DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 367 08 CE 009 103

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth
TITLE Relationships between Career Education and Vocational Education. Monographs on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 44p.; For these papers as separate documents see ED 130 043, ED 130 045, ED 099 623, and ED 109 463-464
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 017-080-01614-1, $0.75, minimum charge $1.00 for each mail order)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Business Education; *Career Education; Change Strategies; *Definitions; Distributive Education; Educational Attitudes; *Educational Development; *Educational Strategies; Educational Trends; *Policy Formation; Program Development; Public Policy; Secondary Education; Teacher Role; *Vocational Education; Work Experience Programs

ABSTRACT

The five papers included in this monograph represent an attempt on the part of the Office of Career Education to clarify differences between career education and vocational education. The first paper, "Everyone's Favorite Solution Can't Be All Bad--A Reply to James O'Toole," rebuts O'Toole's seven charges against vocational education. The second paper is "Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences." Concepts of work, career, vocation, occupation, leisure, and education are defined as they relate to career, vocational, and occupational education. Implications for change in vocational education in the academic setting are also discussed. The third paper, "Career Education and Work Experience Education: Can We Join Together?" discusses implications of the career education concept for work experience educators. "Business Office Occupations and Distributive Education: Keys to Career Education," the fourth paper, suggests ways in which business and office occupations and distributive education teachers could move to convert both academic teachers and vocational educators into "career educators." The fifth paper, "Career Education: Strategies and Dilemmas," summarizes the current status of career education and discusses basic attitudinal problems facing it. (TA)

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CAREER EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

by

Kenneth Hoyt, *Director*
Office of Career Education
Office of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
David Mathews, *Secretary*
Virginia Y. Trotter, *Assistant Secretary for Education*

Office of Education
Edward Aguirre, *Commissioner*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1976

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price: 75 cents
Stock Number 017-080-01614-1
There is a minimum charge of $1.00 for each mail order

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CAREER EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

PREFACE

Career Education received its initial conceptual and financial thrust from the vocational education community. Without the effort and support of vocational educators, it is doubtful that career education could have been successfully launched. It is hoped that, as the career education concept continues to evolve and the career education effort continues to increase its effective implementation, the great contributions initially made by vocational education will be both remembered and appreciated.

Unfortunately, one of the side effects resulting from vocational education's initial support for career education was confusion, in the minds of many persons, regarding what, if any, differences exist between career education and vocational education. This has been particularly detrimental to needed improvements in both career education and vocational education when such mistaken perceptions occur among those whose past backgrounds cause them to be suspicious or distrustful of vocational education.

The five papers included here each represent an attempt, on the part of the Office of Career Education, to clarify differences between career education and vocational education. Equally important, each represents an attempt to clearly picture the mutual need of career education and vocational education for each other. In each of these papers, it is hoped that readers will clearly see that career education is being pictured as a system-wide concept that should, if implemented in all of education, make vocational education programs, as well as other kinds of educational programs, become even more successful. In none of these papers is the distinction drawn in ways that demean nor criticize vocational education.

If the career education concept is impeded because of its strong support of vocational education, it will be a price that career education is willing to pay. The career education concept demands that vocational education be supported. It is hoped that these papers contribute to that support as well as clarifying differences.

CONTENTS

"EVERYONE'S FAVORITE SOLUTION" CAN'T BE *ALL* BAD: A REPLY TO JAMES O'TOOLE

As part of a series entitled MONOGRAPHS IN CAREER EDUCATION, the Office of Career Education, United States Office of Education, recently published a document authored by Dr. James O'Toole, University of Southern California entitled *The Reserve Army of the Underemployed*. Like all other monographs in this series, it is the sole work of the author and carries no official endorsement of the United States Office of Education.

I am personally pleased that this monograph has been published. In my opinion, it is a thoughtful and provocative discussion of one of the major social problems of our time - namely, that of underemployment among persons in the labor force. O'Toole has put the problem in both a national and international perspective. Without proposing a single or any simple solution, he has discussed several alternative, long-run strategies that might be considered. It is a document well worth reading and deserving of serious study.

While generally positive in picturing various possible solutions to the problem, O'Toole has chosen, in one section of the monograph carrying a heading "Everyone's Favorite Solution," to launch a vigorous attack on vocational education. While, of course, I defend his right to do so, my personal opinions on this matter differ sharply from O'Toole's. Thus, I feel a strong need to express my views here.

O'Toole's general position, as expressed in this monograph, is illustrated by the following quotes:

> ". . .everyone's favorite solution - the extension of vocational education - is probably the worst policy to pursue to meet the problems of underemployment."
>
> "The disparity between the expectations of the young and the realities of the labor market can be most readily, thoroughly, and disastrously resolved through a massive program of vocational education."

He then attempts to defend this position by raising even specific charges against vocational education. It is these seven charges that I would like to reply to here. In doing so, I speak as one involved in career education, not as a vocational educator per se. I hope and expect that professional vocational educators will formulate a different set of responses based on their knowledge of vocational education. What I have to say here stems primarily from my conviction that career education, if it is to meet its responsibilities for contributing to solutions in the area of underemployment, will require a strengthening, not a weakening, of vocational education. Thus, my replies here are intended to illustrate the positive contributions vocational education can make to the goals of career

education. It is probably safe to say that O'Toole and I are equally biased about vocational education - but from opposite points.

Charge 1: A Second Class Education for Second Class Citizens

The following two quotes from O'Toole's monograph illustrate this charge:

> "...systems of second-class education for second-class citizens have lowered the expectations and self-esteem of disadvantaged groups and left them willing hewers, drawers and toilers."

> "...(vocational training) is correctly viewed today as an undemocratic anachronism, a way of preserving a dual form of education - one stream for "gentlemen" the other for "ruffians"... The educational track that one gets into at an early age largely determines one's occupational future and social class standing."

From a career education perspective, three points must be made clearly and forcefully in response to this charge. First, it is our goal to help all persons view vocational education as a different *kind* of educational opportunity, not as one of inferior quality. Vocational education is properly viewed as a means of recognizing that students differ in educational motivations - in what will "turn them on" as learners - and that a system of universal public education has an inescapable responsibility of providing for such differences.

Second, career education seeks to make vocational education a real choice for *all* students. It certainly was never intended to simply serve the "ruffians." I would defy anyone to study today's high school students and classify those in the college prep curriculum as "gentlemen" and those in vocational education as "ruffians." Any who truly believe otherwise should be encouraged to attend a local, State, or national meeting of any of the vocational youth clubs associated with vocational education. Such clubs, to me, represent the very best qualities of American citizenship in their student membership. Every sign of future direction that I can see in vocational education points in a direction of opening up opportunities to choose vocational education for *all* students.

Third, it simply is not true that, by choosing vocational education, a student limits his or her occupational future and social class standing. In the first place, vocational education, by appealing to educational motivations of many previously unmotivated persons, has encouraged such persons to complete high school and to continue their education beyond high school. In the second place, several high school vocational education programs - including vocational agriculture, home economics, business and office occupations, and distributive education - are purposely structured around a career development mode that makes it logical for many of their graduates

to enter colleges and universities after finishing high school. Third, there are relatively few postsecondary institutions today who systematically deny entrance to graduates of high school vocational education programs - and this trend is accelerating. Thus, from a career education standpoint, I can see no way that, by virtue of enrolling in vocational education, a person necessarily limits his or her occupational future or social class status.

Charge 2: Vocational Education Seeks to Create a Dual System of Education

O'Toole's charge here is illustrated by the following quotes:

> "On the east side of the Atlantic, the integration of vocational and academic tracks, and of working and middle-class students, is the primary goal of educational reform. Contrarily, in America, we are about to embark on the re-creation of the kind of dual system from which the Europeans are just now painfully extracting themselves. Next year, a major Vocational Education bill will waltz through the Congress with nary a dissenting vote,. . ."

Here, of course, he is referring to the international trend toward using a career education approach as an avenue for educational reform and contending that vocational education is working in ways that contradict support of a career education strategy. Again, the record is clear in illustrating vocational education's concern for career education to be just the opposite.

No segment of American education has been as supportive of career education as has vocational education. Vocational education has, both through dollars and by official policy formulation, been supportive of the career education concept from the beginning. Career education's efforts to bridge the gap between academic and vocational education have been fully and vigorously supported by vocational education. Had the same degree of support been given career education by all other parts of education, that gap would already have been greatly narrowed.

Finally, on this point, it should be made clear that the major piece of current vocational education legislation supported by professional vocational educators - H.R. 3037 - contains one separate title supporting career education. In addition, in several places, provisions are made, in that bill, for accommodating both academic and vocational education students. Instead of calling for a "dual system of education," it goes far in providing a basis for closer and more effective working relationships between academic and vocational education.

Charge 3: Vocational Education Grads Do Poorly in the Labor Market

The specific charge being leveled at vocational education here is stated in the following terms:

"...the initial employment record of vocational graduates in terms of income, job status, turnover, upward mobility, unemployment rates, and job satisfaction is no better than for students in academic programs and, in the long run, is much worse."

As the basis for this charge, O'Toole refers to "an evaluation conducted for the *Work in America* study by Beatrice Reubens. The first thing to be said here is that, in reading *Work in America*, I have never been able to identify the specific references nor see the specific evidence on which this charge is based. I understand that Reubens has collected some evidence justifying a conclusion that graduates of two-year postsecondary occupational education programs do better than graduates of high school programs. Certainly, to show that students who are two years older and who have been given two more years of vocational education do better than youth who just graduated from high school could not be regarded, by any thinking person, as justification for condemming high school level vocational education.

Second, I have seen no evidence, based on data collected from *matched samples* of vocational education students compared with academic students (where matching has been carried out using ability level, geographic factors, and socioeconomic status) that showed vocational education students to have fared worse than academic students. Neither have I seen such evidence presented under circumstances where cultural barriers to employment for vocational education students have been part of the research design.

For all these reasons, it seems to me this is a most damaging charge to level based on what, essentially, is a review of the literature conducted by one person. In operating career education programs, we have seen many youth who, had they not had the benefit of vocational education, not only would have had great difficulty finding any job but who, in addition, would have had great difficulty even finishing high school. I am sure that practicing vocational educators could, if they were asked to do so come up with literally thousands of examples bearing out this point.

Charge 4: Vocational Education is Too Narrow in Scope

The specific accusation made here is stated, by O'Toole, as follows:

"...several critics have demonstrated that the skills taught in vocational programs are too narrow for a fast-changing world of

work - the skills taught are often obsolete before they are ever used."

From a career education standpoint, several replies must be made to this charge. First, in supporting vocational education, those of us in career education have never operated under an assumption that the skills learned will be sufficient for the entire occupational life of the individual. Rather, we have counted on vocational education to provide its students with skills sufficient to allow them to *enter* the world of paid employment. It is essential that one be able to get into the system before one can possibly move up. Given an option of having, or failing to have, an entry level vocational skill, we have simply said that it seems better that youth have some skill rather than none.

Second, it will be apparent, to any who view current relationships between career education and vocational education, that, increasingly, vocational skill training is being provided in broad vocational areas, not in only one possible occupation. The philosophy of vocational education has supported this concept for many years now and its operational programs have illustrated it. It would, it seems to me, behoove those who want to criticize vocational education to study its literature before drawing their conclusions.

Finally, it is simply a gross exaggeration to assert that the skills given vocational education students "are often obsolete before they are ever used." With all the talk about rapidity of occupational change, it seems obvious that such change is not *that* rapid. Sar Levitan's recent book, *Work is Here to Stay, Alas!* provides good data to verify this point.

Charge 5: Vocational Grads are Too Narrowly Trained to be Upgraded on the Job

". . .because vocational graduates have been trained so narrowly and illiberally, there is no base for employers to build on with continuing, on-the-job training."

Again, we find a charge which, when subjected to realities of operation in vocational education programs, simply cannot be substantiated. In the first place, vocational education students are exposed to the same basic academic skills required for adaptability as all other students during the elementary and junior high school years. The curriculum is not different for prospective vocational education students at these levels. True, like many other students, some vocational education students have failed to acquire a reasonable level of proficiency in the basic academic skills. That is why vocational educators have joined the career education team in

developing and operating career awareness programs in elementary schools and career exploration programs in junior high schools.

Second, I know of no vocational high school that is devoid of any emphasis on academic or general liberal education. Typically, not over half of any school day is devoted strictly to vocational education. The system of vocational education, in America, has *not* been established in ways that prevent vocational education students from taking courses in general education. Common practice is quite the opposite.

Third, vocational education has never operated as part of the required curriculum in the American high school. On the contrary, the "required" part has always been general education courses and vocational education courses have always operated as electives. To whatever extent general education can be said to be valuable in providing youth with the academic skills of adaptability, it is obvious that those advantages have not been denied to students enrolled in vocational education.

On at least these three bases, O'Toole's contention here must be denied and regarded as refuted.

Charge 6: Vocational Grads are Trained in the Wrong Fields

The sixth charge seems particularly strange to me. In O'Toole's words, the charge is stated as follows:

> "...vocational graduates are often trained for jobs that don't exist. Moreover, such training is concentrated in declining fields (such as agriculture) and in fields of questionable merit (home economics), while the fast-growing world of white-collar, service employment is completely ignored."

A number of sub-charges are included in this rather sweeping indictment. First, it should be clearly stated that vocational education has not attempted to prepare students for specific jobs, but rather for multiple opportunities for entry into the world of paid employment. It would be much more proper, from a career education viewpoint, to contend that vocational education prepares its students for work than to limit the goals of vocational education to simply job preparation.

Second, the direct criticism of vocational agriculture here upsets me greatly. From a career education standpoint, I have often said that I wish all senior high school teachers had the same kinds of opportunities to participate in career education that are made available to teachers of vocational agriculture. Where else do we find teachers with opportunities to: (a) be on 12 month contracts; (b) visit in pupils' homes as part of their regular job duties; and (c) help students engage in individualized work experience project, that

emphasize initiative, individual responsibility, and the basic elements in the free enterprise system." Where else do we find [illegible] of education that has a government-sponsored [illegible] business-labor-industry community." Where else [illegible] direct emphasis on teaching youth general career [illegible] ity that will be useful in a wide variety of occupat[illegible] these ways, it seems to me, from the standpoint of [illegible] vocational agriculture represents extremely valuable [illegible] for helping youth acquire basic vocational skills that can be useful in a very wide variety of occupational pursuits. It certainly does not deserve to be attacked simply because specific employment directly in agriculture is still slowly declining.

Third, I am at least as upset with O'Toole's contention that home economics is of "questionable merit." From a career education viewpoint, it is doubtful that any part of vocational education has more merit. I say this, not only from the viewpoint of gainful home economics, but also from the viewpoint of the entire field of home economics. Unless the home and family structure receives an increased and more dedicated emphasis as part of American education, our entire society will suffer. Career education's goals depend, on their success, very much on emphasizing the home as a work place for all family members, on parental attitudes towards themselves and toward their children, on productive use of leisure time, and on consumer education. In all these ways, home economics is of great - not "questionable" - merit and worth.

Charge 7: Vocational Education Doesn't Appeal to Today's Youth

Perhaps the strangest, and most difficult to understand, charge leveled by O'Toole is stated in the following words:

> ". . .vocational education cannot be viewed as compatible with the new work values of the current generation."

It is difficult to understand how O'Toole could have arrived at such a conclusion when, only one page earlier in his monograph, he pointed, with some alarm, to the rapid increase in enrollments in vocational education. Certainly, no one has, in any way, forced students to enroll in vocational education. I fail to see how one can contend it has no appeal to the current generation when so many of that generation are seeking to enroll in vocational education programs.

Second, almost all of the recent literature I have been reading in education seems to be stressing a demand, on the part of youth, for closer and more direct relationships between education and work. Opinion polls of youth would seem to indicate that youth are

rejecting an "education for education's sake" emphasis and demanding that their education have more relevance and applicability to the work they will do when they first leave the system of formal education. I don't see youth rejecting work. Rather, it seems to me they are crying for more meaning and meaningfulness in their work. Certainly, vocational education is not moving in ways that would contradict this kind of work value.

Concluding Statement

In making these statements, I, in no way, mean to imply that vocational education represents the only - nor necessarily the most potentially effective - means available to America for solving problems of the underemployed and the unemployed. There are several of O'Toole's major suggestions for change that appeal to me. I am simply trying to say that, in my opinion, any long-run strategy for solving the education-work dilemma in general - or the problems of the underemployed in particular - that ignores or fails to take full advantage of vocational education will be both unwise and unproductive. Vocational education is not the sole answer, but it must certainly be included among the educational strategies we adopt for solving these various serious problems.

Finally, I hope these remarks have helped clarify the crucial importance I attach to vocational education as an essential element in a total career education strategy. We will never make the career education concept an operational reality unless all concerned with this movement recognize and embrace the goals and objectives of vocational education.

CAREER EDUCATION, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION: AN APPROACH TO DEFINING DIFFERENCES

[illegible] Career Education" [illegible] [illegible] for "Vocational Education." Should the terms "Vocational Education" and "Occupational Education" be considered as "synonymous." Apparently for [illegible] of the general public and many professional educators [illegible] that the answer to both questions must be "Yes."

Interestingly enough, during the last three years there has been considerable effort expended proclaiming that the terms "Career Education" and "Vocational Education" are not synonymous, while at the same time little attention has been paid to what, if any, differences exist in the meanings of "Vocational Education" and "Occupational Education." It seems unfortunate that relatively more time appears to have been spent in proclaiming that differences *do* exist between "Career Education" and "Vocational Education" than in specifying with exactness what such differences are. It seems really unfortunate that, by and large, differences between "Vocational Education" and "Occupational Education" have been ignored. It is time that we face the problems.

It would be fruitless to attempt to differentiate meanings of these three terms by defining the meaning of each independent of the other two. Some common base must be utilized for purposes of defining each term. Here an attempt will be made to construct such a base through definitions of [illegible] that are basic to the controversy. These terms are (1) "Work," (2) "Career," (3) "Vocation," (4) "Occupation," (5) "Leisure," and (6) "Education."

Definitions of Basic Terms

Work is conscious effort aimed at producing benefits for oneself and/or for others. As such it is unimportant whether such effort is paid or unpaid in nature. What is important is that it represents the basic need of all human beings to achieve, to accomplish, *to do* something productive that allows the individual to discover both who he/she is and why he/she is. With this definition work is properly viewed as a human right not as a societal obligation.

"Career" is the totality of work one does in his or her lifetime. Thus, any person can have only one career. That career typically begins prior to entering kindergarten and continues well into the retirement years.

Vocation is one's primary work role at any given point in time. Vocations include paid employment, but they also extend to

unpaid work roles. For example, we can speak of the "Vocation" of the student, the full-time volunteer worker, or the full-time homemaker just as easily as we can speak about the "Vocation" of the plumber, the physician, or the engineer.

"Occupation" is one's primary work role in the world of paid employment. Economic returns are always considered among the work values of persons engaged in occupations although these might not be considered at all by persons in certain vocations. The occupations of many persons will be synonomous with their vocations. One can never have an occupation without having a vocation although, of course, one can have a "Vocation" without being engaged in an "Occupation."

"Leisure" consists of activities, other than sleeping, in which one engages when not performing in his or her vocation. Thus, "Leisure" holds possibilities for both "Work" and for "Play."

"Education" consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns. As such, it is obviously a lifelong process and considerably broader in meaning than the term "Schooling."

All that follows here is based on an assumption that these six basic terms are understood and agreed upon. Those who disagree with one or more of these definitions will necessarily find themselves disagreeing with the remainder of this presentation.

Defining "Career Education," "Vocational Education," and "Occupational Education"

"Career Education" consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns about work. As such, it makes no restrictions in meaning whether one speaks about the work of the homemaker, the musician, the lawyer, or the bricklayer. Some work will require advanced college degrees, while other work may require no formal schooling of any kind. To the extent that work is judged "Successful," it does typically—and, in these times, increasingly—require some learned set of vocational skills.

"Vocational Education" consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns about a primary work role. This definition includes all kinds of primary work roles, paid and unpaid, those assumed by high school dropouts and by university graduates, those taking place in formal classrooms and in on-the-job settings. It differs markedly from the definition of this term currently in use by the American Vocational Association. It is advanced here, not to create controversy, but simply because, with the specific word definitions presented earlier, it seems proper.

"Occupational Education" consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns to work in the world of

paid employment. As such, it places a primary emphasis on economic benefits from work that are not necessarily present in either "Vocational Education" or in "Career Education." As with the term "Vocational Education," the term "Occupational Education" obviously includes schooling requiring collegiate degrees as well as schooling at below the baccalaureate level.

With these three generic definitions, it becomes clear that "Occupational Education" always includes "Vocational Education," but "Vocational Education" is not always limited to "Occupational Education." It becomes equally clear that "Career Education," while including both "Vocational Education" and "Occupational Education," extends beyond both in that it may involve work performed as part of one's leisure time. The three terms imply progressive narrowing of purpose. That is, "Career Education" includes all work, "Vocational Education" is limited to all primary work roles, and "Occupational Education" is further limited to all primary work roles in the world of paid employment.

Vocational Education: Bedrock for Career Education

At this point, it seems desirable to move beyond the definitional game-playing to the task of conceptualizing vocational education as part of career education. The primary point to be made here is that, while vocational education can exist without career education, there is no way career education can exist without vocational education. This statement requires some further explanation.

In a societal sense, the goals of career education are to help all individuals (a) want to work; (b) acquire the skills necessary for work in these times; and (c) engage in work that is satisfying to the individual and meaningful to society. Since, by definition, "Primary" work roles encompass most of the work carried out in the world, vocational education, as defined here, becomes a central ingredient for skill acquisition and thus a major part of the bedrock for the career education movement.

In an individualistic sense, the goals of career education are to make work (a) possible; (b) meaningful; and (c) satisfying to each individual. Work, in these times, is increasingly impossible unless one has been equipped with a set of vocational skills that will qualify him or her for work. Further, it is obvious that work can become neither "Meaningful" nor "Satisfying" unless and until it is first "Possible." Again, then, we can clearly see the bedrock necessity for vocational education, as defined here, for the success of the career education movement.

Finally, when one recognizes that, in the foreseeable future, more than eighty percent of all occupations will require the acquisition of

vocational skills at less than the baccaularate level, it is obvious that what has been the prime emphasis of traditional vocational education - i.e., providing occupational skills at the sub-baccaularate level - must be greatly expanded if career education is to succeed. Some have pictured "Career Education" as a subtrefuge for expanding vocational education. It would be much more accurate to recognize that, far from being a subtrefuge, career education must *demand* major expansion of occupational skill training at the sub-baccaularate level. It is simply essential to successful implementation of the career education concept itself.

Implications for Change in Vocational Education in Academic Settings

From the beginning, advocates of career education have called for the complete integration of vocational education into the total fabric of American education for the expansion of what have been academic education, general education, and vocational education into a single system that emphasizes *Preparation For Work* as one of the major goals of the total educational structure. The implications of this objective require some examination.

Some vocational educators have seemed to interpret "Integration" to mean that academic teachers will change in ways that make them more like today's vocational educators. Others seem to believe that "Integration" means that traditional academic teachers will come to like traditional vocational education teachers better - and vice versa. In short, that both will somehow adjust in ways that help them relate better with each other. It seems important to point out that the best that can be hoped for in a mutual adjustment situation is accommodation of different persons to one another. "Accommodation" implies adjustment without the necessity for basic changes in either party. "Integration," on the other hand, implies basic changes in both parties. Career education stands squarely for integration - not for simple accommodation.

The integration called for by career education demands that academic teachers change their internal value systems and their operational behavior in ways that reflect the importance of education as preparation for work. We ask all academic teachers to recognize preparation for work as one, among several, of the basic goals of american education. This will require major internal changes in many of today's academic teachers.

This hoped for integration also calls for fundamental internal changes in today's vocational education teachers. Integration cannot occur in an atmosphere of protective isolationism. The separateness of traditional vocational education which, in the past, has seemed

essential for survival, must, if career education's goals are to be attained, be abandoned. Instead, today's vocational educators must strive to find and to emphasize the commonality of purpose in education as preparation for work that binds them with all other educators into a single family of professionals.

To emphasize commonality of purposes is in no way to say that uniqueness will disappear. Rather, it is simply to recognize the importance of the commonalities. An emphasis on uniqueness will always be important to the individualistic goals of each educator. Vocational educators of today have two basic choices with respect to proclaiming their uniqueness. One would be to emphasize "Vocational Education" as preparation for primary work roles paid or unpaid at the sub-baccalaureate degree level. This would necessitate abandonment of the traditional criterion applied in defining a program as "Vocational Education" that stipulates that it should lead to gainful employment. To do so would immediately make industrial arts, as a curriculum area, part of vocational education. It would also legitimize, as part of vocational education, large parts of the work of today's home economics and vocational agriculture teachers that are not necessarily concerned only about paid employment. It would make vocational exploratory experiences for all students including the so-called "College Bound" a basic and bonafide part of vocational education. Certainly, it would call for major changes in what has traditionally been called "Vocational Education" in secondary schools and in postsecondary educational settings.

A second alternative would be to move from "Vocational Education" to "Occupational Education" in labeling the field. If this were to be done, it would probably be accompanied, for purposes of emphasizing uniqueness, on preparation for gainful employment in occupations requiring preparation at less than the baccalaureate degree level. It can be seen that, while involving a change in terminology, this would necessitate very little change in job functioning on the part of most of today's vocational educators.

There are, of course, a number of additional alternatives open to today's vocational educator. Among these are the following: (a) Keep vocational education "As Is," ignore career education, and hope that career education will go away; (b) Keep vocational education essentially "As Is," but encourage large increases in support for career guidance in hopes that career guidance personnel will take care of the integration problem; or (c) Keep vocational education essentially "As Is" in the senior high school, but support career awareness and career exploratory programs at the elementary and junior high school levels.

Even these few examples will, hopefully, serve to illustrate the basic problem career education asks today's vocational educators to face--namely, the problem of deciding to *change*. To date, the problem has not been very squarely faced by either vocational education or by career education personnel.

Career Education's Need for Support by Vocational Education

Finally, I want to conclude by commenting briefly on the urgent need of career education for support by today's professional vocational education community.

Prior to doing so, it seems important to point out that career education, as a total movement, holds far greater potential for change than could be expected to result from the isolated efforts of any single part of education - such as vocational education. Remember, the broad goal of career education is to bring both prominence and permanence to education as preparation for work as a major goal of our entire system of education. Had vocational education been able to do this by itself, I think it would have done so years ago. That is, career education and vocational education need each other.

But it is *change* that we have been speaking of here. The art of compromise, essential for moving toward change, cannot effectively be accomplished if career education is controlled or directed by vocational education. Vocational education was certainly one of the parents of career education. We must, however, recognize that, if we continue with the analogy, that career education is a child born out of wedlock. The true marriage between vocational and academic education has yet to take place. If such a marriage is ever to occur, it must result, in part, because both "Parents" respect and admire what this child called "Career Education" has been able to accomplish. Neither "Parent" can control if this is to occur.

Career education is a healthy child today as witnessed by the hundreds of local school systems that have initiated career education programs on their own. But it is a child and, as such, in great need of both nourishment and assistance in moving toward maturity. As one of it's "Parents," vocational education has, it seems to me, a continuing responsibility to financially support and provide thought-ful input into the continuing conceptualization of career education. It would be a tragic mistake to see vocational education's interest in and support for career education diminished at this point in time.

The career education movement calls for major internal changes on the part of both the academic and the vocational educators of today. It would be unwise and unproductive for one to change unless the other also moved toward change. Change, if it comes, will be slow and painful for all concerned. If all of us can change in a career education direction, American education will become more meaningful and more appropriate for our students. There *is* a choice, to be sure. There is also a deep professional responsibility.

CAREER EDUCATION AND WORK EXPERIENCE EDUCATION: CAN WE JOIN TOGETHER?

Career education and work experience education share a common goal and three basic common values. The goal we share is an attempt to emphasize education, as preparation for work, as one of the basic functions of American education. The three basic common values I think we share include: (a) a value regarding the importance of work to both individuals in our society and to the society itself; (b) a value regarding the need for and the potential of experiential learning; and (c) a value regarding the need to involve the formal education system and the business-labor-industry-professional community in a collaborative relationship in ways that will expand student learning opportunities.

While it is important to recognize these commonalities, it is equally important to recognize that these two movements career education and work experience education came into being in different ways and with differing initial reasons. Career education was begun, and continues to operate, as a vehicle for the total reform of American education through changing the basic, internal professional commitments of all educators. It has come on the educational scene as a concept, not as a program. Work experience education, on the other hand, was begun many years ago basically as a special kind of *program* emphasis purposely designed to serve only a portion of the student body.

As work experience education has changed in its conceptualization and in the scope of its activities, it has seemed to me that it is moving closer and closer to embracing the career education concept. My purpose here is to provide a basis for practicing work experience educators to decide, for themselves, exactly how close this relationship has become and to decide the extent to which they feel it desirable to move even closer.

To accomplish this purpose, I would like to divide this presentation in three parts. First, it seems important that I review briefly the broad conceptual base of work experience education. Second, I want to devote particular attention to the conceptual meaning of the four-letter word "work" as it is used in career education. Finally, I would like to raise a number of questions which work experience educators must answer for themselves as they consider relationships between career education and work experience education.

Basic Concepts of Career Education

There is no need to review here the entire range of career education concepts. Instead, I have selected a very few which I think

are most germane to the basic question of similarities and differences between career education and work experience education.

The first of these concepts deals with definitions. Three definitions are essential to understand as a basis for examining the generic definition of career education in the OE policy paper, AN INTRODUCTION TO CAREER EDUCATION. All three are contained in that paper. They include:

a. "work" - conscious effort, other than that involved in activities whose primary purpose is either coping or relaxation, aimed at producing benefits for oneself or for oneself and others.
b. "career" - the totality of work one does in her or his lifetime.
c. "education" - the totality of experiences through which one learns.

These three definitions have led us to offer the following generic definition of career education:

> "career education" is defined as the totality of experiences through which one learns about and prepares to engage in work as part of her or his way of living.

Taken together, these definitions form the following basic career education concepts: (1) "work" includes both paid employment and unpaid work; (2) since "career" is the totality of work done in one's whole lifetime, one does not "change" careers - rather, one's career develops starting in the pre-school years and continuing into the retirement years; and (3) "education" and "schooling" are not synonymous terms - "education" takes place in more places than school buildings, in more ways than through books, and "teaching" is not limited to persons whose occupational title is "teacher."

The second basic career education concept is that career education is for all students at all levels of education. It must begin no later than kindergarten and continues through all of formal education and all of adult education. No student at any level is potentially more in need of career education than any other.

The third basic career education concept is that it is not something schools can do by themselves. Instead, career education is pictured as a collaborative effort involving the formal education system, the business-labor-industry community, and the home/family structure. The key word here is "collaboration" - which obviously implies a much closer relationship than the word "cooperation."

The fourth basic career education concept is that of *infusion* into all parts of education and into all educationa programs. It is not a new program to be added to the many that now exist.

Finally, the word "fusion" is equally as important as the word "infusion" in the career education concept. Career education, conceptually, is a fusion of two philosophies - the philosophies of

vocationalism and of humanism - with two processes - the career development process and the teaching/learning process. Time will not permit me to explain this concept, but I hope it is one you will think about.

These, then, are the basic concepts of career education that seem to me to be most germane to questions of relationships between career education and work experience education. I will return to their implications in the final portion of this presentation.

The Concept of "Work" in Career Education

I would like to turn now to a more detailed explanation of the concept of "work" as that term is used in career education. I have a feeling that it may differ, in several ways, from the operational meaning of "work" as it is currently used in work experience education. My purpose is not to convince you that our notions regarding "work" are right. Rather, my only purpose is to try to make clear both our concerns and our concepts regarding work.

As used in career education, the word "work" is a very humanistic [illegible] indeed. It refers to the human need of all human beings to - to accomplish - to achieve - to produce. It is the need we all have to know we are valuable and are valued because we have done something - to know that someone needs me for something - that the world is, in some way and to some extent, benefited because I exist and I have *done*. As the term is used in career education, "work" is not properly thought of as a societal obligation. Rather, it is best thought of as a human right of all human beings.

In my view, it is through "work" that each of us best discovers who we are. If we were to ask any stranger to tell us who he/she is, that stranger would most probably begin by identifying himself/herself to us by relating his/her name, hometown, physical characteristics, and, perhaps, even his/her age. Such a description, while helpful in distinguishing one individual from another, is not at all helpful in understanding that individual. We best understand another person primarily through her/his accomplishments - through what the individual has *done*. The existentialist will tell us that any individual can become aware of his/her being through simply a contemplation process. We would contend that the difference between "awareness" and "understanding" is very great indeed. "Work" is a means by which any individual - youth or adult - can understand himself/herself and, in addition, help others understand who he/she is.

More importantly, "work" is a means available to each of us for discovering *why* we are - the purpose we have for being on this earth. It is a way available to each of us for finding a personal meaning and

meaningfulness in our existence. It is a means available to every human being - young and old alike - for understanding that she/he *is* important and worthwhile.

I have a feeling that we have spent far too much time in education telling our pupils they are important and too little time letting them discover their own importance through those things they have been able to accomplish. We have spent far too much time telling our pupils how they have failed and too little time letting them discover how they have succeeded. That is why career education seeks to impart a "success," rather than a "failure," strategy into the total teaching/learning process. There is an important point to be made here that demands I take time to give you two additional definitions that I use in career education. These are: (a) "vocation" - defined as a primary work role; and (b) "occupation" - defined as a primary work role in the world of paid employment. Viewed in the context of these two definitions, it is obvious that every student has a "vocation" - a primary work role - namely, the vocation of a "student." We in career education do not believe that the student needs to leave the classroom in order to experience "work."

Having said this, let me hasten to add that, in no way, do those of us in career education consider "work experience" logged as a student in a classroom to be sufficient. We are well aware of the fact that no individual's "work" can be limited to that of "student." Most persons, with the exception of those who become educators, will spend much of their adult life working in non-educational settings. *All* persons must be prepared to apply the concept of work in productive use of leisure time. Most persons will spend a considerable portion of their lives in the world of paid employment. For all of these reasons, we in career education consider "work experience," in addition to that found in classrooms per se, to be an important opportunity to be made available to all students.

We in career education are not so naive as to believe that the concept of work, as I have described it here, is to be found available today in all jobs in the world of paid employment. We are well aware of the fact that many individuals who find jobs fail to find work. Instead, they find "labor" - a condition which is disliked, is performed largely only for survival purposes, and which brings little, if any, personal sense of accomplishment or pride to the individual. We think this condition can be greatly alleviated if more attention is paid to humanizing the work place - and we are active supporters of such efforts. At the same time, we realize that humanization of the work place is a long way off for many occupations and, for many others, can be accomplished only to a relatively small extent. That is why career education insists that unpaid work - including volunteerism, work of the full-time homemaker, and work in which individuals

engage as part of their leisure time - be included in the career education concept. After all, those persons who find themselves in dehumanizing jobs in the world of paid employment are no less important as human beings than are any others. We could not be true to the humanistic basis for career education if we failed to include unpaid work in our concept.

As used in career education, the word "work" does not allow for statements that say such things as "He doesn't *want* to work." Such expressions may well pertain to some individuals' perceptions of the jobs available to them in the world of paid employment, but they have nothing to do with the human *need* and the God-given *right* of every human being to experience work - and so to find meaning and meaningfulness in his/her total existence.

Implications of the Career Education Concept for Work Experience Educators

As a final portion of this presentation, I would like to comment briefly on what I regard as several important implications of the career education concept for possible roles and functions of work experience educators. In doing so, I am well aware of the fact that many work experience educators have already changed in many of these ways. I simply want to set the record straight in terms of my own hopes and aspirations for closer working relationships between career education and work experience education.

First, and most basic, it seems to me there is a clear challenge to consider the possibility of making work experience a general educational methodology--rather than a specific kind of educational program--available for use, in varying ways, in the total teaching/learning process beginning in the early elementary grades and continuing through all of higher education. To accomplish this, it would, of course, be essential that decision makers in education embrace both the concept of work and the importance of experiential learning. I have a feeling that we are closer to that point now than many persons now working in education - including both career education and work experience education--recognize.

Second, it seems to me that the implications of unpaid, as well as paid work experience, hold important challenges for change in the role and functions of work experience educators. I am firmly convinced that, if career *exploration* is the goal, unpaid work experience in the world of paid employment holds far greater potential than does paid work experience. As the student moves closer to making bonafide occupational choices, paid work experience - including the responsibilities of being productive and fully accountable - become more important. Exploratory, unpaid work

experience opportunities involving frequent changes in work station assignment should, it seems to me, begin no later than the junior high school years and should be made available to those students who remain undecided well into the college and university years.

Third, I am firmly convinced that, somewhere in education, we must begin paying more attention than we have in the past to work experience opportunities designed to help individuals make more productive use of their leisure time. Whether this function will become part of the job description of today's work experience educators or whether someone else will perform it is still an open question. I do not think the need for this kind of activity should be delayed any longer.

Fourth, I am convinced that great and important challenges exist for today's work experience educators in becoming active participants and leaders in attempts to infuse career education concepts into classes from the kindergarten through the graduate college. Helping teachers understand and capitalize on the career implications of their subject matter, obtaining resource persons from the business-labor-industry-professional community for the classroom, observational and exploratory field trips for students into the business-labor-industry-professional community, and the establishment of work simulation centers available to both youth and to adults in the community are some of the kinds of activities I am talking about here.

Fifth, I am firmly convinced that, if they choose to do so, great need and great opportunities exist for work experience educators to be active leaders in teacher inservice efforts in career education. We are much closer to having work experience educators employed at the building level than we are to having "career education specialists" in each school building. My feeling, at this time, is that, while I support the notion of having a career education coordinator at the school system level, I am opposed to creating this new breed of specialists under an assumption that they will be operating at the building level. At the building level, I could see several kinds of persons - including work experience educators, school counselors, or subject matter specialists - serving as the career education "orchestrator" while the building principal serves as the career education "administrator." It is an opportunity that exists today for many work experience educators. Whether or not you think it wise to seize this opportunity is, of course, up to you.

I have tried here to: (a) make certain basic career education concepts clear so they may be compared with work experience concepts; (b) discuss the concept of work, as a humanizing term, and as the absolute bedrock on which the career education concept exists; and (c) outline several possible implications for change in role

and function of work experience educators that grow out of the career education concept. In doing so, my goal has been to provide work experience educators with some basis for determining their own directions for professional change. It is my sincere belief that career education and work experience education belong together. I would hope that some of you may share this belief with me.

BUSINESS OFFICE OCCUPATIONS AND DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION: KEYS TO CAREER EDUCATION

USOE Commissioner Dr. T. H. Bell has described career education as "going and growing" throughout the United States. Ample justification for Commissioner Bell's statement exists. It is evident in the 46 State departments of education who now have career education coordinators. It can be seen in the 10 States now having career education legislation and the 19 States where such legislation is not under consideration. The fact that, when P.L. 93-380 was signed into law on August 21, 1974, career education became the law of the land, rather than a perrogative of the Administration, is germane to this point. So, too, is the increasing numbers of organizations and associations endorsing the career education concept. Perhaps most significant is the estimate of the Career Education Task Force of the Council of Chief State School Officers that, of the 17,000 school districts in the USA, about 5,000 are engaged in career education activities during the 1974-75 school year. Career education is stronger now than at any time in the past.

In spite of all these encouraging signs, career education is still faced with many challenges and problems. Among such problems, one of the most obvious is the relative slowness with which career education is being implemented at the senior high school level. True, some outstanding senior high school career education programs are now operating. However, by and large, career education has been implemented much more frequently and much more effectively at the elementary and junior high school levels than in the senior high school. I know few who would argue this point.

Vocational educators have played key roles in implementing career education at the elementary and junior high school levels. Yet, in the senior high schools where most vocational educators are employed, we have not seen a corresponding dedication of effort. This, I suspect, is much more due to a perceived lack of authority and responsibility than to any lack of interest or concern on the part of vocational educators. It is hard to become part of the solution when, for years, vocational education has been perceived to be part of the problem. It is even harder to assume a leadership role with colleagues in other parts of education who, for years, have regarded vocational educators as "less respectable" members of the profession. The difficulty of a task bears no necessary relationship to its importance or to its appropriateness at any particular point in time. It is, in my opinion, time that vocational educators, from every area of vocational education, assume responsibility for making career education work in the senior high school.

As I think about the challenges, there is no area of vocational education that, in my opinion, does not have a key and crucial role to play in this effort. While I would pose a different set of challenges for each AVA Division, I consider that each can and should become deeply involved in making career education operational in the senior high school. Here, my remarks will be limited to challenges facing vocational educators working in the areas of business and office occupations and in distributive education. I group these areas, not because I fail to recognize their differences, but simply because I consider their potential for effecting positive change to carry many of the same kinds of action implications.

There are three goals here. First, I would like to specify the basic kinds of changes needed in the senior high school in order for career education to work. Second, I would like to comment briefly on those changes in terms of the present nature of business, office, and distributive education. Finally, I would like to present a set of action suggestions for your consideration.

Career Education: Challenges For Change In The Senior High School

Career education's success is dependent on its ability to effect change in American Education. Of the many kinds of change involved, the most basic are those found in the teaching-learning process. While, to be sure, many of these changes require the sanction and encouragement of school administrators, they are seen operationally in the ways in which learning experiences are made available to students. Among the many changes in the teaching-learning process called for by career education, the following seem particularly appropriate to this discussion:

1. A change toward emphasizing education, as preparation for work, (both paid *and* unpaid) as a prominent and permanent goal of all who teach and of all who learn.
2. A change toward expanding all curricular areas in ways that provide meaningful substance and opportunities for choice by both those who plan to attend college and by those who do not.
3. A change toward emphasizing performance evaluation as a major and important way of assessing student achievement.
4. A change toward providing students opportunities to acquire general career skills (including both basic vocational skills and good work habits) that can be useful in a wide range of occupations.
5. A change toward using persons from the business-labor-industry-professional-government community as resource persons in the classroom.

6. A change toward increasing work experience opportunities for students that takes place outside of the school as one means of supplementing (Note: NOT substituting *for*) student learning in the classroom.
7. A change toward teacher efforts aimed at enhancing career development, including career decisionmaking, on the part of all students.

Career education will not be effectively implemented in the senior high school until and unless most of today's senior high school teachers accept and try to meet these challenges for change. When one thinks about senior high school teachers throughout the country, it is obvious that much remains to be done.

Business, Office, and Distributive Teachers: A Model For Change

As I think about these seven challenges for change, I am often struck by the fact that an excellent model for all teachers to consider already exists in many senior high schools. That model is found in the business and office occupations and in the distributive education teachers in our schools. Here, I would like to illustrate this fact through making a few observations with reference to each of these seven changes in light of current practices of business and office occupations and of distributive education teachers.

First, in these fields, it is obvious that not all students are motivated toward a desire to acquire job specific skills when they enroll in classes. Many of these students want to acquire skills that can be useful to them in their broader life roles, not in their specific places of employment. Neither business and office occupations nor distributive education, as parts of vocational education, have insisted that all students enrolled in their classes do so for purposes of acquiring job specific skills. This, of course, is not to say that such skills are not emphasized, but only that they are not such an automatic requirement as to keep students with other reasons for learning from enrolling in some courses found in these fields.

Second, the fields of business and office occupations and distributive education are clearly pictured as appropriate for and available to students contemplating college attendance as well as to those who will seek employment immediately upon leaving the secondary school. These fields have, almost from the beginning, provided for the full range of student talents and interests found in the senior high school. They have clearly demonstrated that, where appropriate, both students contemplating college attendance and those who do not can learn from each other and learn to respect each other in the same classes. While this, of course, frequently happens in

other areas of vocational education, it is taken for granted in business and office and in distributive education.

Third, performance evaluation has always been a hallmark of business and office occupations. Typing skills are measured by speed and accuracy at the typewriter Accounting skills are measured by successful completion of problems. Shorthand skills are assessed almost exclusively through performance evaluation. The emphasis is always on accomplishments of the student, not her or his failure to accomplish. Each student is encouraged to use himself or herself as a standard with a goal of improving on past performance. While this, too, is taken for granted in these programs, it should be easy to see how different this is from many other parts of the school.

Fourth, partly as an outgrowth of their performance emphasis, these areas of vocational education have always placed a high reliance on consciously emphasizing good work habits. Perhaps even more important, their curricular structure is obviously arranged in such a manner that general career skills, applicable across a very wide range of occupations and also useful outside one's place of paid employment, are emphasized in the basic courses offered in both business and office occupations and in distributive education. The general career skills goals of career education are nothing new to these fields.

Fifth, these fields have always made extensive use of persons from the business community as resource persons in the classroom and as members of advisory councils. While a common practice in all of vocational education, it is significant that the use of such persons in both business and office occupations and in distributive education includes an emphasis on the college-bound students as well as on those who will seek immediate employment upon leaving the secondary school.

Sixth, these fields have been leaders in establishing work experience programs (including many varieties of work-study) for students in ways that supplement and reenforce classroom learning activities. Both of these fields have recognized and resisted any move to *substitute* any form of work experience, in toto, for classroom instruction. They stand as leaders of the concept that, while emphasizing and utilizing work experience, we do so in ways that benefit both students and employers through related classroom instruction. While some disagreement exists within career education regarding the relationships between work experience and classroom instruction, I stand squarely on the side of those who view work experience as a supplementary form of education and not as a supplanting device.

Seventh, both the fields of business and office occupations and distributive education have been established on sound career development principles. Unlike most other areas of vocational education,

there are clearly established patterns for moving one's occupational preparation program from the secondary to the postsecondary levels in four-year colleges and universities as well as in community college settings. Moreover, at the secondary school level, both fields have emphasized broad career exploratory experiences cutting across a wide number of occupations fully as much as they have emphasized job specific skill acquisition. Here, too, they differ from some other parts of vocational education. In yet another crucial aspect of career development, they are similar to other vocational education areas in that they place a high reliance on active youth groups.

In all of these ways, the fields of business and office occupations and distributive education have, for years, successfully bridged the gap between those who regard themselves as "academic educators" and those who call themselves "vocational educators." In this sense, persons teaching in fields have already become "career educators" which, of course, is what we hope will become the goal of all educators at the senior high school level. They have demonstrated, through their actions and the programs they operate, that the kinds of changes called for by career education can be accomplished. Further, they have demonstrated that they work. In my opinion, both business and office occupations and distributive education represent *career education in action.*

Making Change Happen

I am well aware of the fact that not all persons currently working in the fields of business and occupations and in distributive education are operating as I have pictured them here. If what I have said here has validity, the obvious first task is one of engaging in communication and gaining commitment among those now working in these fields. Without downplaying the importance nor the difficulty of this task, I would like to devote the remainder of this presentation to a brief discussion of efforts I hope persons from these fields can and will make to encourage all senior high school teachers to become, in part, "career educators."

I would like to see teachers from the business and office occupations and from the distributive education fields take an active role in converting the so-called "academic" teachers to career education. One opportunity for doing so is to emphasize the many ways in which such teachers are making direct contributions to the career preparation of students enrolled in business and office and in distributive education. The importance and the career implications of English, mathematics, and natural sciences, and the social sciences for such students are obvious. Business and office, as well as

distributive education teachers, could make significant contributions to career education by making such implications clear to those teaching such subjects.

Students in business and office and in distributive education could also be asked to raise, with academic teachers, career implications of subject matter. By so doing, they can not only stimulate such teachers to consider career implications, but they may also serve as effective stimulators for other students to raise similar questions.

The contacts business and office occupations and distributive education teachers have with the business community can be used to make similar contacts for other academic teachers who wish to use resource persons from that community in their classrooms. In this way, such teachers can serve to effectively increase the number and variety of resource persons available to teachers who, in the past, have concerned themselves only with the "college-bound" students.

The vast amount of experience business and office occupations teachers have accumulated in translating performance evaluation measures into grades and credits represents an area of expertise to be shared with all other educators. Both the philosophical and the practical implications of using performance measures in this way, while perhaps taken for granted by those in this field, are matters that many senior high school teachers have never considered. Since many students to whom the business and office occupations teacher applies such measures are the same ones with whom "academic" teachers have in their classes, there exists an easy and natural way of raising the subject with them.

The direct emphasis on general career skills which has, for so many years, been a part of both the business and office occupations and of the distributive education fields, can serve as an attractive and acceptable approach to providing a career emphasis for those academic teachers who are "turned off" by a direct emphasis on job specific training. The concept of unpaid work, as part of one's total lifestyle, can be seen clearly in the goals of business and office occupations and of distributive education teachers and used to emphasize the importance of this aspect of career education to teachers who consider themselves as concerned only with "college-bound" students.

Opportunities for effecting change in other vocational education teachers are fully as great as are those for effecting change in the so-called "academic" teachers. Business and office occupations and distributive education teachers are both well accepted and higher respected members of the family of vocational educators. As such, they, perhaps more than any others, will find vocational educators willing to listen to suggestions that room be found, in vocational education classes, for some college-bound students who want to pick

up a degree of vocational skill that they could use in leisure-time work. Such practices hold great potential for helping vocational education become better accepted and, as has been well illustrated by the business and office occupations field, can improve the general quality of students who enroll for job specific training.

The conscientious way in which both business and office occupations and distributive education teachers have used their course offerings for career exploration as well as for imparting job specific skills is a second illustration of desired change among all vocational educators. To make room for some students who aren't sure they want to commit themselves to a full-blown vocational skill preparation program has paid handsome dividends for both the business and office occupations and for the distributive education fields. It could pay similar dividends to all vocational educators.

Further, the purposeful close working relationships between secondary and postsecondary programs of vocational preparation built by these two fields is certainly well worth emulating for all vocational areas. True, some vocational areas would have trouble finding direct counterparts at the four-year college and university level, but all should be able to relate secondary school programs to postsecondary occupational education programs at the community college level.

All that I have been trying to say here today can be summarized in a very few remarks. First, I tried to indicate that, while the career education movement is indeed a "going and growing" movement, much remains to be done to make it effective at the senior high school level. Second, I outlined a number of changes that must take place in senior high school classrooms in order for effective career education to be provided. Third, I tried to illustrate that both the business and office occupations and the distributive education fields have been built in ways that are already consistent with these kinds of changes.

It is this belief that leads me to call teachers from both fields "career educators." Finally, I tried to suggest a number of ways in which today's business and office occupations and distributive education teachers could move to convert both academic teachers and vocational educators into "career educators." I ask it, not in the name of career education, but rather in the name of the entire student body that each of us should be dedicated to serving.

CAREER EDUCATION: STRATEGIES AND DILEMMAS

In 1962, I appeared before this group and asked your help in fostering the development of post high school vocational-technical education. Today, I come asking your help in fostering implementation of the career education concept. The basic dynamics involved are, to me, strikingly similar in that now, as then, I was convinced of (a) the importance of the concept, (b) the crucial role State directors of vocational education must play in solving the problem, (c) the absolute necessity for involvement of forces outside vocational education in seeking solutions, and (d) my own inability to formulate a final blueprint for use in solving the problems that seem to me to be present.

Now, as then, I feel much more knowledgeable about the problem than the solution. If, 12 years from now, you have devoted the same amount of energy, expertise, and commitment to career education as you have, during the past 12 years, to the problem of post high school vocational-technical education, I have no doubt but that real progress will have been made. It is in hope that this will occur that I appear before you today.

There are three goals here. First, I want to give you a very brief capsule summary of career education's current status. Second, I want to characterize and discuss several major attitudinal problems currently facing career education. Finally, I want to leave time to listen to the good advice I know you can give me in terms of suggested problem solving actions.

Current Status of Career Education: A Capsule Summary

Since coming to USOE in February 1974, I have had opportunity to gather some data, study other data, and observe much regarding career education in the United States. Here, without boring you with statistics, I would like to summarize the current status of career education as it now seems to me. The total picture demands that I give you both some positive and some negative perceptions.

In a positive vein, I think it is safe to say the following: (1) Local school enthusiasm for career education is greater than that seen at the SEA level, but SEA efforts are greater than the current Federal effort; (2) Good consensus exists among career education leaders at the National, State, and local levels regarding the basic nature, goals, and implementation strategies for career education; (3) Some positive evidence related to the effectiveness of career education is now present; (4) The professional literature voicing opinions regarding career education continues to be more positive than negative; and (5) The financial base for support of career education has been

extended beyond that derived from vocational education monies. Data are available to substantiate each of these observations.

I see no sign that interest in or enthusiasm for career education is on the decline. True, the sources of interest and support have shifted somewhat during the last three years, but that is another matter.

On the negative side, it seems to me that we must face the following kinds of sobering facts: (1) Implementation of career education has occurred primarily at the K-8 level with much less emphasis in our senior high schools and very sparse emphasis at the community college, four year college and university, or adult education levels; (2) The quantity of the career education effort has far outstripped its quality; (3) Career education remains largely a matter of overpromise and under-delivery for such special segments of the population as the poor, the physically and mentally handicapped, minorities, the gifted and talented, and for females; (4) Large segments of the professional education community remain distrustful of career education--and large segments of the general public have not yet even heard of it; and (5) The true collaborative effort involving the formal educational system, the business-labor-industry-professional-government community, and the home and family called for by career education has yet to take place.

Such negative facts are, to me, discouraging but not defeating. If I were not convinced that each could be overcome, I would not name them in so specific a fashion. Each fact is, to me, rooted in attitudes that must be changed. I want now to devote the remainder of this paper to a discussion of such attitudes.

BASIC ATTITUDINAL PROBLEMS FACING CAREER EDUCATION

The common criticisms of career education voiced in the literature grow basically out of misunderstandings. They include such charges as the following: (a) Career education is anti-intellectual; (b) Career education will lower our standards; (c) Career education is anti-humanistic; (d) Career education is trying to keep students out of college; (e) Career education is a subterfuge for the expansion of vocational education; (f) Career education will mean tracking of students; (g) Career education hasn't been clearly defined; and (h) Career education is inviting external control of our schools. Each of these charges can be and has been answered. (Hoyt, 1974)

The problems I want to discuss here have not, to date, verbalized as part of the career education controversy. In effect, they constitute what might be considered the "hidden agenda" of resistance. I have

serious questions regarding how each should be solved. I want here to specify the problems and seek your assistance in solving each.

"Where's the Money?"

The first problem can be characterized as a "where's the money" attitude. The sources of this problem seem to me to be two in number. One source is in those who seem to believe that, if something isn't expensive, it cannot be very important. By judging the importance of a given educational activity only in terms of the proportion of the educational budget allocated to it, they assign career education a low priority because it requires relatively few funds. The second source of this attitude is found in those who have never experienced any major change in American education coming about unless the Federal Government induced schools to change through providing massive financial support programs. Such persons, upon observing the sizeable Federal demonstration grants for career education in the last three years, say, in effect, "I, too, am ready to initiate career education - where's *my* $500,000?"

Two items - physical plant and equipment costs plus staff salaries - account for over ninety percent of the cost of education. Career education does not demand new buildings or rooms since it is not seen as a separate "course." It does not demand expensive equipment since most of its materials are either "homemade" by teachers and students or donated by the community. It does not require a large staff since its basic rationale calls for *all* staff members to be involved. For all of these reasons, the amount seen as required for the implementation of career education is bound to represent a relatively small portion of the total educational budget.

To date, my basic strategy has been one of asking school administrators - building principals and superintendents - to assume leadership roles in career education. Reasons for employing this strategy include: (a) Career education demands coordination of all educational personnel and this should be a function of the administrator; (b) Career education is dependent on establishing collaborative relationships with the community which, in turn, depends on basic school policies for which administrators are responsible; (c) I am fearful that, if "career education specialists" are appointed, other staff members will be reluctant to assume career education responsibilities; and (d) I am fearful that any new school program calling for increasing school budgets substantially will not be well accepted by the taxpayers. Thus, I have been championing a concept that holds that, while career education is exceedingly important, it does not have to be expensive.

Perhaps this strategy is wrong. If so, we must immediately begin to face problems associated with the preparation and employment of career education coordinators and specialists. Such thoughts raise, in my mind, the specter of M.A. and Ph D degrees in Career Education, the establishment of certification requirements for career education personnel, and the formulation of something probably called the "American Career Education Association." I am very afraid that, if these things happen, our goal of using career education as an integrative vehicle is doomed to failure. The problem must be discussed. Stated simply, it is "Do we need special personnel in order to operate effective career education programs?" Your advice on this matter would be most deeply appreciated.

"If I Can't Control it, I'm Not Interested"

The second problem can be characterized as a "If I can't control it, I'm not interested" attitude. One of the prime complaints of labor union leaders, for example, is that they are not being consulted regarding work experience and work study aspects of career education. Business leaders want a voice in determining matters related to field trips and the use of their personnel as resource persons in the classrooms. The Council of Chief State School Officers has issued strong statements regarding their leadership rights and responsibilities in career education. The National Education Association leadership has declared that the classroom teacher is the key to a successful career education effort and must be deeply involved in career education program decisions. Even these few examples will serve to illustrate the seriousness of the problem.

Coming closer to home for the vocational education community, it is obvious that some vocational educators lost interest in career education when career education began to voice concerns that extended beyond vocational education. In some States, vocational education funds have been withdrawn from career education with no apparent concern for the effect such withdrawal may have on the total career education movement. It is almost as though, if a given activity is not fully supported by vocational education funds, some vocational educators develop a lack of trust in the activity due largely to the fact that they do not totally control it.

To me, this seems very strange indeed. The AVA resolution on Career Education, passed in Atlanta in 1973, simultaneously expressed a continuing endorsement for career education along with a plea that *additional* funding sources be found. That resolution, as I read it, said nothing about withdrawing all vocational education funds from the career education movement.

For my part, it makes no more sense for vocational education to move away from career education than for career education to move away from vocational education. Career education and vocational education need each other. As career education moves beyond vocational education, it must be sure to never move away from the field of vocational education. A very great deal of my energy is, and will continue to be, dedicated to making sure that this does not happen.

The essential strategy I have been using is one of seeking a small amount of money specifically earmarked for career education. I hope to use this money to encourage such additional funds as are needed from all other parts of education and from the business-labor-industry-professional community. This strategy is based on an assumption that control of any enterprise is, in many ways, operationally defined by its funding sources. I have assumed that, if fiscal responsibility can be shared, then the collaborative goals of career education can and will be met. I think all parts of our formal educational system should have a voice in forming career education policies and that both the business-labor-industry-professional-government community and the home and family structure should also have such a voice. This strategy will be most difficult to implement unless fiscal responsibility for career education is shared.

Perhaps this strategy, too, is wrong. The alternative, of course, is to seek categorical career education funds in sufficient amounts to fund all career education efforts. At the Federal, State, and local levels, this would constitute a major change in policies now in common existence. This, then, is a second matter on which your advice is badly needed.

"What's Mine is Mine"

A third serious problem can be seen as a "What's mine is mine" attitude. So long as career education was viewed as simply a concept, an attitude, and a point of view, this problem did not exist. That is, where there is no substance, nothing is "taken away" from anyone. It was only when people in career education began to think in terms of *programs*, rather than simply concepts, that this problem arose.

At this point in time, most persons who write about career education are doing so in programmatic terms. They speak about career awareness, career exploration, career decisionmaking, career preparation, career entry, and career progression (including re-education) as programmatic elements of career education. Career education *programs* are being organized in ways that emphasize the important contributions many parts of the formal educational system and the broader community make to various aspects of career

education. This trend towards speaking programmatically about career education was, in its early stages, strongly re-enforced by the 1971 "Position Paper on Career Education" issued by the State Directors of Vocational Education in which the following statements appear:

" It is this latter component of Career Education—that of opportunity to prepare for employment—which can be well-served by contemporary programs of occupational education. To deny this climaxing opportunity (—) is to nullify the purpose of Career Education. . . ."

"2. Career Education is not synonymous with Vocational Education but Vocational Education is a major part of Career Education."

Note that, in this 1971 statement, the State Directors of Vocational Education, while intent on carving out a major part of Career Education for vocational education, emphasized strongly that it was *career preparation* they were speaking about and that they did not claim other parts of career education as belonging in vocational education.

In a strategy sense, I have been attempting to emphasize the multiple involvement of a wide variety of kinds of personnel—both from within and outside of the formal educational system—in each of the programmatic components of career education. Rather than assign each component to a different segment of persons, I have been trying to demonstrate that, by working together in a collaborative fashion, many segments of both Education and the larger society can make valuable contributions to each of career education's program components. Usually, I think of one kind of personnel as key but with supportive assistance from many others. For example, I think of the elementary teacher as a key person in career awareness, but I look for involvement of parents, counselors, vocational educators, and resource persons from the business-labor-industry-professional community in the total career awareness component of the career educational program. I tend not to worry about who gets "credit" for helping students, but, rather, how much help the student receives in this component of career education.

Similarly, I contend that, while vocational educators play a major role in occupational preparation, important roles are also played by academic educators for college bound students and by business and labor personnel for all students. When I think about the career decisionmaking component of career education, I see the career guidance specialist playing a key role, but I do not see him or her as the only functionary in this component of career education. It is this kind of true collaboration that, in my opinion, will allow career education to serve as an integrative force that will bring many parts

of the educational system and the larger society together in seeking to attain the goals of career education.

In terms of legislative strategy, my current position is that I would strongly support efforts of both AVA and of APGA to fund functionaries (personnel) from both fields in a wide variety of career education's program components. I do not feel I can support efforts to claim that the *functions* themselves are the *exclusive* right of either vocational education or of guidance personnel. The functions should, it seems to me, be supported in career education legislation. The plea I make is an "anti-turfsmanship" one aimed at assuring that no single part of Education assumes control of any given component of career education. Unless this "anti-turfsmanship" strategy succeeds the collaborative and integrative goals of career education cannot be met.

At this point, I very much need and want some direct advice. If I am simply "tilting at windmills" where there is no real danger, I need to understand that this is so. If, on the other hand, you agree with me that a problem exists, then I need suggestions and assistance in solving it.

"What's In It For Me?"

Finally, a fourth problem can be thought of as a "What's in it for me?" attitude. The entire research base of the psychology of motivation is illustrative of the fact that no mortal person engages in endeavors that promise no hope of personal benefit. For career education to seek the collaborative efforts of all education personnel, personnel from the business-labor-industry-professional-government community, and from the home and family structure demands that each segment see some sensible answer to the "What's in it for me?" question. The obvious danger, with a movement such as career education which is still young, weak, and undernourished, is one of over-promise and under-delivery. What can and should we promise to those we seek to involve in career education?

To date, our promises have been much more prominent than our products. Among the promises we have made are the following:

- We have promised teachers that, if they follow a career education approach, both they and their students will enjoy school more
- We have promised both parents and businessmen that a career education approach to education will result in students increasing their achievement levels in the basic academic skills
- We have promised vocational educators that career education will raise the status of vocational education and that vocational education will become a true *choice* to be considered by all students

We have promised counselors that, in career education, they will have a key and crucial role to play that will increase both the need for and the status of counselors

- We have promised the business-labor-industry-professional-government community that a career education emphasis will result in more persons leaving our educational system equipped work vocational skills, with good work habits, and with a desire to work
- We have promised students, at all levels of education from the elementary school through the university, that a career education emphasis will help them discover a more meaningful set of reasons for learning
- We have promised the humanists in Education that, by including unpaid work as well as paid employment in the career education concept, career education will have a humanizing, rather than a dehumanizing, impact
- We have promised the liberal arts education that we will emphasize education as preparation for work as one among several basic goals of Education in ways that neither demean nor detract from other goals

We have promised minorities, the economically disadvantaged, the physically and mentally handicapped, the gifted and talented, females, and adult education students that career education is intended to meet their needs to find work that is possible, meaningful, and satisfying to them.

We have promised all of these things because we have faith that career education can, indeed, deliver on each of these promises. People have believed us and, according to CCSSO preliminary data, approximately 5,000 of the 17,000 school districts in the United States have initiated some form of career education effort. Yet, the hard truth is that, three years and over 60 million dollars of expenditures later, we are essentially still asking all of these groups to accept career education on the basis of our faith in this movement.

Our strategy has been one of concentrating our major operational and evaluation efforts at the point of least resistance - the elementary school. We have hit first that part of Edueation where the least amount of change is needed and where our chances of obtaining positive results appeared to be greatest. This strategy assumes that, if we ean demonstrate concrete successes at the elementary school level, other levels of Education will be encouraged to move in a career education direction. We have purposely, it seems, stayed away from a concentrated emphasis on those points in Education where the results would be most dramatic - i.e., the transition from school to the world of paid employment - beeause the risks of failure, in these days, seems extremely great.

It may well be that, if we are really serious about attaining the integration of vocational and academic education, we should be concentrating our efforts at that level of education where the two have been in most obvious conflict - the senior high school. Such a strategy, while holding high potential for negative short-term results, also holds high potential for making clear to all concerned the basic concepts of career education in terms of the challenges for change that they hold. Again, we are faced with a problem on which both help and advice is badly needed. Are we promising too much? Are we concentrating delivery of promises on the wrong people and at the wrong levels? What strategy will best ensure the long run survival and success of the career education movement?

The National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education has, since the inception of career education, played a key leadership role in both the conceptualization and the implementation of career education. As a result, the career education movement has evolved in ways that closely approximate the conceptual view contained in the Association's 1971 Position Paper on Career Education. That paper has served as one of my "bibles" in my efforts to further career education. It is now time to assess the results and to decide whether or not the 1971 position of the Association should be re-affirmed or revised. I hope that these remarks may be helpful in making such an assessment a reality.

REFERENCES

1. Levitan, Sar. *Work is Here to Stay, Alas.* Salt Lake City: Olympus Publishing Company, 1974.

2. O'Toole, James. *The Reserve Army of the Underemployed.* Washington, D.C., Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education, 1975.

3. Hoyt, K. B. "Answering the Critics of Career Education." Science Research Associates *Guidance Newsletter,* April-May 1974. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1974.

4. National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education. *Position Paper on Career Education.* Las Vegas, Nevada: The Association, 1971.

GPO 906-580