DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 666   EA 006 117

AUTHOR   Michel, George J.
TITLE   A Systems Analysis of the Political Problems of Using
                  Computers in Education.
PUB DATE   May 74
NOTE   21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the
                  Association of Educational Data Systems (12th, New
                  York, New York, May 1974)

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS   Computer Assisted Instruction; *Computer Oriented
                  Programs; *Computers; Decision Making; Education;
                  *Educational Planning; Educational Policy; *Political
                  Influences; Resource Allocations; *Systems
                  Analysis

ABSTRACT
                  This paper examines some of the applications of
computers in education, focusing on the political and people problems
involved. Through this approach it is hoped that superintendents,
principals, data processing specialists, and scholars might develop a
better awareness and understanding of how to assess the use of
computers in school systems. The paper demonstrates that computers in
education must have specific and systematic objectives and be able to
demonstrate better ways of allocating resources or making decisions.
Planning for computers is also required, and both educational
administrators and computer personnel must be aware of the political
processes involved in introducing computers into school districts. An
awareness that computers have serious consequences in the politics of
school districts should lead educational administrators and computer
personnel to see a need to reexamine the assumptions of computers in
education and perhaps increase the potential of computers in
educational improvement. A bibliography is provided. (Author/DN)

A Systems Analysis of the Political Problems

of Using Computers in Education

George J. Michel, Ed.D.

Department of Educational Administration

State University of New York - Albany

Albany, New York

Paper presented at the Association

of Educational Data Systems Conference,

Friday, May 10, 1974

New York Hilton Inn

New York City, New York

(

The use of computers in educational administration is continuing to grow. Computers are amazing tools with immense possibilities, and educational administrators who see computers only as oversized calculators have missed the essence of their potential. In the decades ahead, it is expected that the structure, form, and process of education will become different. Computers will play an increasingly important role in changing education and educational administration, but these changes will not be without resistance, conflict, and controversy.

The Quiet Controversy about Computers

One of the areas where educational administrators have a right to question the benefits of computers is their actual and potential uses. Umans has been one of the over-enthusiastic proponents of computers who glibly described the wonderful accomplishments of these machines without also describing the pain-staking political work, the systems work, and the costs necessary to make the big machines work.[1] The glamour of the big machines had been emphasized and many educational administrators were stimulated by the potential of computers only to be awakened too late to the fact that the educational uses of computers also had a myriad of political and cost problems.

Computer fallacies. Grossman was probably one of the first to point out some of the fallacies of the educational uses of computers. One fallacy he identified was the assumption that if all the information about educational problems was collected and stored in computers, then the information could be arranged in such a way as to

solve all educational problems. It was reasonable for Grossman to

point out some other fallacies. For example, he stated that com-

puters would provide educational administrators with more information

about their districts than they could possibly use and there would

also be much data that they would not know how to use.[2] Grossman

also felt that computers would provide much useless information and

some information would be given to administrators too late to use in

many cases.

Information abuses. Another falling out that educational

administrators have had with computers was the possibilities of abuses

of the school district information collected and stored in the memory,

the drums, and the tapes of the computers. It is still possible for

persons to misuse school information through the use of remote

terminals.[3] School administrators have to guard against such potential

abuses. However, until they have been assured of safeguards against

abuses, they must approach the use of computers and school manage-

ment information systems with caution.

Costs and wastes. A third area where computers have failed to

reach their educational potential is in cost-effectiveness.

Gruenberger thought that computers in business and education were

being used wastefully in "make work" situations where their actual

and real potential was being ignored.[4] It is incumbent upon edu-

cational administrators, data processing directors, and vendors to

insure that computer usage is not wasted. They must search for use-

ful work for the computers. Basically, they must insure that com-

puters are asked to solve real educational problems, that the in-

formation provided by the computers is readable, and that it is

interpretable so that the administrators can use the computer for more efficient school decisions.

Purpose of the Systems Analysis Paper

This paper is not designed to be a detailed analysis of specific uses of computers in education. Certainly, it will show that computers have utility in educational administration. Its major purpose, however, is to describe the major people problems and the political problems of computers use. To achieve this, it will examine some of the computer applications in education and it will focus on the political problems involved. Through this approach, superintendents, principals, data processing specialists, and scholars should develop a better awareness and understanding of how to assess the use of computers in school systems.

Important Uses of Computers

In examining the uses of the computers, we find that educational information is collected through computers because administrators, teachers, students and parents demand it. Much of the information needed in a school district is of a pragmatic, practical nature. In a sense, the value of computers in education seems to rest with the information required to reduce educational problems to reasonable proportions.[5] The value of computers in education then is based solely on how well the information is structured and how well it solves educational problems.

Data linkages. The potential for linking a data source from one computer to a second data source is greater now than ever before. It is possible to create an all-encompassing information

network with linkage from every class and classroom to the U.S.
Office of Education. Although there are broad constitutional
questions to be answered about the rights and responsibilities of
local, state, federal governments over such uses of these linkages,
the information networks are very much in evidence today. Stollar
and Boardman reported that the National Educational Finance Project
had merged personal income data and educational data of local ele-
mentary and secondary school districts throughout the United
States.[6] By using the zip code as a key, an Internal Revenue file
with tax returns for 1967 was merged with a U.S. Office of Edu-
cation master file consisting of 93,562 data records of individual
schools. The newly merged tape contained information by school of
the number of pupils, teachers, and the incomes of the parents
based on tax returns classed as under $3,000, $3,000 to $10,000,
and over $10,000. The authors reported optimistically:

> "Thus, due to the advent of the zip code and the use of
> computers, it has been possible to put together a data
> base consisting of both personal income and educational
> data. Such information should prove to be valuable to
> both the educational researcher and the decision-maker."[7]

There was no doubt that the merging of massive data files was a
substantial technical achievement for computer technology. Other
achievements of information processing were less spectacular.
Educational administrators, by necessity, collect and use a great
amount of information. This information on students, teachers,
and business transactions is for the operation of the school dis-
trict and is often very detailed. Often it falls into about three
different classes and uses. Computer applications at this district
level are more often related to the form and definition of the data
than to fallacies of the computer. The three categories are:

Pupil/parent information. A great deal of information to
identify families, history, and progress of the students can be
stored in computers. Attendance, student activities, counseling,
and psychological information is collected and disseminated within
schools and districts. All such information could be assembled
and reported by computers.

Personnel/instructional programs. This class has three
basic forms of information; (1) employee information about social
security, name, address, and retirement information; (2) qualifi-
cations and skills of employees, degrees, course work and certifi-
cates; (3) current teaching assignments, subjects, and teaching
periods. Codes or class numbers may serve district purposes and
also fit computer uses.

Business/finance. The school business office expects to
handle invoices, vouchers, and other business of the school
district. Categorical aid programs, reimbursements and infor-
mation about curricular programs are seldom consistent and often
require several separate accounting systems. In reality, the
tremendous duplication of the accounting systems can be elimin-
ated by the use of computers for all school accounting needs.

More Creative Uses of Computers

Many professionals in the computer field take many computer
applications for granted. Reports of the achievements of com-
puters in colleges and universities are very positive even though
the financial resources are scarce.

<u>University applications</u>. Educational Testing Service and
Princeton University as well as other universities are exploring
computers used in teaching chemistry, music, the social sciences,
and career guidance. There is a prevailing optimism for the
potential of computers in higher education decision-making.[9] A
general theme for computers in higher education seems to be to
train higher education administrators in the uses of computers
and to develop further state-wide plans for computer utilization.

<u>Curriculum and teaching</u>. Gordon reported a rather unique use
of computers for evaluating the courses at an U.S. Air Force Staff
College. An evaluation instrument was distributed to students at
the beginning of each phase of instruction. The instrument con-
tained evaluations of: objectives for the given seminar, readings,
content, presentation, organization. A Fortran program used on a
time-sharing basis analyzed the instruction in quintiles from
high to low providing a profile of the curriculum.[10] Gordon
reported this computer application as an excellent instructional
feedback system with further refinements being developed to relate
student background characteristics to their own evaluations.

Other automated response systems for instruction have also
been developed to emphasize rapid feedback to both the student
and the instructor. Sandler and Bowles described an easily con-
structed student response system used for a variety of teaching
systems.[11] Additional feedback anonymously given to the in-
structor, said the authors, would save student embarrassment by
not making their reaction to the instructor public and would
increase communications to improve learning. The previous

system is rather traditional, but more futuristic automated response systems have been proposed for 1985.

Parker viewed cable television as a two-way tutor not yet in existence. In pursuing goals of life-long learning and opportunities to learn anything the learners desired, Parker proposed a two-way cable television system where learners would be actively practicing responses requested by the television instructor. Students would be interacting with the television instructor through small digital computers where responses would be aggregated so that the instructor could view how his teaching was being accepted by students. Admittedly, this visionary student response system would not cut the costs of education; however, if Parker's goals were achieved, life long learning would increase the number of students and unit costs of education would be drastically reduced.

The People and Political Problems of Computer Use

In this paper, the obstacles against school district applications of computers have been focused on costs, waste, and ineffectiveness. The technology is not questioned. Until the present, hard work and heavy funding have made computers work in education. Outlays for computer installations are still very high and new moneys for the educational uses of computers is fast drying up. To prove their worth in education, computers will have to deliver more efficiency for the same number of dollars.[13] But even more, educational administrators will also have to deal with the resistance of computers by teachers, students, and other administrators.

Political Resistance of computers. One study of the
acceptance of computers by administrators, teachers, and pupil
personnel workers showed that school personnel do not have un-
reasonable fears of computers. Among 15 school districts, one-
third of which had used computers for five years, a second third
used computers for less than five years, and one-third had no ex-
perience with computers, 75 teachers, and 75 pupil personnel
workers indicated they held similar positive attitudes toward the
meanings of computer or data processing terms.[14]

Whether these school personnel served in districts that had
extensive or little experience with computers did not significantly
affect their attitudes toward computers in schools. The author of
the study also collected additional anecdotal information from
these school personnel about their feelings toward computers. Al-
though his original attitudinal findings were confirmed, he also
found educational administrators to be slightly more favorable
toward computers than were teachers. He concluded that as long as
the computers remained under-developed and remote from the teachers,
there would probably be no great resistance to computers in edu-
cation. This conclusion still did not consider other political
obstacles to computers where they begin to change the teachers'
functions.

Role changes for teachers. Teachers seemed to be well aware
that there is a lack of clearly demonstrable evidence that com-
puters in education have been used effectively to improve the
quality of instruction. Computer-assisted instruction is

unusually costly. It will not reduce the costs of the instructional
budgets of school districts.[15] In order for computers to be more
useful in public school instruction, the teachers' roles would
have to be restructured. The major change would come in training
teachers to produce and develop the software packages and programs
to support computers in classrooms.

To begin to shift these functions, inservice education in
computer-assisted instruction would have to be offered. Edu-
cational administrators have been lax in offering this form of
inservice education because of expectations that reorganization
and training in computer-assisted instruction would be resisted
by teachers. This administrative expectation is probably valid
since there appeared to be few incentives that administrators
could offer teachers to develop curricular materials suitable
for computer-assisted instruction.

Anastasio conducted an experiment using the Delphi fore-
casting technique with 35 experts in computers and computer-
assisted instruction to discover further reasons for resistance
of computers in education.[16] In addition to those already
mentioned, restructuring of teachers' role, high costs, low
efficiency, and insufficient curricular materials, the 35 ex-
perts were fully convinced that computers in education could
become more productive if there were adequate theory developed
to restructure both curricular and administrative decisions
about computer uses. This appeared to be confirmed in the
reactions of students to the educational uses of the computer.

Student resistance to computers. University instructors who
have gained experience in using computers to instruct college
students reported rather modest results because students generally
had no prior experience in using the computer as an instructional
device. Mohler reported after his experiments with using com-
puters in medical education, he no longer felt that the entire
instructional system of a school could be automated.[17] He
suggested that some broad criteria for the selection of students
who would use computer-assisted instruction should be developed
to limit computer-assisted instruction to those students who had
no prior experience. Further, he advanced and suggested the dev-
elopment of a beginning course for students which would include
aspects of (1) hardware and programming, (2) systems and sub-
systems of information, and (3) systems of educational information.
Students in these experimental courses did maintain enthusiasm
for computers. They became better informed and more realistic
in their attitudes toward computers. However, Mohler also
reported that after the initial experiments of using the computer
in medical education had subsided, the faculty members and the
students lost interest in computer-assisted medical education.
The manifestation of this disinterest was probably illustrated in
polarizations among the students of the humanitarian-physician
model versus the physician-scientist model. As computers become
more widely used in education a similar conflict of values can
be expected among the student-humanitarians and the student-
technicians. They will disagree about the two approaches to
their selected disciplines.

Other questions had been raised about the quality of student learning when computers were used. Selter claimed that students were more interested in the novelty of the computers than in the information imparted by them. [18] He also lamented the lack of adequate theory to assist both teachers and students to make better use of the potential of computers. Most instructors, Selter claimed, wanted to use the computer to impart facts to the students. When programmers attempted to illicit the facts to be imparted from instructors, they failed to do this. The best the instructors were able to identify were areas of instruction which the programmer, himself, had to investigate to obtain facts to be programmed for instructional use. Selter's final conclusion was that students learned very little from computer-assisted instruction. Instead, it was the instructor, himself, who had to reorganize his class material who learned more by using computers.

Administrator resistance. The disadvantages of computers to educational administrators are that data processing personnel use special, technical language which is unfamiliar to school personnel. These specialists with technical language also deal with the very center of the job of administrators, the allocation of resources, decisions about school personnel, and the implementation and evaluation of programs. Basically, the data processing specialists in education know very well these technical aspects of managing a school information, but they know little or nothing of the values operating in the system, the school

personnel, the curriculum, or the critical issues such as integration, sex education, or school politics. Data processing specialists need knowledge of these value and political problems in order to provide information for school officials.

But, the same is true for educational administrators. There is a great gap in the knowledge of administrators about computers. Exposure to knowledge about how computers can function in education seems necessary. Besides additional knowledge about computers, there are new applications for computers being developed by vendors and manufacturers. Administrators need to communicate with vendors about these new developments.

Administrators appear to resist automation because school personnel, teachers and other personnel enjoy working with people. They have to seek computer applications which allow school personnel a frame where they can function with computers in ways which were not too different from the time before computers.[19] Malccrn et. al. finds that administrators need to have an understanding and some capability with computers, but their need is not for a purely technical understanding, it is a need for an understanding of what occurs to school personnel under the potential the changes wrought by computers.[20] Gruenberger agreed with this conclusion. He suggested that teachers, students, and administrators be given an inservice and work experience program with computers which would introduce them to computers before dehumanization shock sets in.[21]

Administrators should carry no more glib thoughts that computers would actually take over schools. There are new multi-

media training materials in a number of administrative areas,
and there is further potential to develop administrative train-
ing programs in computers similar to the University Council on
Education Administration's Monroe City Simulation and Special
Educational Administration Simulation.[23]

A great deal of government moneys have been spent on computer
uses in education. In six years, the U.S. Office of Education fund-
ed 500 projects involving tutoring, problem solving, gaming simula-
tion, testing, vocational guidance, management, and organization.
From 1966-1969, the U.S. Office spent $2.5 billion on computer
based activities. Sidney Marland, former U.S. Commissioner of
Education was optimistically cautious about the effects of computers
in education. He stated:

> "I have no substantial doubts that technology will
> eventually succeed in education, but I would suggest
> that we must think very hard about the kind of success
> we are seeking..."[24]

Marland referred to the disillusionment and the quiet conflict
about computers which seemed to be wide spread.

Some Systems Solutions to Conflicts over Computers

Ten years ago many would have accepted Marland's cautiously
optimistic statement about educational technology and computers.
While not entirely true, there were many cases where vendors and
computer specialists led educators into making blind decisions
about computers without considering the people, politics, or
power involved. Computers treat information and cost-benefits
in a school district in a precise way. They have led us into a
period of elaborate study of school resources and the attainment
of school objectives, but computers cannot deal with the value

and the decision-processes which lead to educational policy-making.
In short, computers may very well lead us to more efficient education-
al programs and better use of economic resources, but they cannot
assess th' social value dimensions or the political aspects of
school decisions.

A solution with value conflicts over computer use. The policy-
making impact of computers in education is very real. The exact-
ness of computers is unquestioned except when educators have to
mix that exactness with the vague goals of school programs or the
less rational political process that are both part of school
decision-making.

McGivney and Bowles suggested a four step model which would
help in reducing the disruption of computer-based decisions.[25]
First, the school system would agree on a set of formal rules
which separate the information power of the computers from the
authority of the educational administrators to make decisions and
establish school goals. Some of these rules would significantly
separate the information power of the computers from the political
considerations that are part of the educational administrators'
decisions. Secondly, computer specialists and educational adminis-
trators must recognize that each school system has its own normal
decision-making patterns. Each school system has set norms within
which the computers would perform as decision tools. Hence in
heavily political school districts, the use of computers would have
serious limitations if its information power did not follow the
customary political patterns. Thirdly, educational administrators
must recognize that computers are not only precise, but they are
also vehicles of power. Computers must be recognized as part of

the decision-making process and part of the objective substance
as well. Both the decision-making potential and the political
potential deserve more attention by administrators. Fourth, and
finally administrators must recognize their power to reward or
sanction people for their cooperation or recalcitrance with re-
gard to computers. Rewards that administrators may use take the
form of salary, status, or recognition; sanctions frequently are
job loss, loss of pay, or status or recognition.

In summary, the model depicted in Figure 1 underscores steps
to be taken when agreement cannot easily be reached on the goals
of computers in a district. No matter what level, the educational
administrators realize that no one person speaks for the district
or can commit district resources to computers arbitrarily.

A solution when values are in agreement about computer uses.
Most experts and practitioners agree that the best conditions for
acceptance of computers is when school personnel agree on the com-
puter uses in a school district. Gorham suggested that there
were seven steps to reaching a policy decision when there are
agreeable goals. These steps have been adapted to be applied to
a decision to use computers in school districts.[26] First, the
problems in the school system which could be solved by computers
had to be identified. Secondly, a policy statement had to be
formulated about the goals and objectives of computer use in the
school system. Third, the administrators also had to propose
alternative solutions to computer uses. Fourth, the administra-
tors had to optimize the alternatives by placing them in a priority
ordering. Fifth, the school system needed to select from among

FIGURE 1

Four Step Model to Solving

Value Conflicts Over Computer Use*

Step 1 - School system agreement on rules separating information

power of computers from authority of educational adminis-

tration.

Step 2 - Recognition by computer specialists and by educational

administrators that each school system has its own

normal decision patterns.

Step 3 - Administrative recognition that computers are precise

in information and part of the decision process.

Step 4 - Administrative recognition of the use of rewards and

sanctions for cooperation or resistance to computers.

---

*Adapted from McGivney, Joseph H. and B. Dean Bowles. The

Political Aspects of P.P.B.S. "Planning and Changing" 3 (1):

6-8, 1972.

those alternatives. Sixth, the selected alternative needed to
be legitimated and legalized by the administrators. And seventh
or lastly, the administrators needed to implement the decision
whether it included computers or not. Figure 2 illustrates the
Gorham model.

Summary and Conclusion

Assumptions that there will be general agreement on the goals
and objectives of using computers in school systems are probably
neither correct nor even close to describing reality of system-
wide decisions about computers. Disagreement over such decisions
is probably the reason that make computers part of the political
process in school districts. Such a political process will not
be lessened or eased because of the two decision-making models
that have been presented.

To educational administrators, this should not mean that
computers in school systems should be abandoned. On the contrary,
it should mean computers in education ought to be developed and
employed to increase their impact on educational decisions.
McGivney and Bowles further suggest that there are four fundamental
modes for further resolving conflict over system-wide decisions
about computers.

Rational search. If there is basic agreement as described
in the Gorham model, then a rational and reasonable search for
optimal computer use should bring the school districts toward a
positive commitment.

Persuasion in computer use. If there is still basic disagree-
ment on the use of computers by district personnel, but the power
positions or the value positions of the participants are also

FIGURE 2

Seven Step Model When School Dirstrict Values
are in Agreement About Computer Use*

Step 1 - Identify the school district problems that can be solved
by computers.

Step 2 - Formulate a policy statement about the use of computers
in the school district.

Step 3 - Propose alternative solutions to the use of computers.

Step 4 - Rank the solutions with and without computer use.

Step 5 - Select from among the alternatives.

Step 6 - Legalize the selected alternative.

Step 7 - Implement the decision whether it includes computers or
not.

changeable, the educational administrators have a good chance to advocate the use of computers. Persuasion would be the best device in this case.

Bargaining with computer use. On the other hand, if the positions about computers are different among participants, but there are trade-offs or exchanges to be made between them. Then, decisions on computers could be made by bargaining or compromise.

Power plays with computers. When the objectives for computers are completely at odds among the district participants and they are neither changeable or negotiable, power politics comes into play. With power politics, the participants will not be persuaded about the use of computers nor will they negotiate. The conflict can only be resolved on a "win-or-loose" basis. In this situation, computers have very little usofulness and the only benefit is that one or another of the participants has a better awareness of what was won or lost.

In a final summary, this paper has tried to demonstrate that computers in education must have specific and systematic objectives. They must be better able to demonstrate better ways of allocating resources or making decisions. Planning for computers is also required, and both educational administrators and computer personnel must be aware of the political processes involved in introducing computers into school districts. If these personnel have some awareness that computers have serious consequences in the politics of school districts, then educational administrators and computer personnel should see a need to re-examine the assumptions of computers in education, and perhaps they can increase the potential of computers to improve education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Umans, Shelley, How to Cut the Costs of Education, (New York: McGraw-Hill), 1973, pp. 20, 153, 161.

2. Grossman, Alvin and Robert H. Howe, Data Processing for Educators, (Chicago: Educational Methods Incorporated), 1965, pp. 231-235.

3. Ware, Willis. "Records, Computers, and the Rights of Citizens", Datamation 19 (9): 112-114, September, 1973.

4. Gruenberger, Fred. (Ed) Effectiveness vs. Efficiency in Computing, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall), 1973, p. 153.

5. Andrews, Gary M. and Ronald Moir. Information-Decision Systems in Education (Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers), 1970, pp. 65-90.

6. Stollar, Dewey H. and Gerald C. Boardman. "Merging of Personal Income and Educational Data" AEDS Monitor, 9 (11): 9-10, June 1971.

7. Ibid, p. 9

8. Maloney, J. P. Jr. "Electronic Data Processing in Education" Journal of Educational Data Processing 6 (4): 246-250, Fall, 1969.

9. "Facts and Futures - A Report on the 1973 Fall Conference and Council Meeting," Educom, 8 (4): 3-10, Winter, 1973.

10. Gordon, J.N. "The Use of Time Sharing Computers in Curriculum Evaluation," Educational Technology, 14 (2): 59, February, 1974.

11. Sandler, Bruce E. and P.E. Bowles. "A Low Cost Electronic Response System for Anonymous Student-to-Teacher Feedback," Educational Technology, 14 (2): 60, February, 1974.

12. Parker, Edwin. "Social Information - the Technology, the Need, and the Challenge," Educom, 7 (4): 12-14, Winter, 1972.

13. "Improving Productivity of School Systems Through Technology" Automated Education Letter, 8 (11): 3, November, 1973.

14. Law, Alexander I. "A Semantic Differential Study of the Meaning Held by Public School Personnel Toward Data Processing," California Journal of Educational Research, 19 (4): 157-165, September, 1968.

15. Anastasio, Ernest. "The Study of the Factors Inhibiting the Use of Computers in Instruction," Educom, 7 (1): 2-10, Spring, 1972.

16. Ibid, p. 8, 9.

17. Mohler, William C. "Computers in Clinical Medicine," Educom, 8 (3): 2-7, Fall, 1973.

18. Selter, Robert A. "Who Gets Instructed in Computer Assisted
        Instruction" Educational Technology, 14 (1): 26,
        January, 1974.

19. Sachman, Harold. Some Exploratory Experience with Easy Computer
        Systems" Proceedings of the AFIPS 1973 National Computer
        Conference, (Montvale, New Jersey: AFIP Press),
        October, 1973.

20. Malcom, Robert E., Gotterer, Malcolm H., and Frank Luh. Computers
        in Administration - A Fortran IV Introduction, (New York:
        Intext), 1973, p. 374.

21. Gruenberger, Fred, Gerald, Curtis, and Richard W. Reynolds.
        "Panel Discussion on the Role of Education in Preparing
        Effective Computing Personnel" in Effective vs. Effici-
        ent Computing, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall) 1973,
        pp. 118-129.

22. "Educational Leaders Meet to Examine Educational Training Packages"
        Automated Education Letter, 9 (1): 8, January, 1974.

23. Marland, Sidney P. "Educational Technology: A Vote of Confi-
        dence" Educom, 7 (2): 8-10, Summer, 1972.

24. McGivney, Joseph H. and B. Dean Bowles, "The Political Aspects
        of P.P.B.S." Planning and Changing, 3 (1): 3-12, 1972.

25. Testimony of William Gorham before the Joint Economic Com-
        mittee, Congress of the United States. "Hearings, the
        Planning, Programming - Budgeting System, Progress and
        Potential", 90th Congress, First Session, September,
        1967, pp. 5-83.

26. McGivney and Bowles, op. cit. pp. 9-11.