DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 893 SP 006 579

AUTHOR Nash, Paul.
TITLE A Humanistic Approach to Performance-Based Teacher Education. PBTE Series No. 10.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
REPORT NO PBTE-SER-10
PUB DATE Apr 73
NOTE 35p.; Order Department, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite #610, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Evaluation Criteria; Human Development; *Humanism; *Humanization; Measurement Techniques; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Performance Criteria; Teacher Education; *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Questions are raised in making performance-based teacher education (PBTE) a more humanistic enterprise. A definition of the term "humanistic" could include such qualities as freedom, uniqueness, creativity, productivity, wholeness, responsibility, and social humanization. As to freedom, a humanistic approach to PBTE would encourage people to act deiberately and intentionally out of self-framed goals; a problem is that such goals are not externally measurable. PBTE would in theory protect one's uniqueness, but would find conflict with the general standards of behavior society demands. The flexibility of PBTE could foster creativity, but this might suffer under the need for measurement. The humanistic idea of productivity, which is different from that of industry, holds that productiveness comes from the center of the person. The wholeness of an individual might suffer in PBTE with its possible emphasis on short-term, isolated gains. The matter of teacher responsibility and PBTE brings back the question of the nature of teacher responsibility. As to social humanization, perhaps making teachers behave more efficiently in the context of the present authority structure may entrench the forces that have led to dehumanization. (JA)

ED 077893

A Humanistic Approach to Performance-Based Teacher Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by Paul Nash

Professor of Educational Foundations
School of Education
Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts

for the AACTE

Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education

April 1973

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D. C. 20036

SP 006 579

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

This paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, through the Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas. The opinions expressed herein should not be construed as representing the opinions of the United States Government or the Texas Education Agency.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 73-78392

Standard Book Number: 910052-73-5

Preface

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is pleased to publish this paper as one of a series sponsored by its Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education. The series is designed to expand the knowledge base about issues, problems, and prospects, regarding performance-based teacher education as identified in the first publication of the series on the state of the art.[1]

Whereas the latter is a declaration for which the Committee accepts full responsibility, publication of this paper (and the others in the PBTE Series) does not imply Association or Committee endorsement of the views expressed. It is believed, however, that the experience and expertise of these individual authors, as reflected in their writings, are such that their ideas are fruitful additions to the continuing dialogue concerning performance-based teacher education.

One of the criticisms of PBTE is that it is anti-humanistic in nature. Critics claim that it is an atomistic and mechanistic approach to teacher education and hence tends to depersonalize the students in the program. Proponents argue that if PBTE programs are appropriately designed and operated they can be more humanistic than conventional ones. The Committee commissioned the author to explore this issue and this paper is the result of his analysis of the problem. We believe that this study is an important contribution to the literature about PBTE.

AACTE acknowledges with appreciation the role of the National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems, (NCIES) of the U. S. Office of Education in the PBTE project. Its financial support as well as its professional stimulation are major contributions to the Committee's work. The Association acknowledges also the contribution of members of the Committee who served as readers of this paper and of members of the Project staff who assisted in its publication.

---

[1] Elam, Stanley, "Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art?" The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, December 1971.

Special recognition is due J. W. Maucker, chairman of the Committee, and David R. Krathwohl, member of the Committee, for their contributions to the development of the PBTE Series of papers.

Edward C. Pomeroy,
Executive Director, AACTE

Karl Massanari, Associate Director, AACTE, and Director of AACTE's Performance-Based Teacher Education Project

Introductory Note

The sub-committee commissioning papers for the Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education has sought to illumine implications of the PBTE concept, citing negative as well as positive aspects. Thus one of its earliest publications was Harry Broudy's "A Critique of PBTE" (paper Number 4). Broudy's point was that one needed to create teachers who were conceptualizers understanding their tasks in a broad, theoretical framework. Teachers are not automatons who behave properly under specified circumstances, as he interpreted the results of PBTE training. (Some have felt that Broudy did not represent PBTE fairly, and have answered him in the AACTE Bulletin Volumn XXV, Number 12, February 1973.)

While Broudy's piece was extremely useful especially in a delineation of types of teaching, there remain to be dealt with the variety of concerns which have been expressed by those in the humanistic fields. Therefore, Dr. Nash was asked to explore PBTE from their point of view. This he has done admirably.

There will still be those PBTE'ers who object to the points made by Dr. Nash on the basis that they are not so much inherent in the concept of PBTE as they are a result of the way the concept is implemented. They would argue that Dr. Nash's concerns are theirs as well; if these concerns arise, they represent a failure in operationalizing the concept. Even though there may be considerable merit in this argument, both Nash and Broudy make important contributions to better understanding the concept and its potential dangers and problems. Their positions present distinct warnings which we fear even yet may fail to be heeded by many programs in their rush to implement PBTE.

David R. Krathwohl, Member of the PBTE Committee and chairman of its Task Force on Commissioning Papers

Prologue

I should like to begin with a personal note concerning my experience in writing this paper. I do so because I believe that this experience illustrates vividly the principal point I'm trying to make. For me, the learning has been powerful, at times painful, and salutary. Perhaps this autobiographical illustration will also speak to some others as clearly as it has to me.

Last spring I was invited by the AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education to prepare a paper on "the humanistic element in performance-based teacher preparation programs." Having accepted the assignment, I set out to complete the first stage, which was to prepare an outline of my proposed paper for perusal by the Committee. In preparing the outline I used as the main structure of my paper a number of questions that the Committee had prepared concerning the humanistic element in PBTE. By taking the essence of each question and turning it into a topic I obtained my section headings. I then went to the literature on PBTE and combed it for issues, questions, ideas, subtopics, and criticisms that were relevant to my paper. I organized this material under the previously-assigned section headings. Thus the outline was virtually complete and with little further work it went off to the PBTE Committee for their response.

The outline was approved and I was encouraged to write a first draft of the paper. This I began to do. At first I made reasonable progress. Then my writing was interrupted by a month-long research and lecture trip to England. I taught a summer course on humanistic education at the University of California, Berkeley, which again took me away from the task, as did traveling across the country and settling in the East again after fifteen months of California. So it went. When I was able to return to the paper, I began to experience severe difficulties with it. By this time I had received some readers' reactions to my initial outline. These covered a variety of issues and were helpful on specific points, but they did not alleviate my general feeling of uneasiness about the paper.

When it was about two-thirds completed, my dissatisfaction with it became acute. The writing was going very slowly, I found myself reluctant to find time for it in my

schedule, and, worst of all, as I reread what I had written, I discovered that often it didn't even convince me. At this point I forced myself to stop and take stock of what was going on. My reflections over several days led me to a somewhat sobering conclusion. I came to realize that my loss of creative energy, enthusiastic commitment, and effective productivity all stemmed from a single cause: I was writing someone else's paper rather than my own. I was "performing" for the PBTE Committee. My uncritical acceptance of their questions as the organizing basis for my paper had been a disastrous beginning. From that point on, other mistakes inevitably followed. Even the working title of my paper now appeared, on reflection, to be the wrong way, for me, to take hold of the problem.

I was faced with a painful dilemma: to grind through and complete the paper somehow, knowing that I would not be satisfied with it and that it would not really represent me; or to begin afresh, starting this time from the center of myself, saying what I uniquely had to say and relating it to the data and demands of the outside world. The second choice would mean a new investment of my time and energy in a project that I was already beginning to resent in terms of ill-spent effort. But the first choice was even more distasteful, as was the alternative of abandoning the project altogether, which would mean breaking a contract with people who had given time and commitment to it.

So I chose to start again. This time I determined to "perform" only for myself. As I began to write, I found that my energy, productivity, and commitment returned as I dealt with topics, ideas, and feelings that meant a great deal to me personally and in which I had a large stake. The organization of the paper now emerged from my own central concerns as these encountered the demands and limits of PBTE. Instead of feeling weak and derivative in my presentation I gained a strong feeling of being willing to stand firmly behind everything I wrote, without feeling a need to impose those convictions on others.

This paper, then, is the outcome of this second attempt. I had originally trapped myself into taking a non-humanistic approach to the task of preparing the paper. I'm not proud of this lapse and it involves considerable risk for me to share this publicly. I do so because I think my own experience epitomizes exactly what I'm trying to say

in the paper: that a humanistic approach to education implies that one be centrally and fully present in whatever one undertakes. If we want to nurture people's creative energies, we must try to organize education in such a way that their "performance" will relate to their own innermost yearnings and convictions. PBTE can serve humanistic purposes only if it avoids the kind of external demands for "performances" that the individual finds alienating and enervating because of their lack of relation to the deepest parts of himself.

Paul Nash

Contents

Introduction

Thinking about a humanistic approach to performance-based teacher education immediately calls up questions about how the word "humanistic" is being used. This raises several problems, for definitions of "humanistic" tend either to be circular or to lead to an endless regression. Thus, we can say that humanistic is that which fosters humane purposes, but that leads us into a similar definitional process for the word "humane." Or we can say that humanistic is that which concerns the humanness of man. Hence anything that develops a fuller humanness will pass the humanistic test. But what is "human" in this sense? Clearly, we are on the brink of launching into an endless process.

Let me suggest another way. Instead of making a frontal attack, let me be more indirect and mobile in my approach to this large and boundary-shifting concept. One aspect of such an approach will be to describe some of my bedfellows--always a self-revealing practice for a lover. The other aspect will be to reveal some of my working assumptions, in particular, assumptions about the nature of the "man" with whose "humanness" I am concerned.

Humanistic educators are a diverse group, with overlapping concerns and values, but drawn from a wide range of backgrounds, traditions, disciplines, and fields. They agree in putting man, rather than a doctrine or dogma, at the center of their valuing system.

The humanistic approach to education draws upon many sources, including the humanistic psychology of Rogers and Maslow; the existential psychiatry of May and Frankl; the existential philosophy of Buber and Marcel; the existential theology of Tillich; the propriate psychology of Allport; the work of Assagioli on psychosynthesis; the work of Alschuler on psychological education; the gestalt therapy theory and practice of Perls; the emphasis on individual growth in the progressive tradition of Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel; aspects of the pragmatic philosophy of Peirce, James, and Dewey; the utopian and futuristic notions of what man might become in the work of writers from Plato to Michael Young; the work of Simon on value clarification; the work of Newberg and others on affective education; the work of Brown on confluent education and of Weinstein on

the education of the self; the personalist philosophy of Macmurray; the work of Benne on authority relationships, human relations, and education; the contributions of the human relations movement, as seen in the National Training Laboratories, the Esalen Institute, and other centers; and the radical pedagogy of men like Holt and Dennison. Somewhat more ambiguously located in this picture, and causing uneasiness for some of the people mentioned above, are a number of other sources. These include counter-culture critics like Roszak; disestablishment figures like Illich and Freire; radical sociologists like Friedenberg and Mills; socialist humanists like Fromm; and critics of dehumanization like Marx and Engels.

It would be foolish, of course, to try to put all of these writers into a Procrustean bed. But I acknowledge that I have been significantly jostled by all of them. Let me move, then, from this listing of some of my bedfellows to an announcement about the offspring of our conjugation. I should like to advance the discussion of the meaning of "humanistic" by stating my assumptions about the nature of man--the focus of our attempted humanizing.

I see man as a free, unique creature, capable of attaining a self-direction and a creative productivity that stem from his whole person. His freedom implies responsibility and enables him to choose. He is capable, at best, of interdependence and of being an agent of constructive social change. I shall now take this statement of assumptions and treat the rest of this paper as an extended examination of it. Thus the remainder of my paper will be an attempt to define the notion of "humanistic" by successive illustrations. Each of the key terms in my statement of assumptions will become a heading under which to examine the problems involved in attempting to make PBTE a more humanistic enterprise.

Freedom

Most humanistic assumptions about the nature of man stem from a basic belief in man as a free creature. This notion of freedom does not imply that human behavior is uncaused, totally random, or uncontrollable, nor does it mean that man is uninfluenced by his environment, his personal history, or his experiences. Rather, it means that he

is, in the last analysis, able to make significant personal choices, to frame purposes, to initiate actions, and to take a measure of control over his own life.[1] This philosophical position is deeply embedded in the western intellectual tradition, but in this century it has been refined by some aspects of pragmatism, with its emphasis on reflective action, learning through experience, and estimating the consequences of different choices. It has also been enriched by existential and phenomenological philosophies, with their focus on concepts like intention, meaning, choice, self perception, freedom, and responsibility.

A humanistic framework for PBTE would lead us in certain directions and so highlight certain problems. The close connection between freedom and purposefulness suggests that the proper education of humans will encourage them to learn to act deliberately and intentionally out of self-framed goals. This attempt to foster purposeful action arising from the integrated experiences of the individual will be threatened by any move to regard human behavior merely as isolated pieces of action with clearly identifiable antecedent stimuli. The humanistic approach will encourage the inclusion in PBTE programs of concern for self direction, responsibility for one's own learning, involvement in the present learning experience, and the development of qualities like curiosity, wonder, awe, imagination, commitment, openness, and respect for self and others.[2]

Needless to say, in this direction lie some enormous problems of measurement and evaluation. It seems impossible to develop a PBTE program without being able to measure the performances that are deemed desirable. The perennial danger is that whatever cannot be measured will simply be excluded. But, according to humanistic criteria, this would leave out the most crucial educational values, given our present level of skill in measuring. If the measuring is done by an external evaluator, it may be impossible to distinguish desirable from undesirable behavior. What the humanistic educator wants to develop is "free" (in the sense of intentional, deliberate, integrative, goal-oriented) action. But this may, at any one observed moment, be indistinguishable in its external manifestations from random or manipulated behavior.

Humanistic education gives considerable importance to self motivation. It is assumed that tasks calling for long-lasting commitment, a great range of a person's capabilities,

or special creativity or initiative, require strong intrinsic motivation for their accomplishment.[3] But where PBTE rests upon one group of people establishing objectives for another group of people to meet, external motivation, in the form of various rewards and punishments, will usually be employed. Thus we risk increasing student passivity and the inability to make strong choices and develop personal goals. We also tend to focus education on those routine and simple tasks whose performance is most amenable to external motivation.

Uniqueness

The humanistic view of men and women regards each one as a unique, unprecedented, unrepeatable creation. Man is, in Martin Buber's words, "the source of all surprise in the universe." Each person contains an essential element of distinctness and hence unpredictability. Although insurance companies can, with highly profitable accuracy, predict the life expectancies of categories of people, their computers cannot tell us the day that you or I will die. Predictions that correctly forecast the behavior of large groups of people are frequently helpless to tell us what any one person in those groups will do. PBTE with a humanistic tone would therefore respect this human uniqueness and unpredictability and be highly conscious of the dangers of crushing some of man's most essentially human qualities under a weight of behavioral objectives.

The practical question is whether it is possible to reconcile a humanistic concern for human uniqueness with the effective use of a performance-based approach. It is not hard to find people who pay lip service to "individual differences." What is enormously difficult is to balance the individual claims of personal morality, choice, responsibility, and self-worth against the social claims of regularity, comparison, ranking, and uniformity. There is wide agreement that the educational system is in serious need of greater flexibility, more options and alternatives, more genuine pluralism.[4] And it may well be that a judicious use of PBTE can help to break open some old rigidities, such as grades, credits, and schedules, and introduce some flexibility and alternatives that will constitute a humanizing influence on teacher education. It also holds promise of enabling teachers to become certified without ever attending

an institution, a promise that might have a humanizing effect even before its realization.

However, there are also some hazards in PBTE that threaten humanistic values. One of these hazards lies in the process of classifying itself. There can be no PBTE without classification of people. But to decide to classify students is a value choice. We are not compelled to classify: we could regard each student as unique and incommensurable. No doubt there are often good reasons--administrative, pedagogical, conceptual--for classifying students. The danger is that the process of classification becomes so attractive and mind-satisfying (not to say soul-satisfying) to the classifier, that he continues the process even when clear justification has ceased and he may convince people (often including himself) that the labels of classification have a permanence and significance that in fact do harm to human potentiality. Research on teacher expectations (the Pygmalion effect) demonstrates with alarming clarity the power of our conceptual classifications to overwhelm our perceptions of persons. The morals are easy to see but hard to apply: never classify people unless there is a clear and defensible justification; classify only as a last resort; do not mistake the label for the person; change or remove the label as soon as possible.

This leads us to the problem of the persistent tension between the unique, personal meanings that the individual gives to events and the general standards of behavior that society demands of him. A humanistic education would help us to live with this tension without fleeing from one pole or the other. A danger in PBTE is that it may militate against the maintenance of this tension by an inappropriate or unduly exclusive focus on external behavior. The long-standing criticism of behavior objectives--that their use is suitable for only the simplest and crudest educational functions and does not lend itself to complex and subtle functions--is often presented in simplistic terms. But the criticism touches upon something of real significance. Personal perceptions and attitudes are more deeply seated and harder to influence than external behavior. The performance-based approach, with its focus on external behavior, may direct us away from the most important elements in education, which lie in the personal meanings that people give to events. The causes of behavior lie always in these personal meanings rather than in the external appearance of

events. But since these meanings are personally unique they are not amenable to general measurement.

A performance-based program that meets humanistic criteria will be one that serves to enhance the unique teaching-learning style of each individual. The alteration of trained behavior among teachers may not be the best way to improve the quality of the teaching-learning process. What most affects students is the interaction around the edges of formal pedagogy, the incidentals of classroom life, the spontaneous responses that come from the depths of the teacher's personality rather than her trained reactions, which she is liable to forget in crises or when she is unselfconscious. A constant danger in the behavioral approach is that of backsliding once the reinforcement is removed. If the "right" way to teach is not congenial to the teacher's unique personality, she will tend to abandon it when she is not being observed or measured.

Overall, what is at issue is the tension or conflict between the claims of society on the individual and the claims of the individual for himself. PBTE serves to remind us that the individual does not live alone, that his actions have consequences for others, that membership in society implies obligations through measurable performance. On the other hand, a humanistic quality is required in PBTE to remind us that the individual is not wholly explained by his group, that he is something more than a member of society, that his person is more precious than his membership label, and that human life is impoverished if demands for performance snuff out or depreciate the individual's unique capacity for joy, zest, curiosity, awe, wonder, or humor. In the face of a largely unpredictable future, it is difficult to justify the sacrifice of such individual human qualities for the sake of higher performance in skills or attributes whose future worth cannot be reliably estimated.

Creativity

The rapid pace of social change makes it increasingly difficult to forecast with confidence what will be "right" behavior in the future. Some central humanistic concerns become of even greater importance in such times of rapid change. I refer to qualities such as a high tolerance for ambiguity, a willingness to postpone closure, an ability to

operate effectively within unclear or open structures, and a capacity for using fantasy, metaphor, and symbols in problem solving. These are all qualities that are positively correlated with creativity. In times of uncertainty about the future, the capacity to deal flexibly, creatively, and effectively with unprecedented situations and problems becomes of cardinal importance.

It seems possible that PBTE can bring about some of the structural flexibility that encourages creativity. For example, one can already see promise, in the literature at least, that PBTE can increase the number of routes to certification, break the monopoly of conventional teacher training institutions, introduce more alternatives and perhaps a genuine pluralism into the system, and be deliberately designed to encourage innovation and experimentation.

But we must recognize that formidable difficulties and serious dangers to the nurture of creativity also accompany PBTE. When we set out to measure performance it is difficult to avoid notions like right answers, correct behavior, and predicted outcomes. But creativity suffers badly under such conditions, for creative solutions or inventions are necessarily unpredictable and usually unique to a particular problem or condition. To be ingenious enough to prevent the search for behavioral objectives from leading to convergence of thinking, fixed models of appropriate behavior, and the closing down of alternatives is a formidable task. The humanistic quest is to encourage the development of teachers who are both creative themselves and capable of enhancing the creative energies of their students. We need to build places and atmospheres where we can be awakened by surprise. This means leaving room for the unpredictable to occur.

Moreover, we now have much evidence of the important role of play in fostering creativity. A period of free play with materials, tools, concepts, ideas, or whatever, seems to be an essential preliminary to the creative use of them. It also seems to be necessary that this play take place in a low-risk, low-threat atmosphere without regard for goals or objectives. Otherwise, the subsequent ideas or outcomes adhere too closely to convention and precedent and fail to break new ground. Thus, we face a serious dilemma. To the degree that PBTE demands predictable outcomes, fixed goals, and measurable performances, it threatens the nurture of that atmosphere of unpressured, present-oriented playfulness

that is a crucial element in the development of creativity.

Productivity

One can hope that PBTE will bring about or encourage the development of a clearer relationship between theory and practice by emphasizing the need to look at the practical outcomes of theoretical hypotheses. This emphasis on the practical consequences, the tangible pay-off, the productive outcomes, can be a very healthy tendency in a field that often operates largely on faith in unexamined tradition. It is important to note, however, that this approach is based upon certain assumptions. These include particularly the notion of productivity as a positive value. It might be widely agreed that we want teachers and students to be "productive." But this idea is so powerful in affecting our behavior that we must look carefully at how the notion of productivity is being used, whether there are numerous meanings of the term, and if so which ones we want to foster and which discourage.

The view that PBTE is merely another example of the invasion of education by business, on a par with the exchange of a guaranteed student performance for a fixed sum of money, is an oversimplification. Nevertheless, the performance that is demanded in PBTE is often spoken of in language that is closely akin to that used to describe attempts to raise industrial productivity or business efficiency. We should be sensitive to the use of the metaphor of industrial productivity and try to estimate its appropriateness to the tasks of teaching and learning.

There are significant dangers, from a humanistic viewpoint, in an uncritical use in PBTE of industrial notions like productivity, efficiency, and cost-effectiveness. An example, perhaps unwitting, of these dangers comes in Weber and Cooper's fictional scenario for a program of competency-based teacher education.[5] In it, they picture a prospective faculty member, Jeff Craig, meeting with a present faculty member, Betty Fry, who is explaining the competency-based program in the university and the way it is evaluated through the use of a cost-effectiveness criterion. In the interview, Jeff asks, "What do you mean by 'cost-effectiveness' data?" To which Betty replies, "For example, some instructional processes such as computer-assisted instruction are expensive

to develop and operate. If relatively few students are choosing this instructional alternative, then we need to know that in order to decide whether or not it's worth it to continue to offer CIA as an alternative."[6]

I don't know whether Weber and Cooper intended to present this as a desirable model of decision making, and I don't want to saddle them with this responsibility if they did not intend it as such. But the point of the authors' intention is relatively unimportant. What is at issue is that they have shown us an example of the inhumane ways in which a narrow notion of "efficiency" or "productivity" can be used to evaluate programs and make educational decisions. To say that cheap programs are in and expensive programs are out may be sound business practice but it does not meet the criteria of humanistic education.

What, then, would be a humanistic notion of productivity? It is one in which the productiveness comes from the center of the person. It is creative energy as an expression of individual potency. The humanistic ideal of the productive teacher would be more closely akin to the creative artist than to the assembly-line worker. The kind of productivity I am advocating is a creativeness that stems from inner urgings rather than an activity that responds to an authority, a hypnotist, a jailer, or a controller. Humanistic productivity may be seen as a sort of creative synthesis between accurate perceptions of the world and personal alterations of it. Under PBTE programs we may be in danger of facilitating the education of accurate perceivers who are nevertheless not genuinely productive because they have no idea how to alter their world personally.

There is also the danger that external demands for "productivity" from teachers may have deleterious effects on their morale if the forms of productivity are unrelated to their inner needs and goals. One consequence of PBTE may be to make teachers feel greater pressure, anxiety, inadequacy, and guilt, feelings that are dysfunctional in their work with students. At a time when other forces, such as economic uncertainty, emotional insecurity in the face of rapid change, and the threat of unemployment in a contracting field, also press upon teachers, their greatest needs may be for psychological support, time for reflection, and the strengthening of confidence in their own unique productive capacities.

The external evaluation and measurement of someone else's productivity also raises serious questions about the relationship between the subjective and objective domains. We must look carefully at the appropriateness of the degree of objectivity and precision of measurement called for by PBTE. It is true that objectivity and precision are virtues under certain circumstances. But it is important to understand what those circumstances are. Aristotle pointed out twenty-five centuries ago that the degree of precision of measurement we demand should be related to the nature of the material or task measured. More recently, Whitehead has warned us against the fallacy of misplaced concreteness. It is no less inappropriate to demand precise measurement of certain subjective states than it is to tolerate imprecise measurement of certain externally observable procedures. Some of the most important educational products, such as creative invention, critical thinking, personal goal setting, choice making, educability (in the sense that Douglas Heath uses the term), feelings of competence, and so on, may be least amenable to the precise external formulation of behavioral standards.

A more radical criticism of the notion of productivity inherent in PBTE would question the entire value of producing and doing, of being active and useful. There is a strong climate of skepticism, especially among young people, about the superiority of these typically American values. What we need to foster today, according to that un-American critic, Ivan Illich, is "the autonomy of the ludicrous in face of the useful." Disenchantment among many people with some of the more pernicious manifestations of American productivity (from military violence to industrial pollution) has led to a revulsion against producing always more. At the same time there has developed an increasing interest in and respect for oriental and existential values of being, in contrast to western and instrumental values of doing. Marshall McLuhan, with a typical half-truth that is also a helpful provocation, has pronounced that students today are searching for a role, not a goal. By "goal" he seems to mean getting ahead and "making it" in a conventionally productive sense. By "role" he appears to mean asking oneself existential questions about one's meaning, identify, and place in the world. William Glasser has suggested that the whole notion of "failure" (in the sense of failing to produce what others demand) is an anachronism in a role-oriented society and is appropriate only in a type of goal-oriented society that is already disappearing in the west.

These views, although oversimplifications, serve to remind us that an educational program that focuses on product so exclusively that the nature of the process is ignored, runs grave risk of being dehumanizing for the participants. One reason why humanistic psychology appears more attractive to many young people today than behavioral psychology (which provides some of the intellectual base of PBTE) is that the former is perceived as paying more respect to the quality of the individual's ongoing experience. This may be unique and not behaviorally measurable but to sacrifice it on the alter of productivity may be to throw away that which is of central human value.

Wholeness

This discussion of being and doing leads us to a consideration of the nature of the being who teaches. In the education of teachers we are, at best, concerned with the quality of the whole persons who are being educated. Harry Broudy has already cogently discussed the organismic nature of human experience and learning.[7] I shall not repeat Broudy's argument but merely mention that I endorse it and that it lends support to the general position I take here. If we are concerned with the whole quality of a teacher's being then we will recognize the severely limited nature of the information we gain by measuring his specific attributes or behaviors and will be concerned to protect him from the tyranny of inappropriate measurement.

The problems of measurement place us in a difficult dilemma with respect to PBTE. On the one hand, we know that there is a tendency for educational programs to be dominated by evaluation procedures. Schooling becomes whatever can be measured with available instruments. Hence, if humanistic elements are not measurable they will be excluded. On the other hand, the task of measuring affective, volitional, aesthetic, and other major elements is so difficult that there is constant danger of trivializing the whole educational process in the cause of more efficient testing.

Thus we may well be concerned that PBTE will lead to an atomization of experience, a separation of cognition from affect, of skill from attitude, of fact from value. It is unjustifiable to hold teachers or institutions accountable for the development of teaching skills without also holding

them accountable for all the concomitant attitudinal and affective changes that occur in the skill training. To teach skills humanistically is to teach them not as isolated mechanisms but in a gestalt of imagination, purpose, and meaning.

Moreover, it appears that PBTE may encourage an emphasis on small, short-term, isolated gains rather than on significant, long-term, integrated growth. There is a crucial need for integration of experience and curriculum which PBTE may threaten by breaking things down into small, measurable units. Because of the pace of social and technological change, we can imagine future needs in only the most general terms. This renders it unpromising to lay down small, specific goals of behavior that will be appropriate in the future.

We are already seeing one change that bears important implications for the nature of schooling. Advocates of deschooling are not alone in pointing out that changes in educational technology render it much easier than in the past to teach specific skills when they are needed, on the job or in the field. We are developing much greater flexibility in our ability to train people in specific competencies. There is less need to bring people together in schools in order to do this. Indeed, fixed institutions may reduce our flexibility and effectiveness. This development raises important questions about the appropriate function of the school. If isolated work skills can be better taught elsewhere, what is left for schooling? Perhaps the school will become the place to play rather than to work, the place for leisure and the cultivation of man's highest powers, the place for the humane nurture of the whole person.

Responsibility

The concept of responsibility is central to a humanistic view of education. It is, in one sense, the other side of the coin of freedom. PBTE can be seen as serving humanistic purposes in that it attempts to assign responsibility more formally and unambiguously than is usually done in the educational process. However, we must examine more carefully the ways in which responsibility is assigned in order to judge whether the effects are benign of pernicious.

For what are teachers to be held responsible or accountable, and to whom? The lack of clear consensus on

the basic skills that should be possessed by the teacher may lead to a demand that he be held accountable for certain student learning outcomes. In this case, the teacher will compare disadvantageously with, for example, the doctor, who is held accountable for prescribing properly, but not for whether the patient is cured or not. To hold the teacher accountable not only for what he does but also for what the students learn is to deny certain humanistic assumptions about the freedom of people (in this case students) to respond as they will to others' inputs. Making the teacher accountable for precise student learnings may merely serve to increase the dependency of the student on the teacher.

The degree of accountability that we demand of teachers or educational institutions must also be related to the degree of control they have over their students' lives. How do we know what portion of a student's educational performance or growth to attribute to the teacher, as opposed to peers, parents, television, and other influences? Is making the teacher accountable, even though he is only one among many educational agents, a form of scapegoating? Is it possible that we put our guilt about raising our children onto teachers and make them expiate that guilt through accountability? A humanistic view of responsibility would relate it to power. A teacher should be held responsible only to the degree that he has the power to make the decisions and command the resources that make successful performance possible.

Hence a major humanistic concern about PBTE lies in the field of power, authority, and participation. Who is to make decisions about setting objectives and measuring performance? A humanistic goal is the development of mature men and women who are able to take responsibility for themselves--for their purposes, decisions, actions, and evaluations. If PBTE means that one must be accountable to an external agent, it may militate against the development of this self responsibility. Respect for persons means that each person affected by a decision should have the opportunity to participate in making the decision. A humanistic program of PBTE will therefore involve widespread student participation in goal setting and evaluating.

We cannot expect students to take responsibility for their own learning if they lack the necessary degree of control over their own lives. But PBTE is concerned with the external control of behavior. When this control is achieved

through reward, punishment, manipulation, or coercion, it tends to develop dependence, opposition, sabatage, or passive resistance, rather than self responsibility. Technocrats will always tend to be tempted by the promise of efficiency and tidiness through rational control over others' behavior and be ready to sacrifice the development of personal responsibility with its unpredictable and varying outcomes. It may be that PBTE as currently conceived contains too many power temptations for technocrats.

Interdependence

The issue of control brings us to the heart of an important potential conflict between humanistic and technocratic values. A humanistic education would foster values like interdependence, collaboration, equality, and dialogue, rather than dependence, competition, hierarchy, and control over others. At the center of a humanistic program would be a concern with the quality of human relationships. One might fear that such humanistic values would be threatened if PBTE engenders competition for higher productivity and "better" behavior.

There are grave difficulties and pitfalls in PBTE when it attempts to achieve humanistic values, for its basic assumptions may nullify its apparent achievements. For example, in the previously mentioned scenario of competency-based teacher education, Weber and Cooper suggest an interview between the prospective faculty member and students in the program. One student points out to the candidate: "One of our <u>required</u> objectives regarding classroom management is that we should be able to work with a classroom group in such a way as to achieve group unity and cooperation. All of us <u>must</u> show our ability to do this...."[8] But what would be meant by "unity" and "cooperation" under these circumstances? Is it not paradoxical to require such behavior from a student by putting him in a position in which he must compete with his fellow students to demonstrate his competence?

PBTE is in danger of merely perpetuating the thrust of traditional schooling by putting students in the situation where they see others as threats to themselves. Individual performance to meet someone else's requirements fosters the notion of schooling as selection and is divisive of human relationships. The humanistic approach encourages the

development of situations in which students regard one another as potential resources. It fosters the notion of schooling as education and attempts to develop fraternal feelings and convictions.

How well this is done depends in part upon the way in which testing and measuring are carried out. We are familiar with many years' criticism of the baleful influence cast on education by testing procedures and the exaggerated faith placed in test results. More recent research on the powerful impact of teachers' expectations on students' performance casts serious doubt on our ability to use testing beneficially. The advent of PBTE raises again the conflict between individual testing and aggregate testing. It seems possible, on humanistic grounds, to justify aggregate testing as sometimes being useful in the advancement of educational research. But I am skeptical of the value of most individual testing and would like to see clearer justification for its practice. Since PBTE must rely on individual testing, it is easier to see how it fosters competitive selection than how it encourages the development of human interdependence.

Social Rehumanization

Perhaps PBTE will lead to a rehumanization of teacher education. It does seem to hold promise of weeding out some anachronistic and tyrannical traditions and opening up some alternatives and options. But if it is to serve humanistic purposes it must constantly be subjected to critical examination. In particular, we must ask what is happending to the human beings who are experiencing the program. I would hope that this same spirit of criticism would be a quality of the teachers produced by such a program. Thus they would be critical of the status quo wherever it is destructive of humane values. And they would themselves be agents of constructive social change in the world.

Humanistic educators argue passionately for the development of more humane alternatives to the often arid, mechanical, packaged procedures found in schools and colleges. The basic causes of this dehumanization must be sought outside the walls of the school. Yet the reliance of PBTE on individual psychology may divert our attention from the study of the social, economic, and political contexts of schooling. For example, we must examine the nature of the connections between

economic conditions and the demand for accountability itself. It may be that educational institutions are more vulnerable to invasion by business firms and business values at times when they are weakened by economic recession or strong external criticism.[9]

The kind of social rehumanization that seems to be called for in the present situation demands that we look not only at the technology of education but also at its culture. PBTE may result in the reform of educational technology but its focus on efficiency may lead to a neglect of the culture, which will more than nullify the technological changes. PBTE tends to focus on the surface curriculum. But much of the important learning that goes on in educational institutions occurs through the hidden curriculum--that is, the prevalent network of authority relationships, institutional structures, hierarchical patterns, and power assumptions. To make teachers behave more efficiently in the context of the present authority structure of school and society may be to entrench the very forces that have led to dehumanization. We cannot hope to rehumanize our society by merely tuning up our educational technology. We need teachers who are able to ask radical questions about the educational culture and are equipped with the human qualities and skills to change it.

Footnotes

[1]For a fuller discussion of the philosophical underpinnings of this position, see Paul Nash, Authority and Freedom in Education. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966. Chapter 5.

[2]My earlier formulation of desirable emphases in PBTE was incorporated into Stanley Elam's paper in the following form: "1) developing in the student the self-confidence to remain immersed in the learning experience long enough and deeply enough to make the assimilation of that experience personally relevant; 2) encouraging a wide-angled, existentialist vision of his learning experience that will enable him to remain open to unpredicted learning outcomes;... 3) developing independent and interdependent thinking; 4) helping the student to clarify his preferred learning and teaching styles and allowing him to develop them." Stanley Elam, Performance-Based Teacher Education: What is the State of the Art? Washington, D. C.: AACTE, 1971. p. 19.

[3]For a useful discussion of incentives and accountability, see Thomas C. Thomas and Dorothy McKinney, Accountability in Education. Menlo Park, Calif.: Stanford Research Institute, 1972. pp. 24-26.

[4]See Thomas and McKinney, op. cit., Part IV, for a clear exposition of alternatives within the system.

[5]Wilford A. Weber and James M. Cooper, Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Scenario. Washington, D. C.: AACTE, 1972.

[6]Ibid., p. 12. (Italics added)

[7]Harry S. Broudy, A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: AACTE, 1972. pp. 3-5.

[8]Weber and Cooper, op. cit., p. 3. (Italics added)

[9]For an excellent historical treatment of this question, see Raymond Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

ABOUT THE TEXAS TEACHER CENTER PROJECT

The AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education serves as the national component of the Texas Teacher Center Project. This Project was initiated in July, 1970, through a grant to the Texas Education Agency from the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, USOE. The Project was initially funded under the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program and the national component was subcontracted by the Texas Education Agency to AACTE.

One of the original thrusts of the Texas Teacher Center Project was to conceptualize and field test performance-based teacher education programs in pilot situations and contribute to a statewide effort to move teacher certification to a performance base. By the inclusion of the national component in the Project, the Texas Project made it possible for all efforts in the nation related to performance-based teacher education to gain national visibility. More important, it gave to the nation a central forum where continuous study and further clarification of the performance-based movement might take place.

While the Texas Teacher Center Project is of particular interest to AACTE's Performance-Based Teacher Education Committee, the services of the Committee are available, within its resources, to all states, colleges and universities, and groups concerned with the improvement of preparation programs for school personnel.

ABOUT AACTE

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is an organization of more than 860 colleges and universities joined together in a common interest: more effective ways of preparing educational personnel for our changing society. It is national in scope, institutional in structure, and voluntary. It has served teacher education for 55 years in professional tasks which no single institution, agency, organization, or enterprise can accomplish alone.

AACTE's members are located in every state of the nation and in Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Collectively, they prepare more than 90 percent of the teaching force that enters American schools each year.

The Association maintains its headquarters in the National Center for Higher Education, in Washington, D. C.--the nation's capital, which also in recent years has become an educational capital. This location enables AACTE to work closely with many professional organizations and government agencies concerned with teachers and their preparation.

In AACTE headquarters, a stable professional staff is in continuous interaction with other educators and with officials who influence education, both in immediate actions and future thrusts. Educators have come to rely upon the AACTE headquarters office for information, ideas, and other assistance and, in turn, to share their aspirations and needs. Such interaction alerts the staff and officers to current and emerging needs of society and of education and makes AACTE the center for teacher education. The professional staff is regularly out in the field--nationally and internationally--serving educators and keeping abreast of the "real world." The headquarters office staff implements the Association's objectives and programs, keeping them vital and valid.

Through conferences, study committees, commissions, task forces, publications, and projects, AACTE conducts a program relevant to the current needs of those concerned with better preparation programs for educational personnel. Major programmatic thrusts are carried out by commissions on international education, multicultural education, and

accreditation standards. Other activities include government relations and a consultative service in teacher education.

A number of activities are carried on collaboratively. These include major fiscal support for and selection of higher education representatives on the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education--an activity sanctioned by the National Commission on Accrediting and a joint enterprise of higher education institutions represented by AACTE, organizations of school board members, classroom teachers, state certification officers, and chief state school officers.

The Association headquarters provides several secretariat services which help make teacher education more interdisciplinary and comprehensive: the Associated Organizations of Teacher Education and the International Council on Education for Teaching. A major interest in teacher education provides a common bond between AACTE and fraternal organizations.

AACTE is deeply concerned with and involved in the major education issues of the day. Combining the considerable resources inherent in the consortium--constituted through a national voluntary association--with strengths of others creates a synergism of exceptional productivity and potentiality. Serving as the nerve center and spokesman for major efforts to improve education personnel, the Association brings to its task credibility, built-in cooperation and communications, contributions in cash and kind, and diverse staff and membership capabilities.

AACTE provides a capability for energetically, imaginatively, and effectively moving the nation forward through better prepared educational personnel. From its administration of the pioneering educational television program, "Continental Classroom," to its involvement of 20,000 practitioners, researchers, and decision makers in developing the current Recommended Standards for Teacher Education, to many other activities, AACTE has demonstrated its organizational and consortium qualification and experiences in conceptualizing, studying and experimenting, communicating, and implementing diverse thrusts for carrying out socially and educationally significant activities. With the past as prologue, AACTE is proud of its history and confident of its future among the "movers and doers" seeking continuous renewal of national aspirations and accomplishments through education.

AACTE PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION PROJECT COMMITTEE

Chairman: J. W. MAUCKER, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Academic Affairs Office, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas 66801.

Vice-Chairman: DONALD J. MCCARTY, Dean, College of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

WILLIAM W. BARR, Student, School of Education, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado 80210.

ELBERT BROOKS, Superintendent of Schools, Metropolitan Schools, 2601 Bransford Avenue, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

PATRICK L. DALY, Social Studies Teacher, Edsel Ford High School, 20601 Rotunda Drive, Dearborn, Michigan 48124.

K. FRED DANIEL, Associate for Planning and Coordination, State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida 32304.

WILLIAM H. DRUMMOND, Professor of Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601.

TOMMY FULTON, Art Teacher, Jarman Jr. High School, Midwest City, Oklahoma 73110.

WILLIAM A. JENKINS, Dean, School of Education, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon 97207.

LORRIN KENNAMER, Dean, College of Education, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712.

DAVID KRATHWOHL, Dean, College of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210.

MARGARET LINDSEY, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027.

DONALD M. MEDLEY, Professor of Education, School of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903.

YOURA QUALLS, Head, Humanities Division, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama 36088.

ATILANO VALENCIA, Head, Department of Education, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, New Mexico 87001.

PAUL VARG, Professor of History, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823.

Liaison Representatives:

THEODORE ANDREWS, Associate in Teacher Education, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, New York State Department of Education, Albany, New York 12204 (Multi-State Consortium).

NORMAN DODL, Associate Professor, Department of Elementary Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306 (Elementary Education Model Program Directors).

HARLAN FORD, Assistant Commissioner of Education (or TOM RYAN) Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas 78701.

NORMAN JOHNSON, Chairman, Department of Education, North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina 27707 (Southern Consortium).

KYLE KILLOUGH, Director, Texas Education Renewal Center, 6504 Tracor Lane, Austin, Texas 78721 (Texas Teacher Center Project).

DONALD ORLOSKY, Professor of Education and Associate Director of Leadership Training Institute, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

BENJAMIN ROSNER, University Dean of Teacher Education, Office of Teacher Education, the City University of New York, 1411 Broadway, Room 1119, New York, New York 10018 (Task Force '72 Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education).

ALLEN SCHMIEDER, Chief, Operations Coordination, National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C. 20202 (Office of Education).

EMMITT SMITH, Vice President, Program Development and Resources, West Texas State University, Canyon, Texas 79015. (Texas Teacher Center Project).

Staff:

KARL MASSANARI, Director
GORDON COOK, Assistant Director
SHIRLEY BONNEVILLE, Program Assistant
BRENDA GREENHOWE, Secretary
SHARON DEVEAUUSE, Secretary

PUBLICATION ORDER FORM FOR PBTE PAPERS

Number of Copies	PBTE Series	
_____	#1	"Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art?" by Stan Elam @ $2.00
_____	#2	"The Individualized, Competency-Based System of Teacher Education at Weber State College" by Caseel Burke @ $2.00
_____	#3	"Manchester Interview: Competency-Based Teacher Education/ Certification" by Theodore Andrews @ $2.00
_____	#4	"A Critique of PBTE" by Harry S. Broudy @ $2.00
_____	#5	"Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Scenario" by James Cooper and Wilford Weber @ $2.00
_____	#6	"Changing Teacher Education in a Large Urban University" by Frederic T. Giles and Clifford Foster @ $3.00
_____	#7	"Performance-Based Teacher Education: An Annotated Bibliography" by AACTE and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education @ $3.00
_____	#8	"Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs: A Comparative Description" by Iris Elfenbein @ $3.00
_____	#9	"Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene" by Allen A. Schmieder (jointly with ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education) @ $3.00
_____	#10	"A Humanistic Approach to Performance-Based Teacher Education" by Paul Nash @ $2.00

BILLED ORDERS: Billed orders will be accepted only when made on official purchase orders of institutions, agencies or organizations. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. Payment must accompany all other orders. There are no minimum orders.

DISCOUNTS: A 10 percent discount is allowed on purchase of five or more publications of any one title. A 10 percent discount is allowed on all orders by wholesale agencies.

Payment enclosed _____ Amount _____

Purchase Order No. _____

NAME _____
(Please print or type)

ADDRESS _____

_____ ZIP CODE _____

Please address: Order Department, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite #610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036

ORDER FORM FOR RECENT AACTE PUBLICATIONS

Number of Copies	
_____	"The Profession, Politics, and Society" (1972 Yearbook) Volume I and Volume II @ $6.00
_____	Volume I (Proceedings) Only @ $4.00
_____	Volume II (Directory) Only @ $3.00
_____	"Power and Decision Making in Teacher Education" (1971 Yearbook) @ $6.00
_____	"What Kind of Environment Will Our Children Have?" @ $2.50
_____	"Social Change and Teacher Education" @ $2.50
_____	"Systems and Modeling: Self-Renewal Approaches to Teacher Education" @ $3.25
_____	"Excellence in Teacher Education" (Limited Supply) @ $1.00
_____	"Beyond the Upheaval" @ $1.00
_____	"In West Virginia, It Is Working" @ $2.00
_____	"Educational Personnel for the Urban Schools: What Differentiated Staffing Can Do" @ $2.00
_____	"An Illustrated Model for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Graduates" @ $2.00

BILLED ORDERS: Billed orders will be accepted only when made on official purchase orders of institutions, agencies, or organizations. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. Payment must accompany all other orders. There are no minimum orders.

Payment enclosed _____ Amount _____

Purchase Order No. _____

NAME _____
(Please print or type)

ADDRESS _____

_____ ZIP CODE _____

Please address: Order Department, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite #610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036