DCCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 893 SP 003 254

TITLE	Three Ccnferences: Urbanizaticn, Wcrk and Educaticn (Chicagc, April 1967); Youth in a Changing Scciety (Cleveland, May 1967); Teacher Education in a New Ccntext (Madiscn, Wisccnsin, May 1967). Project Report Fcur, The NDEA National Institute fcr Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth.
INSTITUTICN	American Asscciaticn cf Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; Ball State Univ., Muncie, Ind.
Spons Agency	Cffice of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date	Ncv 68
Note	38p.
Available frcm	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1 Dupcnt Circle, Washington, D.C., 20036 ($1.5C cash)
EDRS Price	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.00
Descriptcrs	*Disadvantaged Youth, Educaticnal Objectives, Interagency Ccoperation, Interinstitutional Cooperaticn, Negro Educaticn, Student Teacher Relationship, *Teacher Education, *Urban Education, *Urbanizaticn, Work Attitudes

Abstract

This bcoklet contains selected papers from three ccnferences which had common cbjectives: to enable federal, state, and lccal officials tc study the complexity of legal, sccal, econcmic, and psychological ccnstraints cn youth as well as the agencies created by these laws; to review the critical factcrs in urbanization, their relaticn to disadvantaged ycuth, and the impact cn society of the urbanizing community; tc examine the implicaticn of changing patterns cf wcrk, living, and recreaticn for agencies and individuals responsible fcr youth, especially those who ccntrcl the educaticn of ycuth and the preparaticn of teachers; and to examine alternative strategies of actien--legislative, educaticnal, and social--which cculd serve as guides fcr respcnsible public officials. The papers, which focus cn varicus tcpics within the cbjectives, are titled "Institutional Autcncmy and Teacher Educaticn," "Urban Schooling: A Case of Chrcnic Malpractice," "Preparing Teachers of the Disadvantaged: A Practiticner's Perspective," "A Lcok at Teacher Education Prcgrams fcr the Disadvantaged," "Self-Fulfilling Prophecies in the Classrccm: Teachers' Expectaticns as Unintended Determinants of Pupils' Intellectual

PROJECT REPORT/FOUR
November, 1968

THREE CONFERENCES

Urbanization, Work, and Education
Chicago, Illinois
April 1967

Youth in A Changing Society
Cleveland, Ohio
May, 1967

Teacher Education in a New Context
Madison, Wisconsin
May 1967

THE NDEA NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN TEACHING DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, Washington, D. C. 20036

- **To enable federal, state, and local officials to study the complexity of legal, social, economic, and psychological constraints on youth**

- **To encourage a philosophical and operational review of the purposes of various laws affecting disadvantaged youth, as well as the agencies created by these laws**

- **To review the critical factors in urbanization, their relation to disadvantaged youth, and the impact on society of the urbanizing community**

- **To examine the implication of changing patterns of work, living, and recreation for agencies and individuals responsible for youth, especially those who control the education of youth and the preparation of teachers**

- **To examine alternative strategies of action — legislative, educational, and social — which could serve as guides for responsible public officials**

THREE CONFERENCES

URBANIZATION, WORK, AND EDUCATION
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
APRIL, 1967

YOUTH IN A CHANGING SOCIETY
CLEVELAND, OHIO
MAY, 1967

TEACHER EDUCATION IN A NEW CONTEXT
MADISON, WISCONSIN
MAY, 1967

These were the purposes of three conferences supported by the National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth in spring, 1967, in Cleveland, Chicago, and Madison, Wisconsin. At each conference were members of the state departments of education, welfare, and health; officials from various offices in the United States Office of Education who administer titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; representatives from university schools of social work, medicine, law, and education; representatives from vocational education work; officials from organizations such as Head Start and Upward Bound; and selected members of public school staffs.

While the conferences had common objectives, each conference had a particular emphasis. The Chicago conference — Urbanization, Work and Education — stressed consideration of the many problems of urban living attendant upon immigration to the city, and the resulting pressure of such problems in work and education. The Cleveland conference — Youth in a Changing Society — dwelt on the leadership roles of the cities in community action programs and the relations of institutions of higher education to the cities.

The third conference, at Madison — Teacher Education in a New Context — centered on the profession of education and sprang from the results of the analyses and discussions of the previous two conferences. Areas examined in this conference included experimental urban programs, teachers and teacher behavior in the urban schools, administrative behavior, and effective programs for teachers. Continuity in the conferences was provided by those members who attended all three conferences.

This publication contains selected papers from the three conferences, papers which communicate the reflections and convictions of leading practitioners of psychiatry, social work, law, public health, and education.

The Conferences were sponsored by the Institute's National Committee; Vernon Haubrich acted as liaison member from the Committee to the conferences.

INSTITUTIONAL AUTONOMY AND TEACHER EDUCATION

Merle Borrowman
Chairman, Department of Educational Policy Studies
University of Wisconsin, Madison

We are engaged in exploring the possibilities of building a new political community. The problems of preparing teachers of disadvantaged youth — indeed most contemporary educational problems — are, in part, functions of our failure to insure that the right voices both are heard and are responded to in the right arenas. While it is surely the case that no one has *the* answers to these problems, it is also the case that the collective wisdom and resources of all concerned now include requisite insights and skills to do a far better job of preparing teachers than we are doing. Yet institutional autonomy, and loyalty to the guilds of which we are members prevent the mobilization of this wisdom and these resources.

Although the problem is partly a political one, only the most cynical would consider any such problem merely political. Those who seek power without looking to its uses breed evil, but high-minded idealists who scorn a realistic regard for political processes breed futility and despair.

When representatives of state departments of education, colleges and universities, public school systems, and the United States Office of Education meet to talk of common concerns they engage in low-powered political process. This innocuous, cathartic process permits, on occasion, some individuals to form mutually profitable alliances; on rarer occasions, it leads to a continuingly productive confederation among institutions. Yet such a confederation is clearly needed if we want any real mobilization toward more adequate teachers. The traditional parliaments in which decisions about teacher education have been made are inadequate.

NOTE: I have used parliament *in a special way. I toyed with* community *and* arena *as alternatives. The term* parliament *is too political in the partisan sense; it connotes too rigid a structure to serve my purposes perfectly. But in the sense that it evokes the image of a representation of diverse and sometimes competing constituencies, insofar as it focuses attention on community decision-making, it serves well. With these connotations and qualifications, I use it.*

From **Teacher Education in a New Context,** *Madison, Wisconsin, May, 1967.*

Let me turn to the argument: the traditional parliaments are inadequate; institutional autonomy and guild loyalty have blocked the effective use of our wisdom and resources; a new kind of confederation is needed. In the past, decisions concerning teacher education have effectively been made in three parliaments: city school systems, rural-based normal schools and teacher colleges, and large multi-purpose universities. While important voices were heard in each of these parliaments, others were stifled, important things were unsaid.

Teacher preparation programs managed by the public school authorities in our cities have a distinguished record. The teacher training class which Edward Sheldon ran in Oswego, New York, in the 1850's and 1860's became Oswego Normal School which, for a decade or so, largely dominated elementary school teaching in America. Later, William T. Harris' training school in St. Louis was similarly distinguished. In our own day Chicago Teachers College* does yeoman service. This type of institution has unparalleled advantages in its capacity to respond to particular school conditions in the city it services. Coordination between the teacher-preparing institution and the schools in which teachers are apprenticed and ultimately employed is expedited because, while both are controlled by a single authority, the ultimate constituency of the two agencies is the same.

But the immediate constituency of the teacher-preparing institution and public schools is not the same. Since the public at large focuses on the schools, the administration of a city school system has been constrained above all else to minimize community conflict. Less subject to widespread public scrutiny, but clearly subject to the central office bureaucracy, the teacher training programs have often become tools for protecting the status quo, for propagating the official line of the system, and for perpetuating an excessive emphasis on techniques of classroom management. Moreover, the teachers in the system, faced like the administrator with a desperate challenge merely to keep things under control, have rarely used their influence in the interest of the innovation that threatens their own hard-won security.

Finally, the authorities of public school systems in cities where major universities are located have tended, for very understandable reasons, to hold university scholars

---

** Now Northeastern Illinois State College and Chicago State College*

at arm's length. University faculty members who view themselves invariably as experts on education and who firmly believe that what they want in the schools is what all people should want, are not, in fact, representative of the superintendent's constituency. He views them, properly, as one interest group among many; but he views them as a particularly articulate group whose mastery of language and posture of expertise make them difficult to handle. For all the valuable teacher education resources a local school district possesses, its need to protect itself has made it unresponsive both to expert criticism and to calls for major innovation.

The school-district-controlled teachers college has these assets: familiarity with the concrete conditions under which teachers work; an administrative structure which facilitates coordination of teacher education and teacher practice; and a responsibility to produce visible results in the practical world. The same assets are possessed by large school districts increasingly involved in the continuing education of teachers, even though they operate no formal teachers college. For example, the Wisconsin Improvement Program and the Upper Midwest Regional Laboratory are both committed to placing an increasing share of responsibility on public school systems for the clinical aspects of preservice teacher education and for the continuing education (or re-education) of teachers in service. Whatever can be learned on the job, in the practical situation, must to a considerable extent be learned under the leadership of public school personnel.

But public school districts have the same or more intensive limitations than their teachers colleges have. Teachers, universally overloaded, are reluctant to take on additional activities unless relieved of others. The public school's constituency tends strongly to oppose both experimentation and added costs of supportive research and retraining activities under conditions attractive to teachers. The public wants its school money spent on direct instruction of the sort it has come to consider normal. In the present climate neither the public schools nor their teachers colleges can attract and hold imaginative, research- and experiment-oriented people.

The traditional normal school, now generally evolving into state university status, has had some of the same resources for teacher preparation possessed by city school systems. There has been developed in these institutions a great concern for craftsmanship in teaching, a penchant for the practical, and a close tie to the particular schools served by what were conceived as local or regional colleges. They have tended to recruit students from a limited geographical area and to place their graduates in the same areas. Not infrequently local school authorities have taught in the teacher colleges; frequently ex-school administrators from that area have become the professors of education, thus reinforcing both the practical and the regional biases of the system.

Actually, the entire profession or Education (with a capital *E*) tends to be the product, either first or second generation, of this tradition. Professors of education in the major universities, superintendents of schools in the major cities, still tend to have their roots in rural and small town America — in the America of the teachers colleges. So, in large measure, do the leaders of the National Education Association, still the most powerful teacher organization in America. Too often these educators respond to the metropolis as if the values and techniques of small town midwestern and southern America were still highly relevant.

Now, of course, the traditional teachers colleges are becoming large research-oriented universities. They seek increasingly to serve a national clientele, or at least that clientele which includes both metropolitan and rural segments. Their faculty, now more cosmopolitan, adopts the spectator role, the role of the disinterested inquirer. "Closed" universes — experimentally, statistically, rationally "closed" — that lend themselves to making purely scientific propositions become more interesting than the somewhat chaotic and always changing universe in which schools operate. It would be pleasant to argue that a mere alliance of research-oriented professors and action-oriented school people would solve the problem of preparing teachers for disadvantaged youth. Particularly would one hope that universities with the service orientation which gave rise to the "Wisconsin Idea." for example, could make common cause with the practitioners rather efficiently.

Unfortunately, the dual values of research and service have led to a complexity which makes collaboration difficult. As the university becomes more complex, subgroups within it stake out territories which they jealously guard. Departments acquire a vested interest in certain functions and prerogatives, and since only in this way can each protect his interest, the autonomy of departments is supported by all. Not only does the university make it difficult for the practitioner to be heard, it even minimizes the chance that one of its

own segments will hear and take seriously the suggestions of another.

My own university provides the exception to prove the rule. This is an exceptional university in its responsiveness to the practical problems of the state. The college of agriculture, the school of education, the medical school, the law school, the engineering school, and the graduate school itself, can all produce scores of examples of professors reaching out to practitioners in other social institutions and taking their problems into the laboratory and library for study. Moreover, despite our much cherished departmental autonomy, interdisciplinary and interdepartmental research flourish.

Specifically, our school of education is unique in the extent to which it includes active members from nearly every university department; in the extent of its close relationship to the State Department of Education; and in the extent to which, through the Wisconsin Improvement Program and other activities, it has formed alliances with the state universities and public school systems.

Even so, this cooperation is maintained partly by a delegation of function which protects departments and so, with respect to such problems as the preparation of teachers for disadvantaged youth, prevents the mobilization of resources. The initiative in designing teaching majors rests overwhelmingly with particular departments while the design and teaching of professional education courses rests with others, and few of us have the courage or temerity to say that people destined to teach disadvantaged youth in urban centers should have a general education significantly different than that proposed by the college of letters and sciences for all its students.

Were someone to suggest that the professional education segment of our teacher certification curriculum be expanded to include several courses in social psychology, cultural anthropology, urban health problems, and the economics of poverty, screams would be heard across the campus. Most academic members of the school of education faculty are quite willing to accept whatever the professors of education suggest so long as it can be provided in an eighteen credit block, and most professors of education are quite willing to incorporate relevant materials from any discipline so long as, when it is offered in a professional education course they control who teaches it. For the practical purposes of our teacher education program, the professors of law, medicine, and social work have little to say. This may be as they want it since they have other interests to pursue and protect. The cooperative structures in the university thus rest on a pattern of deference, taboo, and psychic withdrawal. The system of sanctions in a major university also militates against faculty members' extensive involvement in action projects, or even "mission-oriented" research. The kind of research which pays off in a national community of scholars is that which involves relatively stable generalizations. Further, such stability is often achieved only by creating a relatively closed system of variables, whether through logic, statistical control, or laboratory conditions. The well-controlled atmospheric conditions that we can create in our biotron can never be found consistently outdoors, nor can a psychological laboratory really approximate a public school classroom.

Moreover, university scholars not only seek stable generalizations, but they also want to be on the frontiers of knowledge. To move on these frontiers, leisure — freedom from the necessity to produce immediately useful knowledge — is essential. Just as the school superintendent cannot survive without responding to the demands of his clientele for practical results, the university researcher cannot survive *if* he must so respond. Though action-oriented people do exist in every university, the tone seems clearly set by the researchers.

As is the case with public school people, the factors which limit the capacity of university people to design and operate effective and continuing programs of teacher preparation and re-education are the source of the very strengths which must be mobilized to these ends. It is precisely because they live in the world of action that public school people are essential in the teacher education enterprise. It is precisely because university people stand somewhat aloof and unresponsive to public clamor for immediate action that they are essential.

In addition to public school systems and teacher education universities, there is a third major teacher educator: the state department of education. Theirs is perhaps the most frustrating of all situations. On their shoulders lie all the legal responsibility but in their own hands is precious little real power — though the statutes speak as if they have much. As individuals, most members of such departments are selected on the assumption that they have the talent and inclination to lead, which means, I take it, that they have ideas as to which way we should move. But they sit — even physically — near the focus of political power in

the state and are the obvious target of legislators who reflect public anxiety about the schools. Not only are they therefore subject to many political restraints, but they are further handicapped because, in the final analysis, they can work only through other agents: the universities and the schools. They can persuade, cajole, bribe, and on occasion even punish, but they cannot directly operate schools or teachers colleges. In order to move vigorously they need an even broader political consensus than that on which a local school system rests.

Yet in certain respects, the state department people appear as natural middlemen between the university scholars and the school men. They have both the innovating interests of the former and the political responsibility of the latter. Whether (given the current financial situation) they are about to surrender this position to the United States Office of Education, to share it with that office, or merely to receive financial assistance from the office, remains to be seen.

I have tried to suggest that none of these — the teacher education institutions, the public school systems, or the state departments — provide the parliament in which can be developed effective systems of preparing teachers for disadvantaged youth, although they do appear to have the kinds of complementary neuroses which are thought by some to provide the basis of a happy marriage. It seems that a new parliament is needed.

But I have also argued that the kinds of pressure under which each of these institutions operate make it very difficult for them substantially to change their behavior. For these institutions to work together, an incredible amount of patience, courage, imagination, dedication, and flexibility is needed. I'm not at all optimistic that those qualities can be developed; in fact, I get tired just thinking about the work and conflict and frustration involved.

There are easy ways out. One is simply to ignore both the desperate condition of certain students in our schools and society and the tempting possibility of federal money. There is a certain austere beauty in this alternative: we can maintain the integrity of our current behavior and simultaneously demonstrate that we are not so materialistic as to do something merely because it pays.

A second alternative also exists. Given the possibility of federal largesse we can simply operate not as a parliament but as a victor's peace conference in which the spoils are divided. Each of us can designate certain things we want to do anyway; then those with sufficient skill in casuistry and rhetoric can dress up the package so that it looks promising to the angels in Washington. Indeed, given the normal human talent for rationalization, we might even find ourselves persuaded by our own sophists that a series of trivial and unrelated moves constitutes a significant statewide assault on a grievous social problem.

I am unduly cynical in describing this second alternative; let me try again. To do something more adequately to prepare teachers of disadvantaged youth may strike all of us as valuable. We may be convinced that a statewide attack on this problem is highly sensible and that certain states have the kind of tradition of cooperation that promises some success in this attack. We may even find this value and this promise attractive enough to assist in drawing up a first class paper project. But then comes the time to act, and each of us may find that in his hierarchy of values other demands are more important. This project becomes something on which we hope other people will work.

Then, into the vacuum created by the withdrawal of those who start the movement, will move other people with their own pet projects which, by a subtle change of description, can be made to appear relevant. Or we may decide to turn the major responsibilities over to project assistants and second or third level bureaucrats. When those directing this project move vigorously, certain of our cherished ways of behavior may be threatened and we may find it desirable to block the disadvantaged youth project. Thus, in time we may reduce a fine paper plan to trivia.

What I am trying to suggest is that we ought not initiate one more project involving school people, state department people, and university people unless we are really committed not only to believing that it would be good if someone carried on this project, but also to employing our own resources, and to risking the destruction of other enterprises in which we have been involved. Though money is abundant, relatively speaking, in our era, time and other human resources are scarce. It is no longer sufficient to reject the bad so that we can embrace the good; we need also to reject the good so that we conserve strength to embrace the greater good.

URBAN SCHOOLING: A CASE OF CHRONIC MALPRACTICE

H. Millard Clements
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

We are all aware of the chronic failure of our city schools. How should this failure be understood? Most educators in our city school systems see themselves as valiant workers in the sorry business of dealing with black children who are simply unfit for the schools. These spokesmen give much attention to "the disruptive child" and to the need for psychological and social services designed to adapt unready children to school routines. On the other hand, black parents who send their children to failing city schools see such failure as the inability of the professional staff to teach their children. The schools, black parents often argue, are not accountable: teachers and principals do not expect to succeed, are not obligated to succeed, and are not accountable for what they do. If we are to understand what is going on in our city schools, we must discover the social meaning of the rhetoric of educators and of the practice of education.

Let us think about the educational customs in our urban schools. I invite you to consider the assertion that what is to be found there is chronic malpractice. I think that the black parents see what is really going on in public schooling and that the professionals are trying to deny the reality of their practice.

We know there is failure; let us see if it should be thought of as malpractice. There are really only two ways to think about failing schools. One must either adopt the "kids are no good" hypothesis or adopt the "schools are no good" hypothesis.

One can argue that lower-class black children are unprepared for school. One can say that they are culturally deprived or unprepared and that it is this deprivation that is the cause of their school failure. This is the "children are no good" hypothesis. Alternately one can argue that school attendance is compulsory and that this compulsion imposes a moral demand upon schoolmen to devise forms of schooling that are attractive and at least somewhat useful to the children who actually come to school. This is the "schools are failing" hypothesis.

Most schoolmen for their own preservation and peace of mind have adopted the view that the historic failure of black children is the result of poor motivation and lack of ability in culturally, emotionally, parentally, deprived children. The "children are no good" hypothesis is a comfort to all educators.

Let us first look at this typical viewpoint in education, then later explore the hypothesis about failing schools. At that time, I hope you will be persuaded that there is a strong basis for asserting that the city schools are guilty of chronic malpractice.

We can explore the "children are no good" hypothesis by examining the assumptions upon which it is based. Consider these assumptions that are implicit in the anti-black children point of view:

1. There is one standard form of schooling, curriculum, and textbook literature that every child in school should experience.
2. When a child fails to benefit from his school experience, then he is defective, in one way or another.
3. The predominately black schools today have inadequate students who chronically fail to take advantage of a satisfactory school program.
4. Schoolmen are under little obligation to reexamine the practice of schooling. There may be some need to improve materials for teaching and the quality of teachers, but the practice of schooling is fundamentally sound and improvement of implementation is all that is called for.

An analysis of these assumptions will disclose whether or not there is merit in the "children are no good" hypothesis. Are these assumptions intellectually competent and ethically satisfactory, — or are they the basis of malpractice?

The first assumption: *One form of schooling is adequate for all children.*

Is one form of schooling likely to serve the wide range of abilities and interests that are to be found among school children? Is the present standard form of schooling so effective for all children that no alternative to it merits serious consideration? Are all of the students in our schools receiving a useful, attractive, and intellectually challenging experience in school?

The answer to all these questions, I think, must be *no*. The single standard curriculum that is a national characteristic of public education has driven from 40 to 60 per cent of the nation's students out of the schools. In the educational jargon, they have "dropped out." Our city schools have a failure rate of about 75-80

From **Urbanization, Work and Education,** *Chicago, Illinois, April, 1967.*

per cent. This finding would suggest that our one form of schooling in some respects fails to serve a substantial portion of students who attend city schools. Interviews that have been conducted with Milwaukee students in the Upward Bound project, students who have high academic aspirations, reveal that they almost unanimously regard their schooling as boring, unchallenging, and destructive. They persist in their efforts only because they aspire to the social and economic rewards that come with successful university work. No evidence suggests that programs of schooling have been developed, either nationally or locally, so effective that alternatives to them do not need to be considered or pursued. Compensatory education is not an alternative to the existing program. Rather, it is part of the "children are no good" hypothesis; it attempts to change children so that they can "benefit" from the existing program. The concept of the neighborhood school, or the elementary school, or the high school with its established literature, routine, and activities discourages innovation; it provides a set of self-justifying motions that are immune to criticism. Not only may schools fail in lower class communities; but it is likely that even when schools appear to succeed with middle class children, they may also fail. Middle class children are not entirely dependent upon schooling for their academic and material well-being. Ordinary middle class living often affords perspectives on work, on school, and on the future that encourages children to get along in school, but not to expect too much from the experience. Education is important, but there is much about it that is boring and not related to anything. Studies of white middle class students suggest that while they are bored and rather contemptuous of much of the work that they do, they regard school as an essential hurdle in their vocational career. These studies indicate that high school students regard the academic work of the schools as the least important feature of school life. Sports, school politics, and school social life are far more important to most reasonably successful students.

For middle class students, schooling often appears to be a somewhat stupid hurdle; for lower class students it appears to be the rape of a dream. Interviews with black children in Milwaukee suggest that they often come to school with high motivation, desire to learn, and curiosity. When they encounter an intellectually barren curriculum, a trivial literature, and too often, a set of teachers and administrators who genuinely believe that they are deprived, inadequate, and unfit for school, the rest is a disenchantment with the possibilities of schooling that leads to boredom, to failure and, in many schools, to chaos. The difference between the lower class and middle class schools appears to be this: Lower class children are dependent upon quality schooling; middle class children can survive the experience of trivialized schooling without too much damage.

The assumption that there is one form of schooling that is satisfactory for all children is neither intelligent nor moral. It is not intelligent because the institutional life in school is demonstrably failing many children. Professional ethics should demand that if a program of schooling in fact is not working and has not worked for years, then educators must invent and evaluate new approaches. The policy of one form of schooling is not moral because it permits educators to ignore their obligation to provide children who are compelled to attend school an experience that in fact is attractive and useful. To pursue a single standard educational treatment in the face of chronic, even historic, failure must be professional malpractice.

The second assumption: *Children are at fault when they fail in large numbers:*

Since schools, for many children, are not interesting places in which to live and to work, and for many teachers, schools are depressing places to work, some technique for the denial of this reality must be devised by professional educators if they are to maintain their peace of mind. For if this reality can be effectively denied, then neither public or professional educators need ever face the intellectual challenge of altering their practice or their malpractice. What they need is a rhetoric or an ideology that legitimatizes the existing institutional arrangements, and makes professionals and the public feel better in the face of chronic failure. Fortunately for many in education there is a popular mythology that effectively absolves professionals of responsibility and allows them to persist in malpractice without a crisis of conscience. The adoption of this ideology is, of course, not a conscious process; it takes place when people face intolerable situations and, at some levels, are unable or unwilling to face the reality of their circumstances.

The fundamental tenet of the ideology of many schoolmen caught up in malpractice is this: Children who fail in school are defective. This belief, which serves a variety of functions, attributes all school failures to parents, to out-of-school environments, and to family defects of children. It implicity affirms that schools

function more or less as they should, and that the curriculum is appropriate. When children choose to withdraw from school, they are investigated. What are their defects? What is deficient in their family background or personality that makes them unable to benefit from school experience? The ideology of schoolmen generally absolves them of the responsibility to provide effective educational programs. There is no blame for effectiveness because all blame, all responsibility, all culpability rests on the children who attend school rather than on the professionals who are there to serve them.

Rather than face their failures frankly, educators distract themselves from their professional obligations by degrading parents and communities, by seeking to develop compensatory programs, by psychological and social services designed to make children fit for the schools as they are presently run. It should not be the obligation of psychiatry and social work to adapt children to the routines and customs of schools. Rather it should be the obligation of professionals in education to think about and to design approaches to schooling that will in fact prove to be attractive and useful to children who in fact attend school.

Existing schools and school arrangements are not given to us by some immutable law of the universe. They are human contrivances. They may be changed; they may be altered; their programs can be regarded objectively. If schools are boring, they need not be; if schools undermine intellect, it is not necessary that they do so; if schools are failing some or many children, the failure can be recognized.

Educators, like physicians, must seek to serve the clients they actually have with treatments and programs of work and therapy that will actually be of benefit. Neither educators nor physicians can blame the failure of their treatments upon the diseases of their clients. Both are in the business of helping their clients and not chastising them about their obstinate intellectual, social or physical ailments that do not respond to an initial treatment.

There is no doubt that working with lower class children and with the wide range of abilities and interests generally found among children who attend city schools poses enormous difficulties. These difficulties are the challenge and excitement of professional education, just as working to cure or prevent or control cancer, polio, or mental illness is a challenge to professionals in medicine. Unfortunately, the educational ideology prevents educators from posing and exploring fundamental questionings relating to the conduct of public schooling.

Just as medical scholars search for remedies to serious disease, so too must professionals in education search for effective approaches to working with children who actually come to school. A search for alternatives will lead to a re-examination of every aspect of the conduct of public schooling and most likely would result in the development of new institutional arrangements.

I think the most dangerous, the most morally culpable assumption of men who work with economicalliy underprivileged children is the attribution of their own failures to the children the system of schooling should serve. Children cannot fail the school administration and its staff, but a professional staff can fail to be useful, attractive and effective with children.

The third assumption: *Black students are unfit and unready for school.*

In predominately Negro schools there are specific examples of the failure of educators to provide a form of schooling that is effective for and attractive to Negro students. School systems are often content with this failure since their ideology transforms the failure of their professional staff to serve children into the failure of Negro students to adapt to a prescribed school program.

Since programs of schooling are failing, since school districts are committed to one form of schooling for all children, and since school districts usually contend that the cause of any failure is the defect of parents, children and community, we in education (according to our prevailing ideology) first, blame the school failure on cultural deprivation, and second, develop compensatory programs intended to make Negro children fit for existing school programs.

Compensatory programs, such as Head Start, cannot make Negro children become successful students because the schools themselves are destructive institutions. Recent studies of the Head Start program indicate that whatever benefits result from such programs are eliminated after a year or so of school. This result was to be expected. Compensatory programs are a massive activity designed to veil from parents, children, and educators themselves, the failures of the schools to be effective, relevant, and viable with Negro children.

Compensatory programs are the answer to any criticism of failing black schools; concern about compensation shows that a school district appears to be trying to help black students; such programs call attention

to the apparent defects of the Negro community; such programs make any serious reconsideration of the school situation unnecessary. Compensatory education is an essential aspect of city educators' efforts to deny the reality of the failure of their program.

Fourth assumption: *There is no obligation to seek alternatives in schooling.*

Since the ideology of educators makes legitimate what is, and since they effectively disguise their own failure from themselves, educators frequently feel no obligation to search for alternatives. In their own eyes they are kind-hearted, hard-working, people trying to do their best to bring a sorry lot of children up to an adequate performance standard. If only the families were not so disorganized, if only the children were more motivated, if only the children had more ability, then there would be more satisfactory performance in school. The assumption that our city school systems are under no obligation to seek alternatives is a fundamental violation of professional ethics as well as the rights of lower class students to receive an attractive and useful school experience.

I have argued that urban schools are and have been in a state of almost historic malpractice. There is no easy remedy to this condition. The most hopeful development is the new demand from black communities for involvement and control of the operation of their schools. Implicit in this demand is the assertion that the schools are failing the children, and because of this implication the involvement of black parents is being resisted by bureaucrats in the school systems and in the teacher organizations.

If we are to develop an ethical position relative to public schooling, we must adopt the "schools are no good" hypothesis and act upon its underlying assumptions:

1. There is no single correct form of schooling, curriculum, routine, and text book literature that every urban child should experience.
2. Schools can fail to serve and be useful to children, but children cannot fail the schools.
3. The failure of a school is the failure of a staff to provide a viable and attractive program of schooling.
4. A school system is obligated to provide programs of schooling that genuinely serve and are useful to the children who are actually compelled by law to attend.
5. The benign tolerance of school failure is professional malpractice and a social calamity.

Let us explore briefly each of the assumptions.

The first assumption: *There is no one correct schooling.* Neither neighborhood schools nor any other institutional arrangement may be presumed to be the best form of schooling for all children. In order to find out what programs might be attractive and useful to the wide range of abilities and interests to be found among children of school age, an effort must be made to diversify institutional arrangements for schooling. We must rethink what it means to be a teacher and what it means to be a school. Most of the recommendations for new approaches to instruction are not based on a fundamental examination of institutional practice; new approaches to instruction are simply a facade on an old edifice.

The second assumption: *Schools can fail to serve and be useful to children but children cannot fail schools.* The purpose of public education is to provide a useful service to students. Although a professional staff may be incompetent and implement a program of schooling that is demonstrably ineffective, childen can only be as they are. It is the obligation of professional educators to search for viable approaches to schooling for all of the various children that are compelled by law to attend school. School and school personnel can fail, can engage in malpractice, but children can only come to school with whatever problems and liabilities they may possess. It is the challenge of education to provide them with a relevant, useful, human form of schooling.

The third assumption: *When children do not learn, the professional staff is failing.*

When a school is failing, say that it is failing. Many schools in our major cities have been disastrously failing ever since they became predominately Negro. Any board of education could name certain of its schools as chronic failures. If they were to be recognized as schools that were demonstrably failing to serve their students, then there might be some effort to find more satisfactory alternatives. If schools are thought to be failing, then they become the problem. What are the dynamics of life in these schools? What sort of program is presently failing? If that sort of program is failing what intelligent alternative might be worth trying? Without this recognition of school failure there will be no remedy for institutional problems.

The fourth assumption: *The school system is obligated to seek alternatives in programs of schooling.*

The business of education is to seek for effective programs in schooling that will actually serve the children

who really attend school. This obligation imposes the demand to seek ever more effective ways to serve the diverse abilities and interests of children. In the predominately black schools, where school failure is chronic, there should be emergency efforts to seek remedies to social calamity. Perhaps these remedies may call for institutional "marriages" between universities and school boards, between state and federal governments and school boards.

Assessing new ideas, programs, and procedures would create a whole complex of attitudes and activities throughout the school system that would make possible the realistic coming-to-grips with institutional problems of schooling.

The fifth assumption: *The benign tolerance of failure is malpractice.*

If polio can be cured, if scientists can devote their time and energy to the remedy of cancer, surely educators can direct their thought and time to provide a satisfactory and attractive form of schooling for every child who is compelled to attend. Perhaps many people will die of cancer before a cure is discovered; perhaps no cure will ever be uncovered. For educators not to try to invent new forms of schooling, not to devise new approaches to working with difficult children, not to invent new instittuional forms to cope with the problems of society that we face, not to devise more effective approaches to teacher education, is to engage in maipractice and to be insensitive to the problems that young people in our society face today.

In short, to be content with the cure of time is a failure of professional ethics, moral courage, and intellect. This is what we have done. We have engaged in malpractice. We have deceived parents and (most serious of all) we have lied to ourselves. Where is the remedy? To advise diversity is an easy recommendation. To propose a fundamental re-examination of the practice of schooling may seem pretentious but there is no alternative if we are to cease our malpractice.

How might we begin that difficult task? I think that one can begin to think about city schooling by noticing something about it that is so obvious that we may overlook it. City schooling takes place in cities.

What is a city? What is an urban environment? What characterizes an urban way of life? If we think about cities and about the characteristics of city life we will get some hints about the sorts of schooling that should be made available in cities.

How do cities work?

I have posed this question in the mood of Jane Jacobs. She poses such questions as these: How are streets safe? How are parks safe? She argues that it is not physical facilities nor lighting that make cities, parks, or streets safe. Processes of living must be understood if the origin of safety is to be disclosed.

Well, how do cities work? I think a few observations may help us to consider some things that are important. City life contrasts with the way of life to be found in small towns. In the past we were a nation of small towns. Today we are a nation of cities. Although many of our institutions, the most important of which is the school, had their origins in small town America, we are an urban nation now. I think that we are facing the necessity to re-examine our institutional forms of government, planning, and education in the light of urban realities. I think the conflicts about urban schooling are largely conflicts about small town institutions and values that have survived until now in urban environments.

Contrasts between city life and town life, I think, will help us see what I am thinking about. It is this contrast that illuminates both the dilemma of cities and the dilemma of schools.

CITY LIFE	TOWN LIFE
1. There is separation of work and residence.	1. There is much less separation of work and residence.
2. There is mobility: both social mobility and physical movement.	2. There is little or less mobility: social conditions are much more stable and there is much less physical travel.
3. Work makes a limited claim on the life of an individual. Although a man and his wife may spend many hours at work, the being of neither is determined by their job.	3. Work makes a substantial claim on life of an individual: to some extent a man *is what he does* in a small town.
4. People change jobs and professions. City people do not follow the occupation of their parents. A job helps a person make money; his *work* may be an after hours affair.	4. Children often follow the occupations of their fathers. People change jobs infrequently. There is a close identity between a man and what he produces for a market.

5. Anonymity makes possible the freedom of moral choice.	5. Community imposes the demand to follow the law or face peril.
6. Values are relativized; cities are pluralistic.	6. Values tend to be established; all must at least appear to conform.
7. Cities offer the danger and the freedom of choice in many contexts of life.	7. Small towns offer the comfort and security of established values, and limited opportunity for choice.

Anonymity may lead to despair as well as to freedom; mobility may lead to crime as well as opportunity; the relativization of values may lead to ugliness as well as beauty.

Plans for schools and plans for cities reflect this dual possibility. Our established system of schooling is a small-town invention. Its approach to books and work is uncritical, self-assured, naive, pretentious, anti-intellectual, but practical. There is little or no pluralism in school opportunities. In an urban environment, drop-outs, boredom and violence are natural developments within a system of schools lacking variety, vitality, and human challenge. The city school is the paradigmatic example of small town values in the midst of an urban environment, and until we alter the institutional character of schooling, I can see little hope that schools will serve urban children well or avoid conflict, for the city schools are not urban.

The spreading secularization and urbanization of our nation imposes upon us all the demand that we rethink our plans for our schools and our plans for cities. In recent decades, much of the criticism of books, schooling, and city life on the part of intellectuals has probably been an expression of dismay and chagrin at being ignored by both educational and political bureaucracies. Practical men of education and practical men of power in the past have ignored intellectuals. But societies change, and the demand for intellectuals is now in politics as well as city schools.

The ideological conflict in which we are engaged, the exploration of space and our transition from an economy of scarcity to an economy of abundance have made the work of intellectuals relevant to the affairs of our society. It is this transition from a society previously devoted to things and men of action towards a society likely to be preoccupied with ideas and their control that has sharpened our conflicts regarding books, schools, and cities.

As might be expected, the first demands upon schools by men of ideas have dealt with mathematics and science. There are the utilitarian disciplines: they serve both business and the military. Science education in many of our schools has been farcical, and this is probably intolerable in technological society. We can expect that our children in the future may encounter somewhat more authentic mathematics and science, but an improved mathematics and an improved science program are not enough; we must seek to understand how cities work in order to avoid the "clean and green" sort of moralizing that has brought disorder to both schools and cities.

Many of us are unhappy with the sentimental view of the world that is portrayed to children in school. Many of us are unhappy about the quality and character of life that some city dwellers lead in our urban environments. The complaints are inextricably united. What are the amenities of city life? They are not products but processes, not buildings but milieux, not naivete, but irony. The amenities of city life are such things as:

1. The possibility for anonymity and selective self-disclosure;
2. Mobility for play, work and adventure;
3. Facilities that permit a plurality of tastes, interests, and pursuits;
4. Functional relationships rather than propinquitous relationships;
5. The opportunity and the danger of choice.

Plans for cities that do not preserve these amenities will most likely lead to ugliness and violence in our cities.

Our schools, a primary city institution, violate almost every one of these amenities of city life, and, thus, predictably encounter the problems and ugliness that come with the denial of city freedoms and the imposition of the securities of town values and customs. In a general way schools that reflect the amenities of city life should have virtues such as these:

1. Functions rather than propinquity should determine school attendance. This means that fundamentally different kinds of schools should be freely available to any who wish to attend. The concept of neighborhood schools should be recognized as a small town concept largely unsuited for an urban community.
2. The notion of compulsory schooling should be altered. Compulsion should impose the obligation upon young people to do something and no particular thing. The city is the milieu of

choice, and choice in schooling should be a city possibility.

3. The notion of school should be made as diverse as the imagination makes possible. Schooling should be dis-established.
4. Life in any school should reflect urban values for both teachers and students. Both should have freedom. Neither should be routinized to passivity, to sentimental ideas, to self-destructive roles in schools.
5. Materials in use in school should reflect city values. They should be authentic, accurate, and reflect the irony that all knowledge of the human situation entails: knowledge is manmade. The business of study is to make knowledge, or to weigh and evaluate it — not to genuflect before it.

I am saying that we must make urban schools urban. The problem of urban schools is not its curriculum but its institutional character.

Fundamental innovation in education must explore the problems and possibilities of altering the role of students, the role of teachers, the locations where schooling takes place, and routines of schooling. Such explorations may be begun by offering to students (and their parents) the choice to work with people and programs that the students themselves find to be attractive and useful; providing a wide variety of high quality alternatives among which students might choose; and assigning responsibility to teachers for the programs of schooling they offer to children.

Children who are compelled by law to attend school should be guaranteed that they will have a reasonably satisfactory and useful school experience. By providing choice, students will be able to avoid situations they find to be destructive. By providing diversity of school, opportunity the wide range of students' abilities and interests might actually be served.

The following are some ways in which schooling might be made diverse, teachers more responsible, and students more involved in their school work.

Special Schools

One approach to diversity is to invent specialty schools on both elementary and secondary levels. The purpose of these schools would be to provide both general educational and strong specialized schooling dealing with art, the performing arts, natural science, social science, business, or technology.

The professional staff in each specialized school would be obligated to develop a program in which it believed. Any student in the school district would be invited to attend any of the various schools. A school staff that could develop a program that would in fact attract and hold a student body would, in fact, be a school. The purpose of this arrangement would be to drive out of the schools those teachers who have neither the interest nor the competence to be effective, and to attract to the profession individuals of initiative and talent who cannot endure the dreariness of the present institutional arrangements.

Mixed Schools

Mixed schools might be thought of as places where schooling occurs in buildings that have many other uses. Space in commercial buildings might be rented for classroom use. The purpose of dispersing the economically underprivileged children into the business and professional community is to place them in the mileu of work. On the elevators, in the cafeterias, and in the halls students would encounter people engaged in one or another kind of profession. A class might spend two months in an insurance building, two months in a bank, and two months in its own school building.

After enough students had moved out of a school building into these various business and professional buildings, the unused space could be rented to businesses whose physical presence in a school might be educational. Examples might be dental clinics, blood banks, barber shops, stock brokers, small speciality shops and city offices. The purpose of this mixed use of the traditional school building would be to display every day in school some of the work activities in which adults engage.

A mixed-use school would provide a milieu of work that is likely to be interesting and attractive. It would take school out of school, out of the institutionalized setting that appears to be destructive to children.

It is possible to think that a specialty school (concerned with business or commerce) might make especially good use of this mixed school arrangement. More or less standard curriculum schools might also take advantage of this world of work milieu to facilitate the conduct of its program of schooling.

In the mixed-use schools, as with all others, the professional staff should be given the responsibility to develop a program with which to compete for students.

Special Academic Schools

There are always likely to be students with special problems or with great talent in reading, writing, math-

ematics, art, and foreign languages. Special academic schools could be established that only dealt with specific academic concerns. These schools could be made avaliable to elementary, secondary, and adult students. They might be attended one or two periods a day or all day for several weeks or months. The purpose of these academic schools would be to work with students who had specific problems or special abilities. This work would be pursued in an appropriate building under conditions designed to maximize benefits to students. It seems plausible to think that an academic school should be located in a commercial or professional building in order to reinforce the effect of milieu.

As with other schools, each staff should be given the responsibility to design a program and compete with it for students.

Neighborhood Schools

One of the alternatives that might be available to students is a standard, all purpose, neighborhood school. Unlike present school arrangements, the neighborhood school staff should design a curriculum and compete with other schools in the district for students.

With a diversified system of schooling, with responsibility placed upon a resident staff, with choice offered to students there is some likelihood that the profession of education would become more attractive to able people and that the life students lead in school would become more useful and interesting.

These possibilities would pose many problems of administration. They would lead to social dislocation for parents, teachers and children. In this dislocation, teachers and students would be forced into new roles that would lead to structural change in the practice of education.

To invent alternatives, to explore administrative facilitation of innovative ideas, and to evaluate the effectiveness of fundamentally different approaches to schooling is a serious intellectual and moral challenge. To face this challenge is the obligation and adventure of professional education, and the only avenue that leads away from malpractice in education.

PREPARING TEACHERS OF THE DISADVANTAGED: A PRACTITIONER'S PERSPECTIVE

Richard Larson
Director, Urban Education Center
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Let me wallow a while in the luxury of the intellectual license my speaking responsibility affords me. If I am to speak on a practitioner's view of teacher education as it prepares students to teach the disadvantaged, then I think my criticisms of such education will be more productive than my many supportive views. I see many good teachers, many evidences of professional scholarship, many committed people: but this iteration takes us no place. Allow me, then, to extract from an overall view of teacher education my negative, critical perceptions, and to elaborate them as if they constituted the total. These are my hunches, my fears and suspicions, the labored woes I mumbled to myself many times prior to this opportunity to cut loose.

I should add that my acquaintance with your [teachers of teachers] work is limited, in a sense. I don't know to a great extent what you do to teachers, but I'm very aware of what we in the urban schools must do after we get them — and we do try. We try despite the fact that we're often too late; for the stalwart across the hall, usually, has already convinced the novice that his artificial preparation program was either entirely artificial or entirely real. In either case, progress is the loser.

I have the subjective and personal impression that teachers are trained to become uninfluential automatons, drill masters covering safe and irrelevant content quickly forgotten; non-status functionaries who mistrust the central office, who procure expedient education from the veteran across the hall, and who believe in the sanctity of arbitrary standards, intelligence quotients, the third-grade concept, cleanliness, and wedded motherhood.

Teachers talk too much. They ask questions to which they have "true" answers and call this the "discovery" method. They are conditioned to anticipate as their just due the possession of a draped, low-ceilinged, pastel-walled classroom world filled with tow-headed children whose antiseptic school education is quite incidental to important learning. Differences among children become bases for referrals.

From **Teacher Education in a New Context,** *Madison, Wisconsin, May, 1967.*

Teachers are paper prophets of an unreal, feminine world. Their credentials boast of relevant course titles, the bulk of which seems to contain irrelevant, antiquated, or sterile content. Many teachers do not know how to teach, save for magic-bags frenetically filled during a campus school student teaching experience, when the outside world suddenly looms large and awesome just beyond the next summer vacation.

Teachers are tradesmen, not professionals. They come at eight, leave at 3:30, work 170 days annually, feel underpaid, and long for more freedom to hit children. Working about 1,100 hours yearly, they earn $4.50 per hour if their starting wage is $5,000 a year. From year to year they yearn for practical classroom advice, and even hopefully trot back to universities to renew their disappointment. Alas, teacher preparation seems to equip one more for advanced teacher preparation than it does for teaching. It is a paradox of mammoth dimension that teacher education programs do not prepare today's teachers for the experience of one-third of our classrooms. Practitioners in school systems teach new teachers the nitty-gritty of classroom performance. Higher education does not concern itself with pedestrian methodology; its function is concentration on irrelevant content.

What are the consequences of teacher preparation programs which have only minimal relevance to the teaching of millions of disadvantaged students? What happens when the real world surreptitiously invades the campus, and both students and professors gain the uneasy and discomfiting awareness that things don't mesh? Sometimes, professors respond with candid advice to their mysticized yearlings. "Don't go to that city," they caution, "you may be placed in an inner-city school." Far less frequently, abortive efforts are made by the conscientious independent to do something about the naivete of his students concerning the education of disadvantaged youngsters. Since his zeal, alas, leads him to books, not people, his efforts replace old myths with new. The poor are *not* lazy, shiftless, and dirty-happy-go-lucky, perhaps; they are *not* against education — merely disinterested; it's not true that the Negro has rhythm in his bones — that falsity grew from misreading his universal emotional spontaneity.

The sad yet hopeful irony of teachers facing today's world of poverty, waste, exploitation, bigotry, and human suffering is, that while neither their backgrounds nor their lumbering institutions have prepared them to cope with today's realities, the nation expects them to cut a swath through the most complex and critical of social problems. The waddling looney bird must, overnight, become a soaring eagle.

The transformation can take place — we live in a miraculous world.

I would start with a plea for general acceptance that our current concerns for the education of disadvantaged youngsters is not a fad. The consequences of our gross inefficiency both in public education and in teacher preparation are catching up with us. A mischievous public is peeking under our mask!

If we can assume consensus allows that our problems are urgent and real, and if we together accept responsibility for attacking our dilemma — the education of disadvantaged youth — then perhaps we can begin together by examining certain aspects of teacher preparation. We may then arrive at questions and hunches that lead to alternative approaches to the task at hand. Today's new teacher seems relatively unprepared to become part of an educational team. He has little readiness for cooperative planning, or flexible grouping arrived at through individual and group diagnoses; he has limited diagnostic skill. His lack of finesse in observing instructional behavior is balanced by his inability to provide positive criticism of the instructional behavior of his colleagues, or to accept the same from them. He seems, rather, to anticipate insulation, ready-made curricula, regimentation — and a class of his own, by God. I worry about these things.

The fact that we in the public schools are only too ready to provide exactly these conditions leads me to a second suspicion, one that reflects a disparity between our in-service and preservice efforts, and the nature of the expected role of the teacher in an on-the-job school setting. The suspicion is this: teachers are not sufficiently aware of the intricacies involved in existing in a bureaucratized, institutional school environment. The pervasive influences of principal, itinerant supervisors, schedules, policies, and mandatory curricula effect institutional rigidity and provide ample assurance that little unexpected will take place in the classroom. It is not surprising that innovations and new ideas seldom are initiated by teachers. Nor is it surprising that enthusiasm wanes. Elizabeth Eddy has elaborately described the bureaucratic nature of today's schools in a detailed and eloquent fashion.[1] Teachers, pupils, principal, and parents all have relatively rigid time and space allocations. Teacher status in a building, or a school system, or a community, reflects his bureaucratized position, and should indicate to the teacher the distance he needs to travel to get things

done in new ways. The school, say some, is a factory, and colleges train the foremen.[2]

Bureaucratized practices pervade other aspects of the school. The "developmental characteristics" on which curriculum content and activities are often based describe anticipated pupil behavior. Consider these, used to describe intermediate grade children:

1. The child of this age is becoming increasingly better at controlling the expression of his emotions. On the surface he appears quite serene and placid. . . .
2. The span of attention of the 9 - 11 year old is almost endless.
3. At home, alone, he is completely absorbed in the radio or television, in making scrapbooks, in reading, in constructing, etc.[3]

As Eddy points out, those children who deviate from these characteristics are labeled atypical and are subject to institutionalized restrictions or punishments. Unfortunately, fledgling teachers are ill-equipped to recognize these inequities, much less combat them.

The problem is this: what skills can a teacher be given that will equip him to assist in altering a school setting similar to and as equally inappropirate as the training program that readied him? At what point can the chain of meaninglessness be broken? It is my contention that new teachers can become more effective educators if they are made aware, in advance, of the institutional environment in which they will work, and of the degree to which these conditions are consonant with educational goals that matter. Only when teachers themselves have a fairly accurate appraisal of the institutional obstacles to learning will those obstacles be overcome.

Another suspicion: someplace along the line, teachers gain a magical sense of fundamental, absolute wisdom that eludes me. New teachers have right answers when I'm still groping with questions. Let me ask you: Do you teach best ways? Do you allude to panaceas, however cautiously? Do you have your students guess answers until — Eureka — they strike on your thought? Do you create black and white minds, or is that too, part of the function of the veteran teacher across the hall?

How do we arrive at sound instructional decisions? Do we all believe that research is, after all, a graduate school exercise and little else? If a research view among teachers toward the classroom problems they face is so uncommon, then Robert Lynd was probably right: Research without value decisions becomes the dirty bag of an idiot, filled with random, meaningless hoardings.[4] Teachers have little sense of alternative solutions to the disparate problems that besiege them. If Mandrake or God stops whispering in their ears, perhaps we can together be about the business of developing a sense of tentativeness among teachers concerning their classroom behaviors. If we can, research will take a refreshing and practical meaning.

Let me assume, before elaborating my next suspicion, that undergraduate and graduate course titles do indicate a relevance to urban education, or to teaching the disadvantaged child. But do the contents of those courses relate equally well? Does a prospective teacher relate the learnings of Sociology 201 to his course of the following year on Social Foundations of Education? Do the lectures, quizzes, and assigned chapters dovetail with concurrent field observations or experiences? Are the instructors of those courses with the promising titles as well as those describing either more traditional or more esoteric content, aware of the urban world and the youth who populate it? Do they relate their generalizations and concepts to the real world of the rural poor, or the migrant worker, or the lives of the unskilled and unemployed? I hope so: but I doubt it.

Take learning theory courses, for example. They acquaint the candidate with a variety of theoretical groundings or laboratory points of view. However, since white rats neither summarize personal experiences nor attend school, any immediate application to classroom learning is virtually impossible. Moreover, the leap from theoretical hunch to classroom learning theory is seldom made when the teacher goes to work, because then she gets the real scoop from our ubiquitous friend across the hall, while the person who taught her all that stuff in the first place is back in the psychology department and therefore doesn't count.

Teacher education bears the symptoms of the caterpillar syndrome. Fuzzycoated and well camouflaged, it humps and nibbles its way from plant to plant. At the time when radical changes are about to take place, it spins a cocoon, insulating and isolating itself from its surrounding environment. Teacher preparation programs too often reflect both a limited relationship to the tough complexities of the social milieu they purport to serve, and a determined avoidance of some of education's most knotty (but common) perplexities: How can school learning utilize the wide range of learning styles that characterisze urban youngsters? What are some effective behaviors for teachers coping with disruptive pupil problems? Which outside re-

sources might one enlist to broaden school learning? What constitutes effective communication between teachers and low-income parents? How can one teach those he hates, when he's been neither taught well to do the teaching nor taught at all to stop the hating?

While you dip into your bags for over-ripe tomatoes, let me summarize. To an increasing degree, schoolmen are discounting the relevance of undergraduate teacher preparation, and are filling the gap themselves. This whole process is somewhat senseless, however, since the preservice and in-service committments we live with do not support one another. Moreover, we do not know what each of these is about, nor do we care.

Today's teachers of disadvantaged youngsters are grossly miseducated. The present pattern, if there is one guiding her preservice preparation, does not equip Miss Jones of Viroquo to teach Timothy Johnson of Mead Street in Racine — or the millions like him — but she tries. She tries, and with limited alternatives as resources, with sagging self-confidence, with no one to talk to, with affirmed expectations about the Timothys of the world, she walks across the hall to sit at the feet of Sarah Sage, who completes her miseducation.

The suggestions I have for short-circuiting Sarah and saving Miss Jones are neither new nor very imaginative, but I've seen some work. Let me ramble about a few of them.

1. Build varied practicum experience into each year of professional training. Let such experience encompass a broader range of activities than observation and student teaching in a school.
2. Send squads of from four to twenty student teachers to the same buildings, so they can rotate assignments and meet as a faculty themselves, thereby learning some of the problems of skillful institutional existence.[5]
3. Involve faculty outside the school of education in relevant field experiences with the students.
4. Provide seminars, discussions, and other in-service activities, aimed at increasing the relevance of teacher preparation to urban education and the disadvantaged.
5. Dovetail pre- and in-service preparation so that the two form a single continuous experience.
6. Bring the university to the school system. Let education teachers learn from those who are teaching well, and reduce the threats of their credibility by showing they can do it, too.
7. Prepare educators to work in teams with professionals, aides, volunteers, and parents. Allow them the chance to practice critical analyses of their own work and that of others.
8. Provide abundant savvy about the real world of education. What do candidates know about school integration? What are their concepts of poverty? What relationships do they see between themselves and the legal profession, or medicine, or the range of social and educational agencies?
9. Be honest, convince the novice that the profession doesn't have most of the answers. Equip them with the skills and desire to develop, attempt, and assess alternative approaches to instructional problems in the classroom. In similar vein, help them to live astride ambiguities, to maintain tentativeness, and to hold their blue corpuscles in check when unexpected behavior offends their moralities. Orient offerings toward change, probability, hunches, new knowledge, changing media, excitement, efficiency, and hope for tomorrow.
10. Scrape one gold star off your own teaching chart each time one of your students states, "I wonder what he wants."
11. Reflect on how the unheard voices of teachers might become a political force for human good in a community. Then teach your students how to utilize that force.
12. Provide tools for the self-assessment of professional behavior. Build into the program opportunity for every student to become part of a long-term, informal, small group discussion where each other's concerns are heard and where a teacher might learn more about how to cope with himself and care for others.
13. Utilize tapes, role-playing, and other gimmicks for communication between the new teacher on-the-job and the university.
14. Provide prospective teachers with the opportunity to see the whole range of veteran teacher abilities, and to observe the successes and failures of first year teachers.
15. Examine the possibility of placing new teachers in groups in the same building, and assure their immediate communication with identified high quality professionals there.
16. Above all: teach them how to teach. Perhaps, after all, if a choice need to be made, a compas-

sionate, warm, unbiased incompetent might be a lesser choice than a highly skilled, artful, and efficient bigot.

These are my current biases. By next month, my list of offensive criticisms and constructive suggestions will probably change considerably, for I, too, am tentative in my judgments, anxious about our success, but willing to fail in some attempts in order, ultimately, to succeed, in creating a system of institutions that matches today's youngsters.

Notes

[1] Elizabeth M. Eddy, *Urban Education and the Child of the Slum.* Project True, Hunter College, New York. (New York: Hunter College, Draft Copy for Experimental Use, 1966), p. 56.

[2] Warner Bloomberg, Jr., "The School as a Factory." University of Wisconsin — Milwaukee, Mimeographed, 1967.

[3] Wisconsin Cooperative Educational Planning Program, *Guide to Curriculum Building, Intermediate Level.* Problems Approach Bulletin No. 4, Curriculum Bulletin No. 12, (Madison, Wisconsin: June, 1962), pp. 26, 34.

[4] Robert Lynd, *Knowledge for What?.* 1938.

[5] Credit for this concept belongs to Robert Strom, who has attempted to initiate it in selected urban schools.

A LOOK AT TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Edward G. Ponder
Research Scientist, Institute for Developmental Studies
New York University, New York

Effective teaching in disadvantaged areas is a pressing need. The disadvantaged child, already limited in his basic skills, generally encounters teachers who have not been adequately prepared to work with him. Let me state at the outset that as I talk about disadvantageness I am not talking about any single racial or ethnic group, for disadvantageness cuts across such lines. In addition, on the cognitive level disadvantageness cuts across social-class lines. Care must be exercised that "disadvantaged," "deprived," and similar terms, do not become euphemisms or synonyms for Negro or Puerto Rican or American Indian or Southern Appalachian white.

In my doctoral study [1] which investigated the effects of special training programs in colleges offered in the summer of 1965, I found that colleges emphasized the racial and/or ethnic groups considered to be disadvantaged within the geographical areas in which such colleges were located. For example, institutes conducted in the eastern, southern, and midwestern parts of the United States appeared to stress work with low socio-economic status (SES) Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and white Americans. In the far western and southwestern parts of the United States, the institutes appeared to put special emphasis on work with Spanish Americans (Mexicans) and American Indians. This does not mean that the institutes were so specialized according to race or ethnic group that they did not include information about work with a diversified racial and ethnic population, but rather, that one is able to ascertain the special groups on which the institute programs generally concentrated.

A recent study [2] by Edwin Kiester and Professor Alice Miel of Teachers College, Columbia University, points up another critical need in the education of teachers: the need to help teachers who work in suburban areas. These teachers working with children whom Miel and Kiester label "short-changed children," need to understand and cope with the nature of the problems of prejudices and materialism which affect these children. The study clearly points out that these children live in

From **Teacher Education** in a New Context, *Madison, Wisconsin, May, 1967.*

"isolated splendor" with racial prejudice and competition for material gains setting them apart from the real world, the world in which they will have to live more meaningfully — and survive.

For example, Miel and Kiester indicated in their study that the suburban children were shown pictures of white children who were unkempt and poor. Reactions from the children shown the pictures generally indicated that the suburban children thought the children in the pictures couldn't possibly be Americans — they must be foreigners. It seems to me that such reactions indicate a great need for the schools, through a variety of strategies, to expose all children to others who are unlike them racially, ethnically, and socially. However, in order to provide a meaningful experience in this connection for children, it seems essential that school personnel be open and accepting in such an endeavor.

With respect to in-service programs for school personnel working with the disadvantaged child, and all children, the need to develop positive attitudes in the staff is often overlooked in the haste to get at so called teacher competence — methods, techniques, and procedures. While methods, techniques, procedures, and organizational skills are important in planning and organizing the curriculum, it is my belief that unless the development of positive attitudes in the professional staff toward work with children is stressed, any competence is negated. Teacher expectation as well as expectations of the teachers by the administration relative to the capability of the children to learn will determine to a critical degree how well and how much the children will learn. Too often, the prevailing attitude of the professional staff in schools serving disadvantaged children is: "What do you expect, look at the I.Q. scores."

It should be understood that one's college degree or status as teacher or other professional in education does not provide immunity from prejudices, stereotypes, or bias. The generalized notion that the more education one has, the less prejudiced he is likewise does not hold up. Educators, like others, have grown up in a society wherein they have been conditioned and have developed feelings and attitudes about others either positive or negative. Therefore, it is important that the teaching profession select out, as early as possible, those persons who find it intolerable to work with "certain types of children." The first task, however, might well be to rid the colleges of prejudiced faculty members who perpetuate and reinforce student prejudices, biases, and stereotypes. Study one comment regarding the need to work with socially unbiased college faculty:

> Some of our leadership was negative in that due to age, there were some who were set in their ideas. It hurt some of our staff members to have frankness brought out, largely on the part of minority group members of the class. I have attended class taught by most of these professors but was not aware of how deep their own feelings were about minority groups. This is a grave problem for all institutions of higher learning attempting an institute of this nature. You cannot have leadership which is racially biased and truly be creative.[3]

With such negative feelings within faculty ranks, it is little wonder that school personnel respond to minority group children in negative ways. However, when faculty members have a commitment to influence the feelings and attitudes of school personnel in more positive ways, improvement seems indicated. For example, when respondents in my study were asked what understandings they gained regarding the disadvantaged child and his social milieu, comments most often expressed were:

> Many of the Indian ways that I had looked at as faults have been identified to me as parts of his culture that have been handed down from ancient times and ways with which we must deal with respect.
>
> I now have a greater understanding of the extent of cultural deprivation in Indian homes and its effects upon the child's attitudes and abilities in school.
>
> I understand that the culturally deprived Mexican is in his predicament because of poverty. His poverty is a result of our bias and the inadequacies of welfare for the poor.
>
> I have a much better understanding of disadvantaged Mexicans relative to their poor self-image. My middle-class values have taken on added meaning — values are relevant.
>
> Because I am more conversant with his background, I am now more tolerant of the Spanish-speaking child's indifference to absorbing the American way of life. I try to make him aware of himself as a person, capable of being respected; this applies to his family also.

> I now understand that disadvantaged children do not belong to any one racial or ethnic group.[4]

A director of an NDEA Institute, when asked if the objectives of her institute had changed, reported that an objective was added to the original proposal dealing with the need to develop the ability of participants to relate to members of another race. It was interesting to note that the respondents from this particular institute generally reported increased racial understanding and acceptance. Some participants reported even traveling to other parts of the country during holidays, and visiting homes of racially different institute colleagues. Two comments seem to sum up what respondents reported about the helpfulness of the NDEA Institutes as related to racial understanding:

> My roommates at the institute were two Negroes. Because our institute was conducted both in a small college town and a large urban area of the same state, we lived together in both locations. I feel that I gained much from this opportunity. I feel far more secure in my present working situation.

> It was my first association with the Negro on a professional basis. I was surprised to find that these teachers felt their training inferior to the white teacher. (Why shouldn't their colleges be equivalent to ours?) It is good for us to work together in such a program as we had. I would like to see other institutes just like ours in the South.[5]

Here one senses the urgency both of college and school faculties to have more positive feelings toward others, especially in this age in which the explosion of knowledge is so great and in which new findings necessitate a re-examination of many previous ways of thinking.

Herein I think lies a tremendous opportunity to sensitize the professionals and to make them more aware of the contributions of many Americans to our country's historical development. All groups — racial, ethnic, social class — helped our country to evolve. Rather, therefore, than to focus primarily on Negro history, or Puerto Rican history, or American Indian history as separate entities, American history needs to drastically revise its present biased and distorted views to include the contributions of all groups in the total perspective of American history. However, it may be important to isolate and focus on special groups, because of the grossly inadequate treatment thus far given them in our schools.

Although one hears today that many of the claims made about Negroes who contributed to the development of our country are exaggerated, the truth of the matter is that these contributions by Negroes so specified have not been included at all in history as taught in America. One can major in United States history at the college level and be graduated without ever knowing what Negroes or other minority groups have contributed, unless a special elective course happened to be given, for example, in Negro history. We cannot continue to teach history in a piecemeal fashion that distorts human endeavors negatively for some and over zealously for others.

Let us now turn to the argument concerning the desirability of new teachers against teachers older in service, and vice versa. One often hears, for example, how the new teacher entering the profession, especially in a disadvantaged area, is discouraged by the "old timers" from performing as teachers and from expecting even minimal results of their students. The neophyte teacher is usually said by the *old guard* to be idealistic and unrealistic. While such instances of behavior can be cited, all new teachers do not necessarily enter the profession with the flexibility, enthusiasm, and openness necessary to do an adequate job. We really cannot generalize that all new teachers entering the teaching profession will produce our best supply of teachers, nor can we generalize that teachers older in service are not open and responsive to other ways of behaving in the act of teaching.

The important thing is to seek out the teachers, both new and experienced, within individual situations, and to determine their flexibility or rigidity in behaviors and attitudes. It seems safe to assume, however, that preservice programs which carefully select prospective teachers and provide them with realistic, adequate training especially suitable for work in disadvantaged areas, will yield a supply of new teachers unlike we have experienced before.

However, this assumes that colleges and school systems have planned and worked together not only in the preservice phase of the students' training, but, more importantly in the critical continuation: the in-service phase. New teachers in service despair, give up, or succumb to the evils of poor teaching from lack of adequate supervision as well as from the influence of the old guard. How may we overcome the psychological dropout of previously enthusiastic new

teachers in service, especially when they are assigned to schools in areas considered to be disadvantaged? Let us explore the partnership concept related to schools and colleges, planning and working together. In planning and organizing future in-service training programs for personnel working with disadvantaged children in the elementary school, the following considerations seem indicated. (These are based upon the data secured by questionnaire.)

Teacher-preparing institutions should be more closely associated with educational systems, both urban and rural, that work with the disadvantaged segment of the population. This association between colleges and school systems should be a deliberate and well-organized attempt to attack the overall problems of educating children in slum and racial minority ghetto environments. Miel has said, with respect to curriculum change which is especially pertinent to the education of the disadvantaged:

> Whether or not our society can achieve some control over social change will depend upon how many persons come to *place value upon deliberate social change* . . .
>
> People must be helped to see that new ways and ideas can usually be made to work if they are thoughtfully selected as the basis of group action and if enough attention is given to making them work . . .
>
> If deliberate social change is to replace haphazard change, human beings in this modern world will have to learn to give more attention to process than they have been willing to do in the past . . .[6]

Using Miel's position as a frame of reference for the moment, it would seem that both colleges and school systems, in partnership, should be cognizant of the many complex social and psychological forces of the larger society which operate in the lives of the disadvantaged, and base their attack on overall, realistic solutions to the problems. Possibly, therefore, an interdisciplinary approach to the multifaceted problems of the disadvantaged is an appropriate vehicle to the critical need of process in the deliberate social change which Miel stated.

Such a plan as released time for teachers during the regular school day, it appears, offers increased opportunity for professional growth of a high quality for all teachers, and should not be misconstrued to mean only teachers working in disadvantaged areas. On this matter, Miel, in her discussion of "New Patterns of Inservice Education of Elementary Teachers," has given us some guidelines to consider.

> Released time during school hours needs rethinking. With sufficient staffing by extra, generalist teachers and plenty of specialists, with sufficient laboratory and library-media centers, and with careful scheduling, it should be possible for the teaching day of every elementary school teacher to be shorter than a child's day. The teacher's duty day would, however, be longer than the children's. If each teacher were to spend with children from one-half to two-thirds of his duty hours, the remaining time could be in a sufficiently large block to be useful for such activities as subsection faculty meetings, small group planning by teachers, individual conferences with parents or children, consultation with resource persons, search of and study of materials, record keeping, and study of records and of children's work. Early dismissal plans and releasing teachers through hiring of substitutes might not then be necessary. Some teachers might be reassigned for a semester or a year for such purposes as conducting a piece of research; developing a specialty needed by a staff; serving as an exchange teacher; spending time in another country gathering information pictorial and taped records, and artifacts to be shared with many teachers and children back home; visiting a number of school systems to learn how a certain problem is being worked on; writing curriculum materials; or preparing materials for children's use.[7]

In these ways, time would be created to focus on developing teacher competence in a variety of tasks in a variety of ways. Too, such a proposal negates the troublesome problem that confronts many teachers: the need to attend in-service education programs either after school or on Saturdays.

However, it is my firm belief that, to be effective, in-service education programs must be an ongoing and integral part of each professional's responsibilities. Moreover, school systems will have to re-examine the hiring and placement practices of professional staff, deployment of professional staff, the hiring and deployment of ancillary staff, and the organization of the

school day to make ongoing in-service education possible within typical colleges, in partnership with school systems, would provide a broader and stronger base from which to make this plan operable.

It may be that within this frame of reference the United States Office of Education can broaden its sights in relation to three needs which face educators today: first, the need for teacher-preparing institutions, in cooperation with school systems, to improve and maintain adequate in-service training programs for personnel working in disadvantaged areas; second, the need to deliberately plan for and include all personnel in ongoing training programs related to work with the disadvantaged; and finally, the need to develop administrative styles, curricula, and materials more appropriate to the development of the potential and work of each child considered to be disadvantaged.

One outcome of our present social revolution may well be that our schools will reflect to a greater degree dissimilarity in the student population along racial, ethnic, and social-class lines. As technological and space age advancements shrink the world, society must plan some organized machinery to provide all children with experiences of other different children. The present as well as the future status of our interdependent world requires that we can neither accept nor afford leaders and populace unable to deal sensibly with others who are both alike and different. The flight to suburbia in order to protect children in "isolated splendor" would appear to trap many of these same children in a monotonous environment, in a life unlike the real world in which they will have to compete and survive. The same is true, of course, of parents and children who are limited to slum and ghetto environments.

It would appear, then, that with an ever-increasing population, with the great mobility of that population, and with the sociological concepts of invasion and secession of neighborhoods constantly before us, ongoing in-service education of all teachers to meet these challenges, is urgent and vital.

One may view present initial attempts of such in-service programs as promising. Nevertheless, it is the hope of the writer that from these specialized beginnings will ultimately emerge better training strategies which facilitate a sufficient supply of adequate school personnel to work in disadvantaged areas. An approach to ongoing staff competence which is thoughtfully, carefully, and continually worked at by colleges and school systems in partnership would seem to offer promise in fulfilling our goal of universal education.

References

1. Ponder, Edward G. *An investigation of the effects of special in-service training programs for work with disadvantaged children as viewed by directors and participants.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967.
2. Miel, Alice, and Kiester, Edwin, Jr. *The Shortchanged Children of Suburbia.* New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, The American Jewish Committee, 1967.
3. Ponder, *op. cit.*, p. 200.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 209-210.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 193, 195.
6. Miel, Alice, *Changing the Curriculum — A Social Process.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1946.
7. _____. "New Patterns of Inservice Education of Elementary Teachers." Paper presented at the Conference on the New Elementary School, sponsored by the Elementary Education Advisory Council, NEA, June 13-15, 1967, St. Louis, Missouri.

SELF-FULFILLING PROPHECIES IN THE CLASSROOM: TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS AS UNINTENDED DETERMINANTS OF PUPILS' INTELLECTUAL COMPETENCE

Robert Rosenthal
Department of Social Relations
Harvard University

Lenore Jacobson
South San Francisco
Unified School District

There is increasing concern over what can be done to reduce the disparities of education, of intellectual motivation, and of intellectual competence that exist between the social classes and the colors of our school children. With this increasing concern, attention has focused more and more on the role of the classroom teacher, and the possible effects of her values, her attitudes, and, especially, her beliefs and expectations. Many educational theorists have expressed the opinion that the teacher's expectation of her pupils' performance may serve as an educational self-fulfilling prophecy. The teacher gets less because she expects less.

The concept of the self-fulfilling prophecy is an old idea which has found application in clinical psychology, social psychology, sociology, economics, and in everyday life. Most of the evidence for the operation of self-fulfilling prophecies has been correlational. Interpersonal prophecies have been found to agree with the behavior that was prophesied. From this, however, it cannot be said that the prophecy was the cause of its own fulfillment. The accurate prophecy may have been based on a knowledge of the prior behavior of the person whose behavior was prophesied, so that the prophecy was in a sense "contaminated" by reality. If a physician predicts a patient's improvement, we cannot say whether the doctor is only giving a sophisticated prognosis or whether the patient's improvement is based in part on the optimism engendered by the physician's prediction. If school children who perform poorly are those expected by their teachers to perform poorly, we cannot say whether the teacher's expectation was the cause of the pupils' poor performance, or whether the teacher's expectation was simply an accurate prognosis of performance based on her knowledge of past performance. To help answer the question, experiments are required in which the expectation is experimentally varied and is uncontaminated by the past behavior of the person whose performance is predicted.

Such experiments have been conducted and they have shown, that in behavioral research, the experimenter's hypothesis may serve as self-fulfilling prophecy (Rosenthal, 1966). Of special relevance to our topic are those experiments involving allegedly bright and allegedly dull animal subjects. Half the experimenters were led to believe that their rat subjects had been specially bred for excellence of learning ability. The remaining experimenters were led to believe that their rat subjects were genetically inferior. Actually, of course, the animals were assigned to their experimenters at random.

Regardless of whether the rat's task was to learn a maze or the appropriate responses in a Skinner box, the results were the same. Rats who were believed by their experimenters to be brighter showed learning which was significantly superior to the learning by rats whose experimenters believed them to be dull. Our best guess, supported by the experimenters' self-reports, is that allegedly well-endowed animals were handled more and handled more gently than the allegedly inferior animals. Such handling differences along with differences in rapidity of reinforcement in the Skinner box situation, are probably sufficient to account for the differences in learning ability shown by allegedly bright and allegedly dull rats.

If rats showed superior performance when their trainers expected it, then it seemed reasonable to think that children might show superior performance when their teacher expected it. That was the reason for conducting the Oak School Experiment (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1966).

The Oak School Experiment

To all of the children in the Oak School (on the west coast) the "Harvard Test of Inflected Acquisition" was administered in the spring of 1964. This test was purported to predict academic "blooming" or intellectual growth. The reason for administering the test in the particular school was ostensibly to perform a final check on the validity of the test, a validity which was presented as already well-established. Actually, the "Harvard Test of Inflected Acquisition" was a standardized relatively nonverbal test of intelligence: Flanagan's Tests of General Ability.

Within each of the six grades of the elementary school, there were three classrooms, one each for children

From (in adapted form) **Teacher Education in a New Context,** *Madison, Wisconsin, May 1967.*

performing at above-average, average, and below-average levels of scholastic achievement. In each of the 18 classrooms of the school, about twenty per cent of the children were designated as academic "spurters." The names of these children were reported to their new teachers in the fall of 1964 as those who, during the academic year ahead, would show unusual intellectual gains. The "fact" of their intellectual potential was established from their scores on the test for "intellectual blooming."

Teachers were cautioned not to discuss the test findings with either their pupils or the children's parents. Actually, the names of the children assigned to the "blooming" condition had been selected by means of a table of random numbers. The difference, then, between these children, earmarked for intellectual growth, and the undesignated control group children was in the mind of the teacher.

Four months after the teachers had been given the names of the "special" children, all the children once again took the same form of the nonverbal test of intelligence. Four months after this retest the children took the same test once again. This final retest was at the end of the school year, some eight months after the teachers had been given the expectation for intellectual growth of the special children. These retests were not, of course, explained as "retests" to the teachers but rather as further efforts to predict intellectual growth.

The intelligence test, while relatively nonverbal in the sense of requiring no speaking, reading, or writing, was not entirely nonverbal. Actually there were two subtests, one requiring a greater comprehension of English — a kind of picture vocabulary test. The other subtest required less ability to understand any spoken language but more ability to reason abstractly. For shorthand purposes we refer to the former as a "verbal" subtest and to the latter as a "reasoning" subtest. The pretest correlation between these subtest was +.42.

For the school as a whole, the children of the experimental groups did not show a significantly greater gain in verbal IQ (2 points) than did the control group children. However, in total IQ (4 points) and especially in reasoning IQ (7 points) the experimental group children gained more than did the control group children ($p = .02$). In 15 of the 17 classrooms in which the reasoning IQ post-test was administered children of the experimental group gained more than did the control group children ($p = .001$). Even after the four month retest this trend was already in evidence though the effects were smaller ($p < .10$).

When we examine the results separately for the six grades, we find that it was only in the first and second grades that children gained significantly more in IQ when their teacher expected it of them. In the first grade, children who were expected to gain more IQ gained over 15 points more than did the control group children ($p < .002$). In the second grade, children who were expected to gain more IQ gained nearly 10 points more than did the control group children ($p < .02$). In the first and second grades combined, 19 per cent of the control group children gained 20 or more IQ points. Two-and-a-half times that many, or 47 per cent, of the experimental group children gained 20 or more IQ points.

When educational theorists have discussed the possible effects of teachers' expectations, they have usually referred to the children at lower levels of scholastic achievement. It was interesting, therefore, to find that in the present study, children of the highest level of achievement showed as great a benefit as did the children of the lowest level of achievement from having their teachers expect intellectual gains.

At the end of the school year of this study, all teachers were asked to describe the classroom behavior of their pupils. Those children from whom intellectual growth was expected were described as having a significantly better chance of becoming successful in the future, as significantly more interesting, curious, and happy. There was a tendency, too, for these children to be seen as more appealing, adjusted, and affectionate and as lower in the need for social approval. In short, the children from whom intellectual growth was expected became more intellectually alive and autonomous, or at least were so perceived by their teachers. These findings were particularly striking among the first grade children; those were the children who had benefited most in IQ gain as a result of their teachers' favorable expectancies.

We have already seen that the children of the experimental group gained more intellectually so that the possibility existed that it was the fact of such gaining that accounted for the more favorable ratings of these children's behavior and aptitude. But a great many of the control group children also gained in IQ during the course of the year. Perhaps those who gained more intellectually among these undesignated children would also be rated more favorably by their teachers. Such was not the case. The more the control group

children gained in IQ the more they were regarded as *less* well adjusted($r = -.13$, $p < .05$), as *less* interesting ($r = -.14$, $p < .05$), and as *less* affectionate ($r = -.13$, $p < .05$).

From these results it would seem that when children who are expected to grow intellectually do so, they are considerably benefited in other ways as well. When children who are not especially expected to develop intellectually do so, they seem either to show accompanying undesirable behavior or to be perceived by their teachers as showing such undesirable behavior. If a child is to show intellectual gain it seems to be better for his real or perceived intellectual vitality and for his real or perceived mental health if his teacher has been expecting him to grow intellectually. It appears that there may be hazards to unpredicted intellectual growth.

A closer analysis of these data, broken down as to whether the children were in the high, medium, or low ability tracks or groups showed that such hazards of unpredicted intellectual growth primarily affected the children of the low ability group. When these slow track children were in the control group so that no intellectual gains were expected of them, they were rated more unfavorably by their teachers if they did show gains in IQ. The greater their IQ gains, the more unfavorably were they rated, both as to mental health and as to intellectual vitality. Even when the slow track children were in the experimental group, so that IQ gains were expected of them, they were not rated as favorably relative to their control group peers as were the children of the high or medium track, despite the fact that they gained as much in IQ relative to the control group children as did the experimental group children of the high group. It may be difficult for a slow track child, even one whose IQ is rising, to be seen by his teacher as a well-adjusted child, and as a potentially successful child, intellectually.

The Question of Mediation

How did the teachers' expectations come to serve as determinants of gains in intellectual performance? The most plausible hypothesis seemed to be that children for whom unusual intellectual growth had been predicted would be more attended to by their teachers. If teachers were more attentive to the children earmarked for growth, we might expect that teachers were robbing Peter to see Paul grow. With a finite amount of time to spend with each child, if a teacher gave more time to the children of the experimental group, she would have less time to spend with the children of the control group. If the teacher's spending more time with a child led to greater gains, we could test the "robbing Peter" hypothesis by comparing the gains made by children of the experimental group with gains made by the children of the control group in each class. The robbing Peter hypothesis predicts a negative correlation. The greater the gains made by the children of the experimental group (with the implication of more time spent on them) the less should be the gains made by the children of the control group (with the implication of less time spent on them). In fact, however, the correlation was positive, large, and statistically significant (*rho* $= +.57$, $p = .02$, two tail). The greater the gain made by the children of whom gain was expected, the greater was the gain made in the same classroom by those children from whom no special gain was expected.

Additional evidence that teachers did not take time from control group children to spend with the experimental group children comes from the teachers' inability to recall which of the children in her class were designated as potential bloomers and from her estimates of time spent with each pupil. These estimates showed a tendency, which was not significant statistically, for teachers to spend less time with pupils from whom intellectual gains were expected.

That the children of the experimental group were not favored with a greater investment of time seems less surprising in view of the pattern of their greater intellectual gains. If, for example, teachers had talked to them more, we might have expected greater gains in verbal IQ but, the greater gains were found not in verbal but in reasoning IQ. It may be, of course, that the teachers were inaccurate in their estimates of time spent with each of their pupils. Possibly direct observation of the teacher-pupil interactions would have given different results, but that method was not possible in the present study. Even direct observation by judges who could agree with one another might not have revealed a difference in the amounts of teacher time invested in each of the two groups of children. It seems plausible to think that it was not a difference in amount of time spent with the children of the two groups which led to the differences in their rates of intellectual development. It may have been more a matter of the type of interaction which took place between the teachers and their pupils.

By what she said, by how she said it, by her facial expressions, postures, and perhaps, by her touch, the teacher may have communicated to the children of

the experimental group that she expected improved intellectual performance. Such communications, together with possible changes in teaching techniques, may have helped the child learn by changing his self-concept, his expectations of his own behavior, his motivation, and his cognitive skills. It is self-evident that further research is needed to narrow down the range of possible mechanisms whereby a teacher's expectations became translated into a pupil's intellectual growth. It would be valuable, for example, to have sound films of teachers interacting with their pupils. We might then look for differences in the way teachers interact with those children from whom they expect more intellectual growth compared to those from whom they expect less. On the basis of films of psychological experimenters interacting with subjects from whom different responses are expected, we know that even in such highly standardized situations, unintentional communications can be subtle and complex (Rosenthal, 1967). How much more subtle and complex may be the communications between children and their teachers, teachers who are not constrained by the demands of the experimental laboratory.

Some Implications

The results of the experiment just now described provide further evidence that one person's expectation of another's behavior may serve as a self-fulfilling prophecy. When teachers expected that certain children would show greater intellectual development, those children did show greater intellectual development. It may be that as teacher training institutions acquaint teachers-to-be with the possibility that their expectations of their pupils' performance may serve as self-fulfilling prophecies, these teacher trainees may be given a new expectancy — that children can learn more than they had believed possible.

The methodological implications of the evidence presented in this paper are best introduced by citing the results of a well-known "total-push" educational program, which, after three years, led to a 10 point IQ gain by 38 per cent of the children and a 20 point IQ gain by 12 per cent of the children. Such gains, while dramatic, were smaller than the gains found among the first and second grade children of our control group and very much smaller than the gains found among the children of our experimental group.

It is not possible to be sure about the matter, but it may be that the large gains shown by the children of our control group were attributable to a Hawthorne effect. The fact that university researchers, supported by federal funds, were interested in the school in which the research was conducted, may have led to a general improvement of morale and teaching technique on the part of all the teachers. In any case, the possibility of a Hawthorne effect cannot be ruled out either in the present experiment or in other studies of educational practices. Any educational practice which is assessed for effectiveness must be able to show some excess of gain over what Hawthorne effects alone would yield.

When the efficacy of an educational practice is investigated, we want to know its efficacy relative to the Hawthorne effect of "something new and important" but the present paper suggests that another baseline must be introduced. We will want to know whether the efficacy of an educational practice is greater than that of the easily and inexpensively manipulatable expectation of the teacher. Most educational practices are more expensive in time and money than is giving teachers the names of children "who will show unusual intellectual development".

When educational innovations are introduced into ongoing educational systems, it seems very likely that the administrators whose permission is required, and the teachers whose cooperation is required, will expect the innovation to be effective. If they did not, they would be unlikely to give the required permission and cooperation. The experimental innovations, then, will likely be confounded with favorable expectations regarding their efficacy.

When educational innovations are introduced into newly created educational systems, with specially selected and specially trained teachers and administrators, the problems are similar. Those teachers and those administrators who elect to go, and are selected to go, into newly created educational systems are likely to have expectations favorable to the efficacy of the new program. In this situation, like that in which changes are introduced into pre-existing systems, teachers' and administrators' expectations are likely to be confounded with the educational innovations. All this argues for the systematic employment of expectancy control groups, a type of control described elsewhere in detail (Rosenthal, 1966). Without the use of expectancy control groups, it is impossible to tell whether the results of experiments in educational practices are due to the practices themselves or to the correlated expectations of the teachers who are to try out the educational reforms.

But as we come to an end, we shall want a summary. Perhaps the most suitable summary of the hypothesis discussed in this paper and tested by the described experiment has already been written. The writer is George Bernard Shaw, the play is *Pygmalion* and the speaker is Eliza Doolittle:

> "You see, really and truly, . . . the difference between a lady and a flower girl is not how she behaves, but how she's treated. I shall always be a flower girl to Professor Higgins, because he . . . treats me as a flower girl . . . but I know I can be a lady to you, because you always treat me as a lady, and always will."

References

Rosenthal, Robert, *Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

Rosenthal, Robert, "Covert Communication in the Psychological Experiment." *Psychological Bulletin* 1967: 67; 356-367.

Rosenthal, Robert, & Jacobson, Lenore, "Teachers' Expectancies: Determinants of Pupils' IQ Gains." *Psychological Reports* 1966: 19; 115-118.

Notes

This research was supported by the Division of Social Sciences of the National Science Foundation (GS-177, GS-714, and GS-1741). We are grateful to Dr. Paul Nielsen, Superintendent, South San Francisco Unified School District, for making this study possible. We also thank Nate Gage, Jerome Kagan, David Marlowe, Jerome Singer, and especially Bruce Biddle for their valuable advice, and Mae Evans and George Smiltens for their assistance. A much more extended treatment of this and of additional material will be published by Holt, Rinehart and Winston as a book entitled *Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupils' Intellectual Development.*

WORK AND ITS MEANING IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

Edward Rothstein
Professor of Sociology
University of Wisconsin

This paper seeks to analyze the nature of work, its definitions, (both in the past and present) and the significance of these definitions not only to industry but, in a special manner, to the educational system. Work means different things in different disciplines. To the psychologist, work is conceived as a task, or a series of tasks, and he is concerned with the relation of the individual to the performing of these tasks. In other words, the psychologist views work and the work situation as constituting forms of problem-solving behavior. Something is being done and the psychologist is interested in how people go about doing it. Because of the definition of work he uses, the psychologist is concerned with analyzing typical environmental variables: heat, humidity, noise, monotony, and fatigue. He seeks to explore the ability of individuals to perform work tasks; he is interested in motivations for task performance, especially those psychological motivations which are related to human needs and human personalities.

The economist views work from quite a different perspective. To him, work is the way in which needs and services are converted into usable forms. Since he is concerned with costs — material costs, capital costs, labor costs — to the economist work itself becomes one of the cost variables. Work efficiency is important, since efficiency is related to this cost factor.

By and large, modern industry and business begin with the assumption that bureaucracy is the most rational model to insure efficiency. The structure of most industrial and business organizations today follows a bureaucratic model, using it as a key to high performance. The economist, therefore, devotes considerable attention to an analysis of bureaucracy. Too, the economist is interested in analyzing occupational mobility; this largely in terms of supply and demand. The sociologist views work as taking place within a social system which is part of, and related to, larger social systems. To him, work is a form of group social system behavior taking place in a specific context — the work environment. In his investigations and theo-

---

From **Urbanization, Work, and Education,** *Chicago, Illinois, April, 1967.*

rizings, the sociologist seeks to apply principles derived from studies of general group behavior to group behavior in economic activity. At the same time, the sociologist is seeking to develop new understandings and generalizations, derived from his analysis of on-the-job group behavior, into principles which can be applied to other non-work areas of group behavior.

The sociologist, therefore, concerns himself with many aspects of work. He examines work relationships, both formal and informal. He explores the nature of work roles. He is concerned with organizational structure and with organizational behavior as group process. He is interested in motivations for work, but, unlike the psychologist, the motivations he seeks are those which are located in the group, rather than in the individual. In recent years, an extensive field of sociology has developed which deals with occupations, with careers, and with professions. Here, the sociologist is seeking to locate the regularities and sequences which mark the work lives of various segments of our population.

Added to these basic disciplinary studies are several applied disciplines which are concerned with the world of work. Historically, ideas about the nature of work found in earlier societies have little relevance for the world of today. On the other hand, many of the ideas held about work in the past have carried over into our contemporary thinking; in fact, many of these earlier definitions and conceptions are part of the confusing picture which people have of the meaning of work for themselves and for others.

One concept of work is to be found in what are called "folk societies." In such cultures, work was regarded as an integral part of everyday life, with no clear distinction between work and non-work activities. Today, in all but a few occupations (and sometimes only for a few people in these occupations) does this idea still hold. For example, the small, independent farmer, a rapidly disappearing feature of our society, still operates with this kind of orientation.

In ancient Greece and Rome, work — any kind of work — was regarded as degrading for the learned and the affluent, and was only for slaves and for the people. In the earliest period of ancient Hebrew tradition, work was regarded as man's lot, the price he paid for his acquisition of knowledge. Although this conception disappeared after the earliest days of Judaism, it was picked up in a more reinforced form by early Christianity where work became regarded as a punishment for original sin. Medieval Europe, the feudal, rigidly structured society, looked upon work in a somewhat different fashion. Some men have to work; God has so deemed it. For others, there is leisure and affluence; this was the natural order of things.

Later, in the thinking of the merchantilists who dominated society, in the expositions of their theorists who stated the rationale, since the masses did not want to work; it was absolutely necessary that they be driven, and driven hard, to make them work.

With early industrialization, and out of the Protestant ethic, we get the belief that the measure of a man is to be found in his work. Failure to work — for any reason — or to be successful in one's work was simply a measure of one's lack of ambition or of one's lack of ability But for those in the higher levels of society, out of the same Protestant ethic came the kind of thinking which led to capitalism of the late 1800's and the early 1900's: the greater rewards belong to those who provide and manipulate capital and goods.

In the developing philosophy of both Marxism and Fabian socialism, the converse conception was expounded: the greater rewards belong to those who actually produce the goods — the workers. Throughout this period (up to World War I) work was regarded as essentially stable. Once one had a job, he was expected to keep that job throughout his lifetime. While an objective analysis of the industrial work histories of individuals during this period shows that this belief was largely a myth, it was nevertheless believed. On the other hand, the contemporary concept of the instability of the work situation, so sharply divergent from the previously held belief in its stability, plays an important part in our concern about work today.

Every economic theory prior to the early 1930's was keyed to the concept that the lot of the working man was always to be at, slightly above, or slightly below the minimum subsistence level. Minimum shelter, but enough. Minimum food, but enough. Whether one considers the theories of Adam Smith, or Karl Marx, or any of the other economists, one finds each one was keyed to the concept that this is the best that could be expected for the worker. Not one of these, including Marxian theory, ever conceived of the worker being able to live with any degree of luxury. However, with the development of Keynesian and post-Keynesian theory, the viewpoint shifted radically. Today, economic theory conceives an economic system in which the majority of employed workers will be substantially above the minimum subsistence level. Work and the definitions of work therefore, in the

world of today, must be tied in with a recognition of the fact that the new economics had a radically different viewpoint of the relationship of the worker to the minimum subsistence level. The importance of this difference in thinking cannot be overemphasized.

Today, except for a few segments of the population, work life has become separated from non-work life. True, there are some segments of the working population where the relationship between the two still exists but even this relationship is quite different from what it was in earlier societies. The "organization man," which William H. Whyte analyzed, not only works for the company, he belongs to it. He is part of it; it affects his life on and off the job. Yet, while there is a tie-in between the work of that organization and his non-work activities, it is quite different from the relationship in earlier times. Moveover, for most people, and especially for the mass of those who work, life on the job and life off the job are distinct.

Another important part of today's definition of work is that the primary value of work lies in its being the means to other ends, *i*.e. its instrumental value. It is not work, *per se*, which has the key value but the material goods, the leisure, and the status one derives from the job which are the ends the individual seeks. For those who are in the bureaucracy or are wedded to the bureaucratic concept of organization, still another change has taken place in the meaning of work. For these, to a great degree, the social ethic has been substituted for the Protestant ethic. While the Protestant ethic stressed that a man should make it on his own, the social ethic stresses the ability to relate, the ability to belong to the group, and the belief that morality derives directly from the current group or organization rather than from any abstract set of principles. The man operating from the Protestant ethic (or as Riesman called him, the "inner directed man") assumes that his prestige and rewards will arise from what he has accomplished. The "other-directed" organization man, however, places greater emphasis upon being loved than on being respected. He wants to be accepted rather than to accomplish things. He assumes that good human relations can be engineered and that conformity to the group is the key to the better life.

Finally, in the meaning of work today, the occupation or job which one has is the key status of all those which the individual holds. It is the one status which, more than any other, establishes your place in the social structure. True, it is not the only status which a person holds and which may be relevant. But whether you are trying to assess your own status, the status of another, or whether someone else is trying to assess your status, the initial and basic information looked for is the job which the person holds. Such information helps decide, at least initially, where the person is going to be ranked in the total prestige or status structure of the community.

These, then, are the definitions of work which underly the broad, theoretical investigations being done by the social scientists and by the psychologists.

Let us now examine what work means to youth. Irrespective of any socio-economic status or class, youth does not use the same frames of reference in looking at work as economists, sociologists and psychologists use. Young people do not think in terms of monotony on the job. They do not think in terms of fatigue; they do not think in terms of routine. They do not think in terms of peer group associations in viewing occupations and jobs. They do not look at the organizational chart; they do not examine the flow of power and authority. They are not concerned with efficiency, *per se*. While these are among the areas to which social scientists have devoted their major attentions, neither explicitly or implicitly are these concepts included in the view of work as perceived by youth.

It is important to recognize that various segments of the youth population define work quite differently. Because of such different perspectives of work and different definitions of work, segments of the youth population will expect different things from school and from the school curriculum. I am, therefore, going to divide youth — particularly urban youth — into three categories.

One category I call the "occupational-career oriented student." Such a student is aiming for a longe range career, usually professional or highly technical in its nature. The second type is one I shall call the "job-career oriented student." He does not anticipate a long period of training which involves absorption of considerable theoretical knowledge, but is looking for a specific kind of job which he considers stable. The third type is what I would call the "just-having-a-job oriented student." All he is looking for is some type of immediate employment. He has no long range ambitions.

Let us look at each type of youth in terms of their view of work and their expectations of the school. The "occupational-career oriented student" regards the public or private school, from first grade through the

twelfth grade, as being a step in a process. Each grade prepares him for the next grade. He recognizes that his twelve years of education constitute preparation that, in turn, permits him to go on to an even higher level of education which, again, he anticipates will prepare him properly for a profession or a highly technical job. What does he expect of the educational system? He expects that this system will provide him with the necessary grades in the proper subjects to insure his admission to the right college so that he can go on with his career plans.

Secondly, knowing in part what the world of work is going to demand of him, he expects the school to give him adequate skills in symbol handling. He knows he must pass college entrance board examinations; he knows he must take IQ tests. Moreover, he knows the way to success lies in his ability to handle concepts and symbols — abstract, nonsensical, or any kind. He wants these skills. Although these are not job skills, they are skills which will enable him to move along in his career plans. He will accept the more theoretical courses without too much complaining because he knows he has to take such courses if he is going to get where he wants to go. He often recognizes that many such courses (or parts of them) have little relevance to anything practical, but he knows he must have them. If he has to do it, he will do it.

The second type of student, the job-oriented student, expects something quite different from the school in respect to its relationship to his eventual work. He want skills, but not skills in symbol-handling; he wants skills in thing-handling. He wants to know the techniques necessary to become a bookkeeper, a stenographer, a machinist, an automobile mechanic. Basically, such skills demand either the handling of things or the handling of relatively concrete symbols. If he can possibly avoid theoretical subjects, he will do so. The job-oriented student also wants the school to provide him with such skills and knowledge as will insure employment in his chosen job field. To him, the school is functioning properly if it provides him with the tools which will enable him to get his chosen job and to advance in it.

The third type of pupil fits more clearly into the area of the present conference theme. I have called this third type the "just-having-a-job" oriented student. What is this student looking for? He is looking for help in getting a job, any job. Yet in regard to the future the feelings of this student are a mixture of hopelessness and helplessness. He sees others like himself facing high unemployment. He has a feeling of frustration as he recognizes that, even if he does get a job, the pay that he gets for that job will not allow him to participate in the affluent society. And he knows there is an affluent society out there; he knows what he should aspire to as a part of that affluent society. How does he know this? He knows it from the schools. The models held up by the school call for participation in this society of abundance. Where else does he get it? He gets it through the mass media and through advertising. Although he is told that this is what all Americans should want, he knows he isn't going to get it because the pay is not going to be enough to get it even with continuous employment.

Understandably, he has a feeling that he has been cheated in this process. The awareness of job discrimination coupled with difficulties which he may encounter in some of his academic subjects enhances this feeling of frustration. Even if he does get through high school, he feels that this may not have any value for him. So we find him with a feeling of hopelessness, growing as he progresses through the grades, and contributing greatly to his cumulative retardation.

The "just-having-a-job" oriented student has other conceptions about the world of work. For one thing, he is looking only for relative job security, not absolute job security. He knows he is going into a world of high job mobility; he knows that, with his lack of training, he is going to be the last hired and the first fired. He does not visualize his work life as a continuity in a single job. What he hopes for is that, if he loses one kind of job, he can pick up another one rather quickly. Whatever measure of status he can hope to gain is to be found in the fact that he is receiving pay for work. He hopes he will not miss many weeks without that pay check. He certainly knows that being employed carries a higher status than not being employed but his whole conception of job stability, his whole conception of career, is quite different from the other two types. He does not think in terms of a career which involves preparation, rather extensive preparation in fact. He does not think of upward mobility in terms other than perhaps one or two minor steps. By and large, this kind of pupil is one most difficult to reach and the one which is most inadequately served by the schools.

We are now in a position to examine what is involved for the educational system as a result of these differential meanings of work. For one thing, I think the school does not have, although it should have, a reali-

zation of what work actually does mean to various youth. Certainly a recognition that different students have different goals and that they look at work differently will at least serve here as a starting point. To achieve at least one of its purposes adequately, the school must be aware of the fact that the expectations of the occupational-career oriented students are different from the expectations of the job-oriented students; these, in turn, are different from the expectations of "just-having-a-job" oriented students. Each type expects and needs different things from the school.

Another aspect of the orientation toward work which the school must recognize, even though it may not necessarily agree with it, is that the majority of students, when they think about a job, or of a work career, are thinking about it in terms of the instrumental value of work. They apply this same instrumental value orientation to courses and subjects which are supposed to prepare them for work.

Many of them examine the curriculum and course content in terms of — Where is it going to get me? Will this help me make more money? I am not advocating that our schools ignore or play down cultural aspects of the curriculum and become mere factories for turning out workers but I am saying that this view of work is definitely relevant to the schools in carrying out their obligations.

A misconception which teachers continue to pass on to their students is that, in American society education is clearly recognized as a value in and of itself. One may believe that it is a good idea to have education, *per se,* but unfortunately, that is not the way much of society looks at it. While relevant education has important status implications, learning something purely for the sake of learning is insufficient. Yet in our schools, teachers continually tell their students that one must learn this or that because it is important. While a strong case can be made for some type of learning, to add to this the idea that today's society similarly rewards learning for learning's sake is to distort reality.

Another area of mythology: the schools leave their students with the belief that, even though one may not make it all the way to the top, the work career of anyone consists of a continuous and continual series of steps. "Onward and upward — excelsior!" Work is not that way for all people, or even for most people. Especially is this not true for those with lesser education and from disadvantaged backgrounds. In fact, it isn't even true for most people from the middle and upper classes. Most people, sooner or later, have to face the reality that this is as far as they are ever going to go; perhaps a step or two more is possible but that is it. One's career, as far as continuous upward mobility is concerned, is about finished.

Yet, the work career of educators does not fit into the kind of career pattern which is typical of most people. Even though most teachers will not progress in terms of occupational gradations, they do improve in terms of income so that the last years of a teacher's work life are often the highest income years. It is unfortunate that most teachers read, at least partially, their own autobiography into their conceptions of the nature of the world of work. For the truth of the matter is that for most workers peak earning years and highest job status years come in the middle rather than at the end of work lives. Especially is this true of workers in the lower socio-economic groups. Furthermore, mobility during their work careers is often sideways. Frequently, toward the end of their work lives, they find themselves with jobs far more menial than those which they held during their better years. Even for many middle class workers, the later years of their lives brings a downward job mobility, not the upward mobility characteristic of the professions. For the schools to hold out the idealized picture of the individual's life time as being spent in continuous progress is clearly to perpetuate a myth. By failing to prepare the individual for the realities of mobility, schools have done a major disservice to people in all social classes.

Still another of the mythologies which the schools continue to disseminate is the idea that the schools are, in fact, preparing most people for jobs. Consistently, the schools have lagged behind the technical changes which are creating demands in the job market. In too many schools, large numbers of youngsters are being trained either for jobs which are already obsolete or for jobs for which there is little demand. Relatively few of our youth are being trained for jobs which will open in the future.

The unfortunate part is that we do have projections which will permit us to determine the nature and extent of the jobs and occupations for which there will be demands in the future. For example, we do know with relative accuracy, and we have known in the past, what changes are likely to take place in industry, at least for a period from five to ten years in the future. We know which industries are going to grow, which are going to remain relatively stagnant, and which are

going to decline. With this information as a starting point, the schools not only have a basis for knowing the differential occupational demands of the near future but also, at least generally, what kinds of skills, will be needed. Yet by and large, the schools leave it to industry to accomplish any really meaningful job training although much of this training could be done in the schools themselves.

I am not trying to oversimplify the problem. I realize that there are many difficulties in getting adequate financial support for such programs and in securing a properly trained staff. The primary reasons for the culture lag in job training, however, I would have to attribute to other factors.

One of these is yet another myth, widely held by educators, that there is only one worth while career pattern: continuous and continual upward mobility through a series of specifically defined steps. One must get through grade school, get through high school, get through college or technical school, then get into a job or occupation, and, finally, move on up through the ranks. This is the "proper" pattern. Anyone who does not follow it is obviously inferior, inadequate, or incapable — psychologically, sociologically, or both. Anyone who does not make it all the way through this pattern is labeled a failure.

Not only do school personnel believe this but they also pass it on to the students in the schools. Yet, as I have indicated, this is not going to be the life-work pattern for most of the youth who pass through this school system. Most will find themselves either in jobs which are essentially dead-level or in occupations where upward mobility ends at levels far lower than they have been taught to expect. Until educators move from book-learned mythology to the world of work in its reality, they will not make the necessary re-examinations of what they are doing.

Another reason why the school has fallen so far behind society is related to the problems of risk. Making changes, or engaging in experimentation, inevitably means that some mistakes will be made, some projects will turn out wrong. One of the ingredients in the bureaucratic mentality and thus, in education, is the idea that you play it safe — you don't take chances. Taking chances may lead to mistakes; one doesn't want to make mistakes because the bureaucracy does not take kindly to those who commit errors or to those who promote programs and activities which do not work out. Playing it safe, normally, means that one maintains the *status quo*, one doesn't try something new unless there is adequate insurance that, should it fail, the blame can be widely dispersed. So whether the *status quo* is adequate or inadequate, stay with it. It is safe and no one can be blamed for accepted practice. The question of whether or not current, accepted practice is adequate is relegated to a secondary level by the bureaucratic-oriented mind.

What I am trying to say is that this problem of culture lag in the schools in respect to technological changes need not be as great as it is. We have a good idea of the directions in which the schools should change and we have some assessments of the nature of the changes called for, both in magnitude and kind. What we do need is a change of attitudes and perspectives by educators so that the necessary changes can be effected.

There is another relevant criticism I would like to make of our educational system. Schools are so busy trying to develop the abilities of their pupils to manipulate either symbols or things; schools are so busy utilizing overgeneralizations, high level abstractions, and idealized concepts that educators fail to give students any conception of what working in an office or a factory is really like. Behavior on the job is more than using knowledge and skills; one is operating in a social system which has norms, values, expected behaviors, sanctions, and many other aspects which are part of any group interaction. Do these students who pass through the educational system know anything about this?

Let me take an example from the field of political science (since the same indictment can be levied against this field). Children are taught the structure and form of the United States Government. It is explained to them how a bill, theoretically, becomes a law. Any person who has ever been involved in the actual process by which a law is enacted, knows that the idealized description is considerably modified in practice. The lobbies, the horse-trading, the injection of personal and group ideologies, the manipulations, the maneuvering, the compromises, the watering-down, — all these and many more are involved in the process by which a bill, in reality, becomes a law.

The schools do the same thing as far as work and occupational behavior is concerned. Our educational system presumes, that, for example, if it teaches the industrial arts student how to run the necessary machines, he is fully prepared to take his place in a factory. He isn't. I would contend that the schools have a responsibility to their students to give them the

understandings necessary to live in the social system of the work-place.

My indictment of the schools, at this point, is their failure to present a true picture of what the world — not only the world of work — is like in reality. It is a serious indictment and one which can be just as strongly made of our colleges and universities. How many of you, while going through college, really learned all that is involved in teaching in a school? Those who become doctors, lawyers, engineers, junior executives know even less about the realities of the world of work in their occupations than you did about the world of work in school. At least you, yourself, went to a school: you had some ways of checking the theoretical abstractions presented in your courses against the realities of your own experiences and observations as you went through the school system. However, people going into most occupations and professions do not even have this; all they have is an inadequate mixture of naive and idealized over-generalizations.

In presenting some of the earlier points, I have alluded to various ideas, concepts, and practices which are worth considering by the educational system. Are there any others? Certainly. Sociology, economics, psychology, and the field of business administration have all contributed to a growing knowledge of what goes on in the work-life of people. True, the abstract level may be such that the very nature of the abstractions prevents the non-expert from being able to use the concepts as understandable reflections of the real world. I can, however, give you at least one example of an analysis out of the sociological perspective which has considerable value in portraying the reality of behavior in the work situation.

In any group situation which is formalized, there develop patterns of informal group interactions. Moreover whenever formal groups persist for any length of time, this process of informal group development is inevitable. Now most people, including students, have some understanding of the formal group. They know that a factory or office or school has its formal rules, regulations, statuses, sanctions to insure conformity, and so on. What they do not realize is that the informal groups which develop within the formal organization have their own norms, their own approved behavior, their own sanction systems which may or may not coincide with those of the formal organization. The youth in our schools are not even taught that these things exist, let alone how they operate. Yet, a more than adequate knowledge of the formal structure as well as of the informal structure is most important, for anyone who goes to work for any organization has to learn to adjust to both structures. Both the formal and informal structures make demands on the individual who must learn to live and operate within both at the same time. A person must adjust to the formal structure which, incidentally, in practice does not really operate the way the idealized version of the formal structure says it is supposed to. In the last analysis the handbook does not tell you how the decision-making process operates in the real world nor does it tell you the various and often subtle ways in which power is used. But especially it does not tell you about those informal groups which are just as much a reality of one's work life as the formal structure.

Why does a youth have to go out into the world of work so ignorant? Why must he be left to his own resources and experiences to find out not only what is going on, but how to make the necessary adjustments? Why must we allow him to make unnecessary blunders and errors in his relationships with both the formal and informal structures simply because we have not seen fit to provide him with the necessary understandings which could help him avoid a great many of these? The ideas I am talking about are not difficult to comprehend. Unlike concepts about sex, we cannot justify keeping him in ignorance by saying we don't want to expose him to the evils of life. It is unfortunate, if not tragic, that we are doing nothing to prepare our children for the world of work as a reality even though we know that, eventually, all of them are going to be a part of it.

Furthermore, we do not provide our students with anything resembling an adequate knowledge of the nature of the job market. We do not tell our students where the jobs are. We do not effectively train our students in the techniques of getting a job. We do not adequately inform our students of the opportunities in jobs, occupations, and professions. The schools do have responsibilities in these areas.

Finally, one of the great problems we have insofar as work is concerned is the ethnocentrism of our teachers. By ethnocentrism I mean using the behaviors and values of your own group as the measures by which you judge others. Most teachers in schools populated by working class and disadvantaged youth come from a socio-economic background different from those of their pupils. Teachers impose their own orientations, perceptions, values, and behaviors on the children

they teach. If the thinking and acting of the children, individually and collectively, do not coincide with those of the teacher, the child is regarded as obviously inadequate, inept, stupid, or deviant.

The teacher must recognize that there are other conceptions of the world which exist besides those of the middle class and, to those who hold these other views, they are valid. As has been indicated, there are certainly ways of looking at work other than the idealized model held up by middle class, bureaucratic, upward-oriented America. And yet, most teachers of these youth firmly believe that those children who do not agree with the philosophy held by the teacher are not only wrong but are also inferior, ignorant, and unambitious. Such youth, who are labeled by the teacher as undesirable deviants, usually find themselves receiving a disproportionately smaller share of the rewards and sympathetic understandings.

My thesis is this: with a better understanding of what work means today, not only to the larger society but to segments of that society, our educational system not only can, but must, re-examine how it has been preparing our youth for the world of work. I have suggested a number of areas where such efforts can be fruitful. It is in these and other areas where the school must change if it is to effectively carry out its function of preparing all youth, but especially disadvantaged youth, for meaningful participation in the world of work — the single activity in which each individual will spend the greatest proportion of time in his adult life.

AN EDUCATIONAL BLACKPRINT FOR THE SCHOOLS

Barbara A. Sizemore
Elementary School Principal,
Chicago, Illinois

The problem of educating the youth in the ghetto will not go away, and experts in this area are sprouting as abundantly as spring dandelions. There are recommendations for reading revolutions, self-concept development programs, male-model projects, "instant Negro" faculty members, and forced busing of black children to hostile white communities. All of these programs mentioned have been designed to answer the "How shall we educate?" question. Little is being said about the "Why do we educate?" question.

In 1933, Carter G. Woodson explained in his book, *The Mis-Education of the Negro:*

"The chief difficulty with the education of the Negro is that it has been largely imitation, resulting in the enslavement of his mind. In fact, the keynote in the education of the Negro has been to do what he is told to do. Any Negro who has learned to do this is well prepared to function in the American social order as others would have him."

And so, as a result, a United States Senator, the first Afro-American since Reconstruction, can proudly announce to his country that a war is righteous and that black soldiers are the first to re-volunteer for active duty in Vietnam. The implication seems to be that the soldiers want to fight to preserve democracy. The truth may be that the war is the only thing that has happened in their lives to give them a feeling of being. They may want to die for democracy because they cannot live in it. They are acting as others have indicated that they should and in the best way they can choose to fulfill the need for identity and stimulation. But other Afro-Americans, who do not do what they are told to do, do not fare as well as the august Senator elected by a white constituency. Muhammad Ali, heavyweight champion of the world and a Black Muslim minister, cannot be a conscientious objector (as can any Quaker) because his religion is not recognized! Adam Clayton Powell deserves to be expelled while Senator Dodd is only censured. And Paul Robeson is vilified while Svetlana Alliluyeva is hailed. What inconsistencies manifest themselves daily to the thinking student in America as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is maligned because he, a minister of God, fought for "peace on earth, goodwill toward men"? And what

From Teacher Education in a New Context, *Madison, Wisconsin, May, 1967.*

happens when the student offers these incongruities to his teacher for explanation? The teacher usually defends the status quo and admonishes the student to conform. So today we live with our youth in hypocrisy and we call it a democracy. The trouble is that our youth know we are lying.

It is exactly this conflict which poses our central problem. Why do we educate our young? Presently our schools are designed to promote racism; that is, to prepare white youth for superordinate roles and black youth for subordinate roles. Our schools do this wonderfully well. They reflect the wishes of the society and therefore execute its goals, and until the goal is changed nothing will help us. As long as the schools are what Nat Hentoff in *Our Children Are Dying* calls "apologies for the social order" the present condition will remain unchanged. Now, if anyone is to begin to fulfill the giant prescription proposed by scholars to save the schools he will indeed need:

- a resolution to do combat with the present social order;
- an alignment of his values and ethics and an understanding of himself;
- a change of his attitude if he thinks that his values and ethics are the only kind in existence.

Integration is recommended as a part of the prescription. I am not so certain that this is not more of the old social order's middle-class missionary policy at racist work again. In fact, integrated education may be a new myth, generated by the fall of "separate but equal," which was itself a myth. Webster says that a myth is an ill-founded belief held uncritically, especially by an interested group. "Separate but equal" was held uncritically by a group interested in segregation; it was ill-founded because it actually was "separate but unequal." Integrated education via desegregation is held uncritically by a group interested in integration; it is ill-founded because it results in denigration and resegregation. The interested groups are saying that desegregation is the abolition of social practices that bar equal access to opportunity while integration is the realization of equal opportunity by deliberate cooperation and without regard to racial or other social barriers. The assumption has been made by these groups the way to education is by means of integration. However, at the present moment in history neither accomplishes the desired goals.

Unfortunately black people who think as I do, and say so, are branded as opponents of interracial cooperation. Woodson has something to say about this too.

> Cooperation implies equality of the participants in the particular task at hand. On the contrary, however, the usual way now is for the whites to work out their plans behind closed doors, have them approved by a few Negroes serving nominally on a board, and then employ a white or mixed staff to carry out their program. This is not interracial cooperation. It is merely the ancient idea of calling upon the "inferior" to carry out the orders of the "superior." To express it in post-classic language, as did Jessie O. Thomas, "The Negroes do the co-ing and the whites do the operating."

Somehow, the Supreme Court decision of 1954 has laid the foundation for the thinking that an all black school must be an all bad school. On the other hand, it does not lead one to think that an all white school is an all bad school. It says:

> "Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law, for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to retard the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system."

The point I would like to raise is that the policy of integrating through desegregation is, like the policy of separating, usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the black group also.

Little black boys and girls must climb on the bus each morning scrubbed until their faces burn, to ride to a community which is against open occupancy and to be taught by a teacher who is chairman of his neighborhood block club, also opposed to open occupancy. In this classroom the child is taught to disown his culture and his neighborhood and to despise his ancestors and their heritage. For example listen to these class lessons:

Teacher: Please study hard and do your work well
so you won't grow up to be a garbage man.

Student: But, teacher, my Daddy is a garbage man.

Yet, the Supreme Court says that a sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Actually, what is happening in both integrated and segregated schools is that we are promoting a profound disrespect for black people. The problem is that Americans have not yet decided to attack the disease. They prefer to treat the symptoms. Segregation is a symptom of the disease: racism. As long as the society attempts to treat the symptom without curing the disease, the disorder will continue. Integration corrects the symptom: segregation. Society cannot educate with integration. It can, at best, only be a desirable by-product. It has been indicated that new blood could be recruited to fulfill this prescription. I am greatly concerned about these new people, and about how, exactly, we develop this new commitment to the new social order. Evanston Township High School, in Evanston, Illinois a suburb of Chicago, was described by The *Chicago Daily News,* on May 5, 1965, as one of the top ten high schools in the country. Yet, the Afro-American students there did not have the same rate of achievement as white students, and all students were grouped according to ability. At that time only three Afro-Americans had entered college-level classes in the school during the past six years; and only two per cent of the Afro-Americans participated in honors classes, while Afro-Americans dominated classes for slow learners. Experts agree that the teachers there are competent, dedicated, carefully recruited, and creative. This suburban community of 82,000 (11,000 of whom are Negroes) has been integrated since the turn of the century.

Statistics revealing success for black students in integrated facilities need closer examination by experts unbiased by traditional models. It may be that what is being done in schools is not good for white people either. If Evanston's educational system is producing citizens who believe that Afro-Americans should not have the right to adequate housing, quality education, or job opportunities, does the system really have a quality program for preparing youth to live in a democracy?

Certain directions have been proposed toward which curriculum should be remade to accomplish these ends. If I could, I would like to firm up these directions into definite proposals called an Educational Blackprint.

Now we have been saying something like this for a long time. "The schools should educate for the purpose of self-fulfillment and self-realization by the utilization of the human potential for the best possible interests of each person concerned so that he can lead a more meaningful life in a democracy for the betterment of himself and all mankind!" No, let's say that this is our goal; this is our answer to the question "Why shall we educate?"

What do we use to achieve this goal? What philosophy will guide us toward a choice? It would seem that a new all human ethic must be employed as a guideline. We have been working along the lines of an all human ethic which says that people are the same. They will, therefore learn the same thing at the same time in the same amounts at the same rate. In this ethic, equality meant sameness. Everytime a new method emerged, consequently, it was for ALL students.

I would like to suggest the philosophy of the "Golden Talent." This is based on the assumption that people are different, and each person has a golden talent which predisposes him toward a certain approach to learning. Some people are sight learners, some kinesthetic, some memorizers, some abstract thinkers, some deductive reasoners, some inductive reasoners, some idea manipulators, some intuitive learners, some auditory learners. Indeed it may be that there are as many approaches to learning as there are people. The teacher, then, must be trained to observe and record these observations. When a child does not learn, he must be studied, not punished or ignored. The significance of these observations must dictate the materials used to teach him.

If a child loves to sing and will sing, he can be taught much through the world of his songs. He can be taught mathematics from the musical score and the understanding of notes, rhythm, etc. Entirely too little investigation occurs in the affective and psychomotor domains of learning, and hardly any application of this learning appears in projects to coordinate the cognitive learning process with the others. Our curriculum continues to be impaired severely by unnecessary fragmentation.

The curriculum should include a thorough study of the ghetto for the black student. He should learn: Who owns the houses? The businesses? Who are the precinct captains? The politicians? Who are the voters? Who wields the power? Who are the doctors? The lawyers? The preachers? The leaders? What kind of schools are there? Who are the teachers and principals? What is the power structure? Black students should study the community in order to solve their problems of existence. Black kids grow up thinking

that there is no money in the black community, which is actually a community of consumers. If black people really understood the ghetto, the Dr. Kings of today would not have any trouble, for everyone would know the effectiveness of the boycott. A one-Saturday-night boycott of all the liquor stores in the third ward of Chicago would bring an instantaneous response to a request for garbage removal. Whether we know it or not the ghetto is changing. A new understanding is evolving, not because of the educational system, but because of the lessons of the street. It may now be that the ghetto will be forced to understand itself, and to serve itself thus providing the job opportunities it previously had to beg for.

Moreover, if we agree, that the basic drives are for identity, stimulation and security and that man will sacrifice the last for the other two, we must provide our youth with the means for answering the following questions. (1) Who am I? (2) Where did I come from? and (3) Where am I going? None of these questions are presently satisfactorily answered by public education. This must be remedied by fair treatment to black heroes, black myths and black models. I mean for whites as well as blacks. Our black youth deserve an answer to the question, "Why have you done this to me?"

All of these changes have strong implications for teacher training. I see the following as imperative:

The study of self	Psychology
The study of learning	Psychology
The study of man	Anthropology
The study of history	History — African/Asian/European
The study of philosophy	Philosophy — African/Asian/European
The study of literature	Literature African/Asian/European
The study of religion	Religion — African/Asian/European

Let these be the methods and let the teachers learn to write the materials. Let all educators utilize the problem-solving technique.

The American society must be willing to let its educators construct a curriculum directed toward the goal of self-fulfillment for all of its youth. An acorn drops to the ground; given the right climate and atmosphere it will grow into an oak tree. If it is chopped down and made into a chair, its original design is thwarted and it becomes something it was not meant to be. This is what our educational system is doing to black children. American society must free its educational system to respond to its original goal and civil rights leaders must support the schools in this effort. There is no doubt that a democratic integrated society is imperative. That fights must be waged on all fronts is accepted. Just let Americans tell no more lies, make no more myths, create no more evasions. At long last, let's set about to cure the disease, and not to treat symptoms. Education can be concerned then with the meeting of men's needs of identity, stimulation and security. Once this occurs, the vital area of man's purpose and existence on this earth becomes the primary focus of his educational experience and the point position at the frontier of knowledge.

I see the change in focus occurring somewhat in this way:

Philosophy: The Golden Talent	People are different, and each has a golden talent which predisposes him toward a certain learning approach.
Objective: Why educate?	For the purpose of self-fulfillment and self-realization by the utilization of the human potential for the best possible interests of each person concerned so that he can lead a more meaningful life in a democracy for the betterment of himself and all mankind.
Method: How to educate?	Through problem solving techniques: Define the problem Make observations of reality See the relationship of what is to what should be Compare the differences Consider the alternatives Choose one and follow it Observe and record the consequences Define the new problem and start sequence again.
Material: What to use to educate?	Materials dicated by the above findings based on objectives and goals defined and outlined in these three domains concurrently and simultaneously: cognitive, affective, psychomotor

The program for the uplift of the Negro in this country must be based upon a scientific study of the Negro from within to develop in him the power to do for himself. Given the intransigence of the white community in this day — when Congress refuses to seat a

duly elected black representative and the country grows tired of the plight of the black brother, when Alabamans agree to the Wallace hoax and Georgians elect illiterates — the Negro himself must grasp the forces of power which will assure his right to participation in this democracy. The educative system is obligated to assist him.

John Gardner in his book, *Self-Renewal,* says something to the effect that the way to self-renewal is from self-examination to reparation through reconciliation. It will be painful but it need not be bloody. .

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1201 Sixteenth Street, NW, Washington, D. C. 20036

Additional copies of this publication at $1.50 a copy
may be ordered from
AACTE, 1201 Sixteenth Street, NW, Washington, D. C. 20036

A project supported by the Office of Education administered by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in conjunction with Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana. Richard E. Lawrence, Director.