traditional available labor pool of unmarried and childless women decreased by half. In the 1970's there will be more unmarried or childless married women seeking jobs at the same time middle-aged married women are returning to the labor force.<sup>2</sup> Recent studies indicate that mature women who begin teaching after age 35 become highly effective teachers and are committed to a career in education.<sup>3</sup> These changes in the quality and quantity of the female labor force cannot help having an impact on the future of women in education.

Sex-typing links occupational roles with sex roles and makes female occupations of those which involve nurturing, helping, and empathizing (e.g., teaching, nursing, and social work.) Occupations which require coolness, detachment, objective orientation, and outspokenness are generally not considered appropriate for women. Although historically women have outnumbered men as teachers, only a relatively few have held the so-called responsible positions (e.g., administrators, professors superintendents). The large number



of women in teaching has been cited as a serious problem in the achievement of professionalization. That a woman's major interest in life is to marry and bear children and that this interest conflicts with devotion to a career is a misconception frequently stated by critics of women in education. That fewer women earn master's degrees and take longer to get them is perceived by some as a lack of commitment. These perceptions, coupled with the fact that women have in the past been willing to work for less money, cause the woman to be viewed as a professional risk.<sup>4</sup> Results of surveys of the reasons for women entering teaching—e.g., short hours, long holidays, compatibility of teaching with marriage and ease of return—give some credibility to the aforementioned criticisms. The competency of women as teachers is not assumed to be a consideration.

Are men more capable administrators than women? Superintendents and boards of education seem to think so. While men constitute only 12% of the elementary teaching force, they account for 69% of the elementary principalships. Yet research findings show that the answer to the question is NO. Studies by Wiles and Grobman<sup>5</sup> and Grobman and Hines<sup>6</sup> showed that women ranked higher than men as democratic leaders, in working with teachers and outsiders, being concerned with objectives of teaching, encouraging pupil participation, evaluating learning, and gaining positive reactions from teachers and superiors.

One reason often mentioned for favoring men is the assumption that women teachers dislike working for women principals, and men teachers like it even less. In a survey by Barter<sup>7</sup>, however, a group of teachers rated female and male principals as equal in ability and personal qualities. The results indicated that while, in general, women teachers approved of women principals more than men teachers did, those male teachers who had taught in schools administered by women were more favorable to women principals than to men. Those who disapproved of female principals were men who had taught only under male principals.

In another study, data was gathered about problem-attack behavior and a comparison of results revealed that teachers described female administrators as noticing potential problem situations and as reviewing results of action significantly more often than did male administrators. One explanation is that generally speaking the female principals in this study had more years of elementary school teaching experience than the male principals prior to assuming an administrative position. Another possible explanation is that female principals may be more sensitive to "problems" of other women than male principals are.<sup>8</sup>

But in spite of the research studies which extol the administrative skills of women, the ratio of women to men in administration as well as other positions of decision-making responsibility is continuing to decrease. Women need to consider some reasons for this decrease besides the obvious one of discrimination on the basis of sex.

Typically, men expect financial rewards, job satisfaction, approval and encouragement, prestige, and power from their occupation. We don't think anything of men being wage earners, loving fathers, maintenancemen around the house—why such a big thing for women? No one says it is easy, and

something has to give, e.g., volunteer and social activities, and gardening, but when the children are grown it is easier to resume these activities than an interrupted career. Yet another reason given for the decreasing number of women in responsible positions implies that women do not expect or ask for the same things.

Recent studies on women's motivation have shown a generally inconsistent pattern of results. Attempts to relate such factors as individual value orientation, achievement relevance of goals, sex of Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) stimulus figures, nature of arousal conditions and sex-role orientation to achievement-motive scores and to performance have been so inconsistent that they have emphasized the complexity of the issue. Evidence from studies on women's motivation to avoid success and achievement-related anxieties provide a clearer understanding of the problem.

In any achievement-oriented situation, performance is evaluated against some standard of excellence; thus the situation offers both a chance for success and a threat of failure, though the results may not immediately be ascertainable. Women may in fact be more anxious than men in achievement-oriented situations because they face negative consequences not only in failing but also in succeeding. There are aggressive, masculine overtones that are implicit in successful competition. This is not to say that women are aggressive and masculine when they are successful but that they are perceived by significant others to be aggressive and masculine.

If not rejected, they are praised for having masculine minds. A woman actively engaged in professional pursuits often finds herself trying in various ways to prove her femininity. As a whole, society has been unable to reconcile personal ambition, accomplishment, and success with femininity. The more successful or independent a woman becomes the more she is viewed as having lost her femininity, being a failure as a wife and mother, as a hostile and destructive force within the society. Whereas men are unsexed by failure, women seem to be unsexed by success.

Many American women facing the conflict between maintaining their feminine image and developing their abilities compromise by abdicating from competition in the outside world. Women have been choosing—consciously or unconsciously—not to develop their potentiality or individuality rather than pay the price of social rejection.

Whenever a woman places herself in a leadership role, either alone or as a team member, she must be aware of the feelings her position of leadership, prestige, and power are generating in both men and women. Men are frequently angry and women are frequently resentful and vindictive. A partial solution is to be aware of these feelings, though this awareness often results in withdrawal behavior, deference in front of the group to the male leaders, assuming an "assistant" role rather than a "leader" role.<sup>9</sup>

More problems emerge when one looks at the intentional or unintentional chauvinistic behaviors of male supervisors. They question the seriousness of a woman's efforts, expect competency but not originality, and pass judgment if she works and has children. Many male faculty members find it



difficult to develop strong platonic friendships with their female colleagues, considering them as belonging to an entirely different, inferior status system.<sup>10</sup> It is widely recognized that opportunities for advancement in education are heavily weighted in favor of men, who now hold an increasingly disproportionate number of principalships, superintendencies, and other high-ranking posts. Educational administration will not attract the best women or inspire their best efforts until opportunity is truly equal.

Many women have become effective and significant leaders in education and more women must take their rightful places as decision makers in educational institutions. Our society can no longer afford to waste the ideas, skills, and commitment of the female members of the profession. However, women now more than ever must make conscious decisions about what their goals are and how best to accomplish those goals. Women with discontinuous or intermittent career patterns only support the proposition that women are at worst a peripheral and at best a secondary component in the teaching labor force and in public endeavor in general.

The woman educator of the '70's has not been a victim of a delimited area of vocational choice. Moreover, her possession of a teaching certificate is not an insurance policy but rather a matter of career choice. She will realize herself as a professional with special abilities through choosing to teach.<sup>11</sup>

The strongest argument of all for competency must be the performance of women themselves in professional pursuits. Women as well as men must accept the fact that women have not only the right but the responsibility and the need to lead multidimensional lives, and both must further un-

derstand that a chosen activity outside the home may express womanhood just as well as duties within it.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Samuel Brodbelt, "Teacher Professionalization: Its Determination and Achievement," *School and Society*, vol. 97 (March 1969), p. 151.
2. Alice Rossi, "Discrimination and Demography Restrict Women," *College and University Business*, vol. 48 (February 1970), pp. 75-76.
3. Barbara Doty, "Predictions of Teaching Effectiveness of Women Who Begin Teaching After Age Thirty-Five," *Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 21 (Winter 1970), p. 524.
4. Brodbelt, *loc. cit.*
5. Kimball Wiles and Hulda Grobman, "Principals As Leaders," *Nation's Schools*, vol. 56 (October 1955), p. 75.
6. Hulda Grobman and Vynce Hines, "What Makes A Good Principal?" *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, vol. 40 (November 1956), pp. 5-16.
7. Alice S. Barter, "The Status of Women In School Administration," *Educational Horizons*, vol. 37 (Spring 1959), pp. 72-75.
8. John Hoyle, "Who Shall Be Principal—A Man or A Woman?" *The National Elementary Principal*, vol. 48 (January 1969), p. 24.
9. Beatrice Dineman, "Sex Discrimination in Academia," *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 42 (April 1971), p. 263.
10. Jessie Bernard, *Academic Women* (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964), p. 111.
11. Ted W. Brooker, "The Woman Educator: Designer of the '70's," unpublished speech presented at a symposium at Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas, 1971.

## Involvement

As many teachers are prone to do to heighten student interest, I began hamming it up to get my seventh grade social studies class in the proper mood to hear a story about a Viking raid. As I read, the room became very still. "Quiet, all!" commanded the Viking captain sternly in a low voice. Fifty men held their breath, not daring to whisper. For a few moments in the stillness of the dawn, there was no sound except the dripping of water from the oars. "Row, all!" the leader signaled. . . . And from the back of the room came a small clear voice singing, "Row, row, row your boat. . ."


—Mrs. Mickey Bogart, Teacher  
Manhattan (Kansas) Junior High School



How does a community-involved educational organization actually get its program moving? What does it take to close the gap between school and university? An educator with experience in both areas concerns himself with old problems in new ways, using the Urban Education Center in Louisville, Kentucky, as an example.

## the Louisville urban center: an experiment in facilitation

By Herbert K. Heger



Dr. Heger is Associate Director of the Louisville Urban Center and Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Kentucky. He has supervised student teachers and interns and has taught in both secondary schools and universities. He is especially interested in educational administration, curriculum, and teaching-learning interactions, particularly those involving nonverbal communications and simulation gaming. He has been curriculum consultant for several American Dietetics Association programs. His new book, **First Steps in Secondary Teaching: From Survival to Confidence**, has just been published by Charles E. Merrill Company, Columbus, Ohio.

According to the standard measures, Louisville is a typical urban situation. Within the city, poverty is high and school achievement is down. But, Louisville's response to its problems is not typical; Louisville is attempting massive educational change. While not everyone in Louisville is agreed on matters of strategy, the community, school board, and professional staff are united in the common desire to move forward. The Louisville effort has been documented in general terms as an example of a school district with renewed faith in people and what they can accomplish.<sup>1</sup> This article reports on one aspect of the Louisville effort, a story of experimentation in inter-institutional cooperation, facilitation, and mutual support through the Louisville Urban Education Center.

The Louisville Urban Education Center is a type of consortium. It was created to answer the need for pooling resources from universities and public schools in order to expedite educational development. The Center is a broad purpose consortium, linking institutions with apparent diverse missions: The Louisville Public Schools, the College of Education, University of Kentucky, and the School of Education, University of Louisville. The Louisville community is directly represented on the Center's Executive Board.

Unlike many consortia, the Center was not created to operate, maintain, or control specific programs. Rather, it has been given a more subtle mission: the facilitation of educational development through the pooling of the resources and talents of the community and three sponsoring educational institutions. The basic assumption behind the Center is that professors, school administrators, teachers, and parents sincerely desire to work together on the problems of urban education but are too often hindered by institutional barriers, demands of job assignments, even geographical distance (the University of Kentucky is seventy-five miles from Louisville). Therefore, the Center has adopted a philosophy of unobtrusive facilitation to help others carry out their missions, not to build its own empire. In the rare cases where the Center independently starts a project, the strategy is to involve the people to whom the project will belong and to release the project and credit to its natural environment.

### Center Functions

The Center is a quasi-independent institution which functions among its three sponsoring institutions to achieve a pooling of resources to help create change in the three

EDUCATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS, VOL. 1, NO. 1, SPRING 1973



institutions. It is hoped that change will occur as a direct result of the cooperative pooling of resources. The universities desire field sites for professional preparation programs while the school district needs assistance in its staff development program. The district needs research and planning assistance with its very real problems, while professors need access to field sites for their research efforts. Both university and public school staffs need to test their ideas in the crucible of public opinion, while the members of the community need a greater sense of control over their own destinies.

The Center's search is for cooperative approaches to educational development which meet the various needs of its clientele.<sup>2</sup> A professor desiring to pursue research in the schools may be able to solve an immediate public school problem with his study; a service need of a neighborhood school board may provide a valuable field experience for a student teacher or graduate student.

The Center staff attempts to locate resources which can be linked, via facilitation and mediation, in order to arrive at mutually beneficial solutions. Three basic strategies may be used to accomplish these ends.

#### **Facilitation**

In many cases, solutions can result from simple facilitation of communication between people. Should a university desire to implement an experimental training program, the Center staff facilitates the installation of the project. Should a school need assistance from a reading expert, the Center staff facilitates the contact.

#### **Project Support**

Often, cooperative projects need logistical or manpower support. Manpower to conduct surveys or to analyze data might be necessary to assist a project. In such cases, the Center attempts to provide the support necessary to get a project moving. The Center often provides evaluative, monitoring, or consulting services as a form of support.

#### **Strategic Planning**

In the previous two categories the Center assists others and the major portion of the project remains in the hands of others. Strategic planning usually involves Center-conducted efforts, including background research and the development of planning alternatives in a manner not unlike the now famous "think tanks." Even in this area the Center strives to involve concerned parties on a continuing basis and, in the words of Center Director Roy Forbes, "minimize its ego involvement."

#### **Center Structure**

The Center's structure is capped by an executive board including the superintendent of schools, the two deans of education, and representatives from the Louisville community. The staff includes associate directors from the three sponsoring institutions and a director.

Key to the success of the Center is the staff of graduate interns<sup>3</sup> as well as the secretarial staff. This is the group of

staff members which provides the manpower to support projects, to conduct research or to simply provide liaison as it is required. The staff has discovered that the availability of interns can extend the resources of the clientele to establish cooperative projects which otherwise would not have been feasible.

#### **Center Development**

The scenario for Center evolution is quite different from a typical consortium. Typical consortia create a bond between institutions with common missions,<sup>4</sup> connoting the eventual emergence of a super institution. The Louisville experiment, however, links diverse institutions with separate missions. It would be unreasonable to expect a super institution to emerge.

The focus of the Louisville effort is on the people within the institutions with the aim that involved people will freely cross institutional boundaries to join in common projects. The ultimate result would be twofold. First, the institutions would change as a result of the cross-institutional and community experience gained by members of the sponsoring institutions. Second, if one assumes absolute personnel stability within the three institutions, the Center would work itself out of existence—eventually all involved personnel would be actively cooperating and could continue cooperating independently.

With the above scenario in mind, it is possible to identify four specific stages of development for the Center:

**Stage 1** Planning and establishing the Center.

**Stage 2** Building a record of accomplishment and establishing a positive expectation of success on the part of the various clientele.

**Stage 3** Planning, implementing, and modifying activities in order to reach all aspects of the Center mission.

**Stage 4** Accomplishing stage 3 so well that Center existence is no longer needed.

The assumption of staff stability in order to reach stage 4 is obviously idealistic. Staff turnover and the ever changing nature of educational problems are likely to create new needs as rapidly as prior needs are resolved, but stage 3 is a practical aspiration.

Initial conferences in early 1971 led to the first Center operations in the fall of 1971. The plan, as developed by August, 1971, covered organizational and initial financial factors as well as a broadly defined list of purposes and objectives. The Center began to operate in September without a director but with seven interns.

The fall months were spent developing projects without a very clear notion of priorities on the basis of the need to build a record of accomplishment.<sup>5</sup> This is not to suggest that Center goals were violated; rather, the goals were broad enough to make nearly any urban education need seem valid. The absence of a director created an immediate need to function at low profile to avoid restricting the role of the director when he arrived.

The Center director arrived in January, 1972, and the staff immediately focused upon planning for 1972-73. It was determined that the efforts underway did, in fact, fit Center



goals and were establishing a record of achievement and providing experience and data that could be helpful in determining service needs. Therefore, these projects were completed.

The fall of 1972 saw the development of the first prioritized Center operations. Each involvement was selected carefully; however, it was not possible to develop activities which completely balanced Center efforts according to the overall Center goals. The Center was solidly in stage 2 of the scenario discussed above and activities were no longer taken on merely to build a track record.

Examples of Center efforts include facilitating a pre-student teaching experimental field experience program with the University of Kentucky, providing monitoring and evaluation services for the Child Development Services System, assisting the local Urban Rural Project, facilitating the school district's evaluation task force, operating the Louisville Cooperative Urban Teacher Education (CUTE) project, and assisting local efforts in diagnostic prescriptive instruction.<sup>6</sup>

As discussed earlier, most Center efforts are invested in projects in which ownership is vested elsewhere. Few projects are exclusively Center projects. It is occasionally necessary to take on a project on a pilot basis. The CUTE program is such an example. The intention is to release such programs to other settings as they mature. It is expected that other such projects may occur in the future. Perhaps one of the major unanswered questions at this point in the evaluation of the Center is whether such programs can be successfully "released."

A major thrust for 1973-74 will be to extend Center efforts and to further balance priorities. One route to success in this area may be through the acquisition of grant funds for the Center's overall operation. Currently, the Center is funded by its three sponsoring institutions. The school district's share of funding comes from a portion of a grant from the J. Graham Brown Foundation. These funds do not carry restrictions. Other funds are received for specific purposes and do carry restrictions. An example is a small grant under the USOE Teacher Center effort. Thus far, these funds obligate the Center to activities it wishes to pursue regardless of funding sources. The funds are earmarked for the planning of a local Teacher Center, an activity which falls under the general concerns of the Center.<sup>7</sup> However, funding from federal programs with appropriate guidelines is not altogether certain. Therefore, there is an effort to develop other sources of funding.

### **Accomplishments and Prognosis**

The quality of Center efforts will be difficult to judge. Few efforts of the Center will result in technological breakthroughs; rather, Center efforts focus on development and application of proved methods to real situations. Real world resources are too limited for radical innovations. Judging the quality of Center efforts will also be hampered by the basic philosophy of the Center. With an intentional low profile and non-ownership of projects and with careful involvement of various clientele groups, there will seldom emerge a purely "Center" product.

Center achievements will have to be measured by indirect methods, such as increasing cooperation between the personnel of the sponsoring institutions and by the changing operations of the institutions.

The outlook for Center work is good. It would be hard to find a school system in the country more open to progress than the Louisville Independent School District. While the universities involved in the Center effort have problems of their own, not unlike all universities, their dedication has been established. Cooperation and support seems assured.

The major task facing the Center staff is involved in moving from stage 2 to stage 3; organizing priorities to assure a goal-related balance of activities and efforts.

According to Newman Walker, superintendent of the Louisville Public Schools, "The experience gained in providing services to university, school, and community personnel provides a strong basis for optimism for the success of the Center."

### **Implications for Others**

Establishing a Center such as the Louisville experiment requires only a few elements. Modest funding is an obvious requirement. The other elements are more complex. A spirit of openness is an absolute must. Personnel in a school district and a reasonably close college must have a certain awareness of the potential resources of the other institutions and must be willing to give it a genuine try. Where these conditions exist, cooperative ventures are possible with the right kind of leadership.

Leadership requirements include, above all, the ability to see common elements in the mission of a school district and higher education. Training is an example. Can universities and school districts continue to go their separate ways in training? The Center staff is convinced that cooperation is imperative in this area.

Leadership requirements include the ability to see beyond questions of authority and accountability. School and university people cannot afford to get hung-up on their unique roles as defined by boards of education and trustees. They must look at the larger picture. As professionals in state agencies, they must see the overall responsibility to their state and the people it represents.

The Center staff would recommend a low profile strategy as less threatening than other approaches and as effective in building cooperation among the people who count—the professionals in the sponsoring agencies. Any other strategy will merely build a new institution to stand between the sponsors and complicate relationships.

This author would further recommend beginning a cooperative venture of this sort with a plan of action for a period of about two years. This plan might be broad purposed, like the Louisville Urban Education Center. In this case, a small, initial territory in a geographical sense is recommended with a plan to grow in territorial size by stages until an entire school district is involved.

Alternatively, an operation could start cooperation on a single conceptual point, with a plan to add conceptual territory. In either case, care should be taken to avoid a large, permanent staff with its tendency to become a new in-



stitution. Graduate interns make ideal staff members in this respect since they do not remain on permanent assignment with the operation.

Care needs to be taken to talk out, in advanced planning, differences in perception between the members of the sponsoring institutions. Does in-service training, for example, mean the same to members of each sponsoring group?

Special care needs to be exercised in defining the power of the representative from each institution in his home setting. This internal matter in each institution may be overlooked in the press of other organizational questions. To whom does this representative report? How does he keep up with internal developments back home? Above all, how does he recognize the contributions of his colleagues to the new project?

Finally, attention needs to be given to the problem of long- or short-term thinking. Schools need assistance. Is there a danger of aborting an otherwise successful project due to expectation differences on the speed and amount of impact of the experiment?

If the experience in Louisville is any guide, the gap between school and university is not as large as it may sometimes seem.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Terry Boston, "Reform Without Politics in Louisville," *Saturday Review*, February 5, 1972, pp. 51-55; Story Moorefield, "How Louisville Put It All Together," *American Education*, December 1971.

2. The Center's clientele falls into four groups: university personnel, central school administrative personnel, school site personnel, and community personnel.

3. Interns are recruited from many specialties. Most are in graduate education programs at the sponsoring universities but others are accepted where their skills meet current priorities.

4. Paul Ruben, "Consortium of the Seminaries," *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, June 1972, pp. 21-23.

This article provides an interesting report on a conventional consortium. The implied scenario for this type of consortium would be to create a bond of inter-institutional unity since participating institutions share common missions.

5. Projects begun were largely short-term projects involving needs assessment services and investigative services.

6. Part of the Center's staff, the graduate interns, could be considered a project in themselves since they receive training while on the job.

7. The Teacher Center is planned to operate independently of USOE's Teacher Center of Educational Renewal Effort.

"In changing times, unchanging schools are anomalous. Competency-based education promises the thrust necessary for adaptation to meet the challenge of a changed and changing society. Such change must be planned in systemic terms, dealing simultaneously with all of the elements that comprise the total system—teacher-education institutions, prospective and inservice teachers, the schools, certification agencies, professional education organizations, community groups, and the public. The emphasis in competency-based teacher education on objectives, accountability, and personalization implies specific criteria, careful evaluation, change based on feedback, and relevant programs for a modern era."

—Robert B. Howsam and W. Robert Houston

**Competency-Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems, and Prospects**, p. 1  
(Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1972)



Despite all the fanfare about innovations, teacher preparation programs in the United States haven't really changed all that much, says curriculum professor Moore. He suggests that an open-access competency-based program might hold considerable promise.

## a plausible competency/curriculum approach to improved educational programs

By Arnold J. Moore



Dr. Moore has been Head of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, Kansas State University for six years. For interest and research, his particular professional concerns are in the areas of student self-concept, classroom learning environment, theories of curriculum and instruction, and evaluation of instruction. In the Fall of 1973, he will become the new Dean of the School of Education, Youngstown State University, Youngstown, Ohio.

There is little question that reform, modification, and improvement in teacher and public school education are topics that have been discussed at considerable length, but there is also little evidence that practice has been significantly affected. Any extensive examination of today's teacher education programs across our nation would reveal that they are quite similar to those existing several years ago. With few exceptions, most institutions have programs in operation that function without any comprehensive theoretical base which provides for or incorporates research data and societal needs. Whether or not competency/performance based education, one of the current trends in teacher education, has such a theoretical base is the subject of many polemics by Broudy<sup>1</sup> and others. It is only when a program has a sound theoretical base with the capability of generating significant hypotheses that we can expect meaningful and predictable outcomes. Such a strategy means the rejection of a simplistic, dogmatic justification of activities and discussions associated with the total educational enterprise.

A number of teacher education research findings concerned with the analysis of teacher behavior strongly imply the conception of such behavior as a complex of skills which can be identified and practiced systematically under given conditions.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, most preparation programs do not incorporate such research data in the determination of their program designs. Innovations such as interaction analysis and microteaching usually are appended to such programs rather than made an integral part. As a consequence, such efforts reduce the innovation's potentiality and the total program does not change significantly.

Is it possible that we can consider as a mode of operation the development and continuance of a variety of program alternatives? If that is the case, then it is possible to formulate a series of tenable options that function as alternatives in relationship to the improvement of learning for a diversity of individuals. Of course, challenge has to be maintained even in the midst of diversity. Paramount in such a situation would be a willingness to continue scientifically to examine the claims and contentions of the various approaches, whether they be conventional or innovative. But remember that context is also important, in that such a conclusion suggests that each program component needs consideration in terms of the total teacher education system and the means by which the component can effectively be integrated.

Critics and reformists are challenging teacher educators and others to make substantial changes in their programs, especially to incorporate some of the concepts of an open access curriculum, an idea which has applicability at all levels of education. There are and will be many versions of the open access curriculum. Perhaps the best is Wilson's.<sup>3</sup>

*EDUCATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS*, VOL. 1, NO. 1, SPRING 1973



The foremost characteristics of an open access curriculum, which does have a theory base and has applicability in elementary, secondary, and higher education, as postulated by Wilson, can be summarized in six statements. These are (1) multiple entry points to each large body of content usually beginning at the exploratory level and proceeding toward in-depth facts, (2) guidelines for student study that facilitate a self commitment to fully personalized projects, (3) students assuming direct responsibility for a significant part of their own education, (4) differentiated teacher roles, (5) both the teachers and students helping to define and implement the meaning of the concept of open access, (6) assuming that all students will succeed.

Many times discussions pertaining to curriculum research, theory, and development are disconcerting, primarily because the discussants have failed to define clearly the terms "instruction" and "curriculum." Mauritz Johnson has defined curriculum as a set of intended learning outcomes which stands in an anticipatory relationship to the learning process and not in a reportorial relationship to that process.<sup>4</sup> According to Johnson, curriculum deals with expectations or intentions, and, more specifically, with the learning outcomes intended to be achieved through instruction, that is, through the experiences provided, through what happens and what learners do. In his discussion he indicates that these outcomes — cognitions, affects, and performance capabilities—must be selected, on the basis of sort criteria, from that vast expanding pool of knowledge, competencies, and belief that constitutes "cultural content," and they must be ordered on some basis or other. The resulting curriculum is not an instructional plan, for it deals only with the intended ends of instruction, not with the proposed means.

The acceptance of this concept of curriculum, couched in the framework of an open access approach, seems to hold considerable promise. Certainly students with diverse educational and economic backgrounds who enter an educational milieu and program generated from this conceptual basis will have an entirely different kind of experience.

Because education programs traditionally have lacked a theoretical base with accompanying systematic evaluative processes, there is increasing pressure to incorporate accountability into the educative process. Performance or competency based education programs have a design whereby the intended outcomes are clearly described in explicit observable terms and made public to all concerned. Such an approach is goal oriented and based on the development of competencies thought to be essential for the learner. Activities then are designed to facilitate the students' acquisition of knowledge, skills, and competence which can be demonstrated as they display achievement of objectives.

Efforts to implement program modifications require a variety of considerations and possible strategies. There are at least four major problems associated with the adoption or modification of a program. These can be identified as (1) resistant groups, who engage in a variety of holding actions, (2) resource allocation, human, physical, and monetary, (3) phasing, so that the induction of students and faculty can be accomplished with a minimum of frustration, and (4) role expectations for faculty, students, and administrators.

The apparent facilitating processes for a program are (1) information handling, which includes analysis and the concomitant process of defining variables, (2) a communications network which includes a feedback mechanism that provides information about both the successes and the opportunity of making revisions based on feedback data, (3) resource allocation, and (4) logistical support.

Castelle C. Gentry, of the University of Toledo, has delineated four principles of management having some degree of applicability. These are (1) successive approximations, (2) selective negligence, (3) structured induced practice, (4) accumulative feedback effect.

Successive approximation means that with minimal support by faculty and administration, in the long run, an objective can be more effectively and efficiently reached by the systematic determination of successive approximations than by any other means, provided the heuristics of organizational change are followed. The principle of selective negligence can best be described as an approach whereby energy and resources can be used most effectively when we identify and neglect what is unimportant or of low priority. Structured induced practice implies that familiarity and habit resulting from practicing activities reduces opposition and increases understanding and acceptance. This may even involve faculty in activities contrary to their present interests or philosophies. When faculty become interested and involved to the degree that they possess relevant information and knowledge of effects of their decisions and of how decisions affect them, the principle of accumulative feedback effect is operative.<sup>5</sup>

The curriculum models being proposed here ought to be considered by all educators concerned with improving the quality of decision-making. Historically speaking, our society, which is dynamic in nature, has been innately susceptible to change; thus it is essential that we attempt to resolve our common problems through experimentation and reasoned change. Tentative guidelines are essential as facilitators and will need to be incorporated and kept under critical surveillance with the assumption that revisions will be necessary as progress is made. Certainly, proponents of any idea considered "new," different, or nontraditional must be willing to respond to challenges and insightful questioning.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. See, for example, Harry S. Broudy, *A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education* (Washington, D.C., American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, May 1972), 25 pages.

2. For example, see M. Donald Carriker, "A Study of Teacher Attitudes Toward Educational Research," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, 1971. Carriker's study indicated that an important difference between average public school teachers and those selected as outstanding was simply a much more favorable attitude of the latter toward educational research.

3. L. Craig Wilson, *The Open Access Curriculum*, Boston: Allyn, and Bacon, 1971.

4. Mauritz Johnson, "Appropriate Research Directions in Curriculum and Instruction," *Curriculum Theory Network*, vol. 25, Winter 1970-71.

5. Castelle C. Gentry, "Defining Characteristics of a CBTE Management System—A Rationale," paper presented at the Regional Invitational Conference on Performance Based Teacher Education, January 8-9, 1973, Dallas, Texas.



## the editorial board of review

LEWIS A. BAYLES is Chairman, Department of Foundations of Education, Atlanta University. His Ohio State Ph.D. studies were interdisciplinary (Political Science, Sociology, Philosophy of Education), and he subsequently continued his research and involvement with the interaction of social trends and educational ideas—particularly in urban areas—at the Universities of Tennessee, Indiana, and Cincinnati before coming to Atlanta in 1970. At Atlanta University, he is also associate Director of the Center for School and Community Services. Dr. Bayles' primary research interests are concerned with social philosophies in education, emphasizing varieties of democratic theories and their implications for policies and practice. In 1964 he was editor of *Professionalism and Power in Education*, the August *Indiana University Bulletin*. As a member of the Technical Assistance Team, he helped develop proposals for the community agency portion of the Emergency School Desegregation Act in 1970, 1971, and 1972. He is particularly active in the Philosophy of Education Society.



Lewis A. Bayles

JAMES A. MCCAIN has been President of Kansas State University since 1950. From 1945 to 1950, he was President of the University of Montana. President McCain earned his doctorate at Stanford University and holds the honorary degrees of LL.D. from Colorado State University, The University of Montana, and Wofford College, and Doctor of Science from Andhra Pradesh State University in India. He is widely known for his work in the areas of international education and land-grant universities. He has served as consultant to state universities in Hawaii, New York, Ohio, Maine, Indiana, and Pennsylvania, and to four universities in Iran. In 1969, he received the Dwight D. Eisenhower People-to-People Medallion for Outstanding Contributions to International Understanding. In 1966, the Department of the Army awarded him a Certificate of Appreciation for Patriotic Civilian Service. He was a charter member of the President's Advisory Council of the Peace Corps, and is a member of the Advisory Council to the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D.C. For various programs, he has visited or been a consultant to universities in 13 European nations, India, Iran, and Colombia. Since 1950, Dr. McCain has guided Kansas State University through the stresses of rapid expansion. His "open door" policy of availability to students is credited by many observers with minimizing the kinds of unrest so often found on other campuses in the past 10 years.



James A. McCain


CHARLES E. LITZ—"Chad" to professional and personal friends—is both philosopher and humanist. Since receiving his Ph.D. in 1970 from the University of Michigan (Major: philosophy and history of education), he has pursued extensively his special interests of educational historiography and value formation. At present, he is an assistant professor of Administration and Foundations, College of Education, Kansas State University, as well as co-editor of *Educational Considerations*. He is also a member of a national team of researchers conducting a historical investigation of the Federal Government's educational policies before and during the late President Lyndon Baines Johnson's administration and focusing initially on papers in the Johnson Library in Austin, Texas. Dr. Litz is particularly active in the John Dewey Society and the Society of Professors of Education.



Charles E. Litz

EDUCATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS





Don B. Croft

FRED T. WILHELMS retired last year from an active educational career of 45 years. Nebraska was where it began: he was teacher and administrator in schools there from 1927 to 1936. Then he joined the University of Nebraska's Extension Division, which was a leader in development of high school supervised correspondence study. While there he earned his Ph.D. in 1940. From 1942 to 1948 Dr. Wilhelms was Associate Director of the Consumer Education Study sponsored by the National Association of Secondary School Principals. In 1948 he joined the faculty of San Francisco State College, teaching two years and then serving as Chairman, Division of Education and Psychology for the next eight years and from 1959-1963 as Director of the Teacher Education Project, an experiment relating teacher education and mental health. He was appointed Associate Secretary of NASSP in 1963 and held that position for five years. In 1968 he became Executive Secretary of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, a key position because of the continuity it provides the organization as its elected officers change each year. He retired from ASCD in 1972 and has returned to Lincoln, Nebraska, where he is continuing his educational writing, reading manuscripts ferociously, "Fishing hard. . . , Planning to paint, to travel, and to grow roses."



Warren I. Paul

DON B. CROFT, Director of the Claude C. Dove Learning Center at New Mexico State University since 1969, holds bachelors and masters degrees in psychology and a University of New Mexico Ph.D. in educational psychology. He has been involved with testing and research since 1952, and from 1967 to 1969 was in Washington, D.C., as Chief of the Analysis Section, Division of Educational Laboratories, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Among the institutions for which he has been consultant are the Self-Help Office of Educational Opportunity Mexican-American Housing Project, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque; Yale University College of Nursing; University of Utah College of Medicine; State of Utah Department of Education. Dr. Croft's specialties: administration and organization, statistics and design, organizations evolution, measurement, social psychology, computer programming, systems theory, information systems, test construction, educational programs for Mexican-Americans and for disadvantaged students.



Fred T. Wilhelms

WARREN I. PAUL is an advocate of increased curricular integration to balance the subject and disciplinary fragmentation he finds so prevalent in K-12 settings. At Kansas State University, where he is an assistant professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, he is involved in the areas of foundations, methods, supervision, and curriculum, particularly in secondary social studies. His Rutgers journalism major and 13 years of public relations and newspaper writing, editing, and graphic arts already have proven useful with his co-editorship of *Educational Considerations*. On the curricular side, his advocacy of wholism was developed by Newark State College masters work in humanities and Ohio State University Ph.D. studies in curriculum, sociology, educational communications, and teacher preparation. His nearly 20 years in the Marine Corps Reserve have extensively involved administrative and training responsibilities. The use of games to increase student motivation and learning is another interest; Dr. Paul has directed or co-directed several "creating educational games" sessions for teachers, administrators, and counselors at national and state conferences. At present, he is also expanding an interest in the extent and accuracy of curricular presentations of cultural pluralism.