DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 821 08 CE 010 050

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth
TITLE Career Education Implications for Counselors. Monographs on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 37p.
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402 (Stock Number 017-080-01619-2, $0.55, minimum charge of $1.00 for each mail order)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *Change Strategies; Concept Formation; Cooperative Planning; *Counseling Goals; Counselor Characteristics; *Counselor Functions; *Counselor Role; Counselor Training; Educational Needs; Guidance Counseling; Guidance Objectives; Higher Education; Job Placement; *Occupational Guidance; Student Placement

ABSTRACT

The set of four papers contained in this monograph focus on the counselor's importance in implementing a career education effort. The first paper, "Career Education: Challenges for Counselors," proposes a set of suggested changes in role and functions for school counselors. While covering a wide range of activities, it centers attention on the key importance of the counselor as a member of the career education "team." The second article, "Career Education and Counselor Education," addresses the problem of finding and focusing on an appropriate response to career education on the part of counselor education. A number of alternative actions counselor educators might consider for collaborating with career education are suggested. In the third article, "Career Guidance, Career Education, and Vocational Education," an attempt is made to conceptualize differences among these three concepts. The paper suggests that, while career education needs professional counselors, it is neither a synonym nor a substitute for career guidance. The final paper, "The Role of Career Counseling and Placement in the College and University," addresses counseling in the college and university setting. General implications for change are discussed. (TA)

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

CAREER EDUCATION IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNSELORS

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*

2

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1977

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price: 55 cents
Stock Number 017-080-01619-2
There is a minimum charge of $1.00 for each mail order

CAREER EDUCATION: CONSIDERATIONS FOR COUNSELORS

PREFACE

The Office of Career Education, USOE, recently published a monograph entitled "School Counselors And Career Education" based on advice received from practicing school counselors. This set of papers is intended to supplement that monograph with some additional thoughts regarding counselors and career education.

The set of four papers contained here stands as clear evidence of the importance the Office of Career Education attaches to the counselor as a pivotal person in the implementation of a career education effort. The first of these papers proposes a set of suggested changes in role and functions for school counselors. While covering a wide range of activities, it centers attention on the key importance of the counselor as a member of the career education "team."

The second article addresses directly the problem of finding and focusing on an appropriate response to career education on the part of counselor education. While the author's biases are clearly evident in this article, an attempt has been made to suggest a number of kinds of alternative actions counselor educators may wish to consider.

In the third article, an attempt is made to conceptualize differences among career education, career guidance, and vocational education. The emphasis on career guidance as a "service," rather than a "program," is obviously one that many professionals in counseling will find less than fully acceptable. It is hoped that the view of career education as a "concept" may be relatively more acceptable. The paper tries to make it clear that, while career education needs professional counselors, it is, in no way, either a synonym nor a substitute for career guidance.

The final paper speaks to counseling in the college and university setting. The general implications for change posited in this article hopefully will not keep readers from considering the specific kinds of changes proposed for counseling personnel.

CONTENTS

CAREER EDUCATION: CHALLENGES FOR COUNSELORS

The counselor is a key person in the career education concept. Thus, the future of career education will obviously be affected by the counseling and guidance movement. The degree to which counseling and guidance will be affected by career education is neither clear nor obvious. It is the purpose of this paper to provide one view of possible challenges for counselor change posed by career education. It will, of course, be up to each counselor to decide whether to accept or reject these challenges. I pose them here because, in my opinion, they can no longer be ignored.

As background for this contention, I refer to two facts that became clear during the summer of 1974 when I conducted 20 "mini-conferences" for leading career education practitioners from school districts throughout the United States. Each "mini-conference" consisted of from 10 to 15 persons nominated by their State coordinator of career education as representing the best K-12 career education programs in their State. In all, approximately 275 persons attended these mini-conferences. Two facts pertinent to this discussion became apparent. One was that, of persons nominated to attend these conferences, more came from a guidance background than from any other single professional specialty in Education. The second was that, when conference participants were asked to name factors currently acting to impede career education in the senior high school, counselors were among the most frequently mentioned "roadblocks" named. Both facts have implications that form the basis for the challenges I want to present here. The fact that they may appear to be contradictory simply adds to the challenge.

Before proceeding, let me state my own personal biases as clearly and as forcefully as possible. I believe career education is a vehicle that can be used to greatly strengthen the status of counselors, the effectiveness with which counselors function, and the personal satisfactions that can accrue to practicing school counselors throughout the nation.

As I have worked in career education, various positive potentials for change in counselor role and function have become more and more obvious to me. By relating them here, I hope to present a basis each counselor can use for deciding whether or not to become involved in career education.

The Significance of "work" in Career Education: Implications for Change in Counselor Role and Function

The concept of work is, in my opinion, central to conceptualization of the entire career education movement. This concept holds several key implications for change in counselor role and function. I am well aware of the negative connotations the word "work" holds for many counselors as well as for many others in our society at the present time. Thus, my first task must be one of presenting a definition of "work" that hopefully will foster more positive attitudes.

Thanks to my many critics, I have frequently revised the specific definition of work that I want to use in career education. My current definition is:

> "WORK is conscious effort, other than activities whose primary purpose is related to either coping or relaxation, aimed at producing socially acceptable benefits for oneself and/or for oneself and others."

The key words in that definition are:

- "conscious" - which means that it is chosen by the individual, not forced on him or her involuntarily (as "labor" is)
- "effort" - which means that some necessary degree of difficulty is involved
- "produce" - which means that some clear outcome is sought as a result of the effort being expended

"socially acceptable benefits" - which means that the outcome is one aimed at helping, rather than hurting, those who receive the results of the effort being expended

Several basic concepts are implied in this definition. First, this definition of "work" is not limited to the world of paid employment. On the contrary, it obviously includes work done as part of one's leisure time, the work of the volunteer, the full-time homemaker, and the student. Second, this definition of "work" allows for economic, sociological, and psychological reasons for working to exist singly or in some combination. Third, while in no way denying economic reasons for working, this definition extends beyond such reasons to include the basic human need of all human beings to accomplish - to do - to achieve something. To feel that someone needs him or her for something. To know that, because he or she lives, the work is, in some way and to some degree, benefited.

The concept of "work," implied in this definition, is a very humanistic one indeed. As such, it is applicable to all persons, of all ages, in all settings - both within and outside of the formal educational system. Because the concept extends from the pre-school

through the retirement years, it is truly developmental in nature. This leads logically to defining "career" as:

"CAREER is the totality of work one does in his or her lifetime." That, to me, is what the word "career" means in the term "career education." You can see why I must insist that the word "work" is central to the basic meaning of career education. It must also be obvious why I reject a view of career education pictured as being concerned with "all of life."

Several direct implications for change in counselor role and function are immediately apparent to those who recognize the centrality of work in the conceptualization of career education. Perhaps the most obvious is the degree to which the concept of work focus on accomplishment - on performance. The research literature of guidance has, for years, clearly demonstrated that the best prediction of future performance is past performance. Yet, in typical student appraisal programs, we often seem to have overlooked the operational significance of this common research finding. For example, we know the best single predictor of future grades is past grades. Yet, we continue to value various so-called "scholastic aptitude" tests more than we do grades. John Holland has demonstrated that the best predictor of future vocational activities is to ask students about their vocational interests, not measure them with interest inventories. This, too, has had little apparent effect on practices.

One of career education's tenets is that a person is, to a very large degree, a product of his or her past accomplishments and experiences. When we ask an individual "Who are you?" the individual, if responding honestly and completely, tells us primarily about his or her past accomplishments. True, one often begins answering the question by describing his or her characteristics - name, age, physical characteristics, interests, and values. Such descriptions help us differentiate one person from another - i.e., they serve as "identifiers." They do not help us greatly in our attempts to understand the person. We *predict* a person's behavior, to a limited degree, by the way in which we combine data concerning the person's characteristics. We *understand* another person only through behaviorial expressions. I submit that the emphasis on accomplishments which the word "work" brings to career education holds great potential for counselor use in better understanding those persons counselors seek to serve.

The generalization I am making is that, in the past, we have put an undue emphasis on *describing* students by their *characteristics* and a relative lack of emphasis on *understanding* students through their *behaviorial accomplishments*. Career education holds great potential for helping counselors correct this imbalance.

Further, I submit that an emphasis on accomplishment, if carried out in a positive fashion, holds great potential for increasing meaningful student self-understanding. I think we have spent too much time *telling* students they are worthwhile and too little time letting students *discover* their own worth through their successful accomplishments. The key word here, of course, is "success." Our guidance literature is heavily burdened with normative approaches to increasing student self-understanding - with attempting to help students understand themselves through letting them know how they compare with others on some set of norms. The prime approach to self-understanding used in career education is one of helping the student see what he or she has accomplished - not in seeing what he or she failed to accomplish. We emphasize success, not failure.

The generalization I am making is that, in the past, we have put an undue emphasis on normative comparisons and a relative lack of emphasis on demonstrated success in our attempts to increase student self-understanding. Career education challenges all counselors to correct this imbalance.

Finally, I submit that the emphasis on "work" found in career education holds great potential for helping individuals discover a personal meaning and meaningfulness of work in their total life-style. Too often, in the past, counselors have spoken to students about "work" only in terms of the world of paid employment. Broader lifestyle implications, when discussed in conjunction with occupational decisions, have too often failed to consider either the desirability or, in many instances, the necessity many individuals have for work during part of their leisure time. This is particularly tragic for those individuals - and there are many - who find their roles in the world of paid employment so dehumanizing that it could not possibly be called "work." Instead, it must surely be regarded as "labor" - as primarily an involuntary set of activities the individual endures in order to gain enough economic benefits so as to find some happiness when away from his or her place of paid employment.

I submit that those who find themselves in such dehumanizing roles in the world of paid employment have no less a human need for work than does any other human being. A discussion of occupational goals devoid of discussion of the meaning and meaningfulness of work in the total lifestyle of the individual results in many individuals finding both their paid jobs and their total lifestyle largely lacking in significant personal meaning. That, I am afraid, is what has happened much too often.

The generalization I am making is that, in the past, we have put an undue emphasis on work only in the world of paid employment and a relative lack of emphasis on work as a positive part of an individual's leisure time. This, then, is a third imbalance that career education challenges counselors to correct.

The Significance of Action in Career Education: Implications for Change In Counselor Role and Function

Career education is action-centered and experience-oriented. If you have read the career education literature, you must be impressed by the emphasis on such expressions as "hands on," "work experience," "field trips," and "work study." Its emphasis on the project approach and on a general "learning-by-doing" emphasis has reminded many of the philosophy and the recommendations made many years ago by John Dewey. Inso far as this *portion* of career education is concerned, there is justification for the analogy.

This approach seems to have great appeal for the "now" generation of students. Rather than talking about the future in abstract terms, they are experiencing what it would be like if, as adults, they were to engage in various forms of work. Because of the implications such activities hold both for increasing student self-understanding and for decision making, it would seem worthwhile for counselors to consider becoming actively involved in helping students gain such experiences. Perhaps it is time, as one student said to me, for counselors to "spend less time giving me sympathy and more time giving me help."

If counselors were to accept this challenge, they would be spending relatively less time collecting and filing standardized test score data and relatively more time in helping to design and use performance evaluation measures. They would spend less time talking with students about their need for part-time work and relatively more time in helping students find it. They would spend relatively less time helping students gain admission to college and relatively more time helping students decide what they plan to do after they leave college. That is, going to college would not, for most students, be a way of avoiding work but rather a way of preparing oneself for work. It would put a purpose in college attendance that, at present, is largely non-existent for many of our so-called "college bound" students.

I submit that the action orientation of career education calls for more "action-oriented" counselors. I further submit that, if counselors were to change in this direction, they would be perceived by students in a more positive light. In asking counselors to consider this kind of change, I am simply asking that we reflect on Maslow's needs structure and consider its implications for change in counselor behavior. If we think about this carefully, we may discover that we have spent relatively too much time in attempting to meet student self-actualization needs and relatively too little time meeting their prior needs for survival and for security.

The Significance of Collaboration in Career Education: Implications for Change In Counselor Role and Function

A third basic emphasis in career education is one of collaboration of efforts both within the formal educational system and among that system, the business-labor-industry-professional-government community, and the home and family structure. Much of the rationale and organizational structure of career education is based on this basic principle of collaborative - not merely cooperative - effort. It is an emphasis that places high value on the total amount of help made available to any given individual and a relatively low value on assigning specific persons or organizations "credit" for such help.

This emphasis asks those teachers we call "academic" and those we call "vocational" to join together in making education, *as preparation for work*, both a prominent and a permanent goal of all who teach and of all who learn. It encourages a project approach to teaching that allow several teachers to be involved in a single project. It encourages the use of resource persons from the business-labor-industry-professional-government community in the classroom. It encourages the active involvement of parents in exposing youth to work values, to teaching good work habits, and in assisting youth in career decision making. It urges the classroom teacher to discuss the career implications of subject matter and to help students explore both the nature of various kinds of work and student aptitude for such work as regular classroom activities. In short, the career education movement has proclaimed that career guidance, in its fullest sense, is the proper business and concern of the entire school staff, of the business-labor-industry-professional-government community, and of the home and family. By doing so, career education has denied that career guidance is the exclusive responsibility of the counselor.

Counselors can, of course, choose to react to this emphasis in a variety of ways. Some way very well react negatively by asserting that career guidance is one of the unique roles of the professional counselor. Others may react by pointing to the obvious lack of both skill and understanding in career guidance present on the part of many who work in career education. Still other counselors may, when faced with a career education program, profess to be disinterested in career guidance and busy themselves with other kinds of activities that they consider to more properly fit their role.

I submit that the most appropriate and productive role counselors could play is to enthusiastically endorse and enter into the collaborative efforts of the career education movement. I think counselors should be actively seeking to help teachers discover and

infuse career implications of their subject matter into the teaching-learning process. I think counselors should be active participants in establishing and engaging in collaborative relationships with persons from the business-labor-industry-professional-government community. I think counselors should seek to actively involve parents in the career decision making process. In short, I think counselors will gain most if, instead of proclaiming career guidance as their "unique" role, they share their expertise in career guidance with all others involved in the career education program. Counselors will, in my opinion, gain more status and acceptance by sharing their expertise than by "hoarding" it.

This would, of course, demand that counselors give a higher priority to career guidance than many now do. If this happens, I submit that both students and parents will be happier with counselors than many now are. It would demand that counselors spend relatively less time in their offices and relatively more time working directly with teachers. If this happens, I submit that counselors would be better accepted as members of the school staff. It would demand that counselors spend relatively more time outside the school building interacting with both parents and with members of the business-labor-industry-professional-government community. If this happens, I submit that students will, in the long run, receive more and better career guidance than if the counselor tries to be the primary person helping students in this area. Finally, I submit that the need for elementary school counselors will become clearer to school boards everywhere and that the number of such counselors will increase.

In short, I view career education's call for a collaborative emphasis as one holding high potential for increasing both the acceptability and the effectiveness of the professional counselor. I do not see negative results for the guidance movement if this direction is followed.

Concluding Remarks

This presentation has been purposely limited to challenges for future change that the career education movement poses for counselors. It seems mandatory to conclude by concentrating briefly on the appropriateness of such a limitation at this time.

To those who would prefer to wait, in discussing counselor role, until we know for sure whether or not the career education movement is going to survive, I say that, by the time that answer is known, it will be too late. I do not know if the career education movement can survive without the active involvement and commitment of the counseling and guidance profession. I do know that, if it

survives without that involvement, it will be because it has been forced, by necessity, to find other kinds of personnel to do what we are now asking counselors to do. The long-run implications here are obvious.

To those who would try to proclaim that career guidance is part of the unique role and function of the counselors, I say they are living in the past and, professionally, are already dead. The days of educational isolationism are, in my opinion, gone forever. Relationships between education and the larger society become closer each year. We have reached a point when we must abandon the false assumption that the best way to ready students for the real world is to lock them up inside a school building and keep them away from that world. It is, to me, not a question of whether or not the counselor must become involved in activities outside the school. Rather, the question is one of the kinds of activities in which the counselor will be involved. In my opinion, career education is the most viable option now available to school counselors.

To those counselors who may be inclined to claim the career education movement as their own, I say they have missed the basic point of collaboration inherent in the career education concept. True, viewed as a *process* consisting of career awareness, exploration, decision making, preparation, entry, and progression, career education and career guidance have much in common. When viewed as a collaborative *program effort*, they do not. Career development, like vocational education, is properly viewed as one programmatic component of career education. Career education is no more a simple extension of what, in the past, has been known as career development than it is of what has been known as vocational education.

To those who profess no interest in either career guidance or in career education, I say they should study carefully reactions of students, parents, and the general public to recent public opinion polls concerned with both counselors and with career education. In my opinion, these polls are clearly supporting both the career education movement and the counselor's deep involvement in that movement. While, of course, such polls are no suitable substitute for professional decisions made by counselors, it seems to me unwise to ignore them.

The career education movement, and the guidance movement, are both faced with crucial decisions regarding future directions. It seems to me that both have much to gain by joining forces. I hope that it seems that way to some of you.

CAREER EDUCATION AND COUNSELOR EDUCATION

The current national emphasis on education and work is gaining in strength each year. In a generic sense, that emphasis has been organized and operates under the term "career education." One of the outgrowths of this emphasis has been a nationwide call, on the part of diverse segments of the total population, for an increased emphasis on career guidance, counseling, placement, and followup. This call is reflected in a variety of public opinion polls, in studies and surveys critical of current counselor practices, and in the Congress. It is a call that no conscientious counselor educator or supervisor can afford to ignore.

There seems little doubt, but that strong pressures - with or without new Federal legislation—will continue to grow aimed at increasing the emphasis on career guidance in counselor education programs and in counselor role and function. If some version of APGA's bill entitled "The Career Guidance and Counseling Act of 1975" becomes law, it can be predicted that the response of both counselor educators and supervisors of counselors will be both immediate and highly positive—i.e., from the beginning, our movement has been shaped and has shifted in response to Federal legislation. (Hoyt, 1974.) If such legislation is not forthcoming, debate regarding the proper response to this call for an increased emphasis on career guidance and counseling will probably continue within the personnel and guidance movement.

My purpose here is not to argue the merits nor the appropriateness of the call for an increased emphasis on career guidance and counseling. For my part, I am firmly convinced this emphasis is much needed and long overdue in counselor education programs for counselors who will work in a wide variety of settings - including elementary and secondary schools, community colleges, post high school occupational education institutions, four-year colleges and universities, employment service, vocational rehabilitation, veteran administration, and community counseling settings. This should surprise no one who knows me even slightly. That is, my position on this question has, I hope, been both clear and consistent now for more than twenty years.

Today, I want to discuss an equally important controversy—namely, the relationships between career guidance and career education. There are some who, consciously or unconsciously, seem intent on creating a collision course between career guidance and career education. Unless this is checked, both the career guidance

and the career education movements will be damaged. More important, persons to be served by both movements will suffer. The time has come to face this problem and to seek a resolution that will avoid the collision. Hopefully, these remarks may serve as a positive contribution toward that goal.

The hard questions that must be answered include: (1) what differences in meaning exist between the terms "career guidance" and "career education"? (2) Should counselors seek to become "career education coordinators"? and (3) If counselors and career education coordinators are two different "animals," how should they relate to each other? In posing these questions, I make no pretense that I know how to answer any of them. I am saying only that these questions must be answered—and soon. Because of the urgency and importance of obtaining such answers, I want to devote the remainder of this presentation to a brief discussion of these three questions. My uncertainties and the personal dilemmas I am now facing with respect to each should be made clear through this discussion.

"Career Guidance" and "Career Education": Similarities and Differences

The similarities between "career guidance" and "career education" are obvious and require only brief mention. First, both express concern for helping all persons, of all ages, in all settings, recognize and capitalize on relationships between education and work—both paid and unpaid work—that exist in our society. Thus, they share a common generic goal. Second, both embrace a developmental philosophy that recognizes career development as part of human growth and development and work values as part of one's total system of personal values. Thus, they have a common basis in philosophy.

Third, and most important, both have, in many ways, been organized and discussed using, as a framework, the process of career development. Such words as career awareness, career motivation, career exploration, career decision making, career preparation, career entry, career progression, and career maintenance are clearly appropriate for use and are used whether one speaks about "career guidance" or about "career education." Those who would argue otherwise are, in my opinion, playing a senseless game of "educational turfsmanship" which, in these times, can neither be defended nor operationalized in practice. Thus, both "career guidance" and "career education" have a common basis on their emphasis on the career development process.

The differences are more difficult to discern. As of now, I see them as three in number. First, in my opinion, career education is best thought of as a *concept* while career guidance is best thought of as a *service*. I have written about this in some detail elsewhere. (Hoyt, 1974, b.) The basic point I have tried to make is that career education is best thought of as a concept to be infused throughout a wide variety of programs and services both within and outside of the formal educational system. It is not properly thought of as a separate program or service to be added on to others that currently exist. Career guidance, on the other hand, must be thought of as a service to individuals that demands a clear organizational identity and the effective presence of a clearly identified body of professional specialists. In this sense, career education can be thought of as a concept that demands, among other things, the presence of professional career guidance specialists for its effective implementation. Thus, one difference is that which exists between a concept and a service.

A second basic difference is evident in operational philosophy required for recognition, effectiveness, survival, and growth. Career education, as a concept, is based on the *collaborative* involvement of the entire formal educational system, the business-labor-industry-professional-government community, and the home and family structure. It urges the active involvement of a wide variety of personnel from all three of these segments of society. Its effectiveness is measured by the total amount of help an individual receives, not on who receives credit for helping. The career guidance movement, on the other hand, has, for the last fifteen years, devoted a considerable amount of energy to identifying and emphasizing the *unique* role and function of the professional counselor. The career education movement must continue to emphasize collaboration if it is to be effective and to flourish. The career guidance movement must continue to emphasize the need for professionally prepared counselors if it is to be effective and to flourish. This, then, is a second difference.

Third, and by far the most important difference, is that career education, as a concept, is equally dependent on both the career development process and on the teaching-learning process as a means of organizing its implementation efforts. Career guidance, on the other hand, is very largely rooted in only one of these processes - namely, that of career development. As a concept that aims to be infused throughout the entire educational system, career education will be evaluated, first of all, on the basis of its effectiveness as a vehicle for improving educational productivity as measured by academic achievement. A major thrust and emphasis of career education is that of reducing worker alienation in the classroom on

the part of both students and teachers. An equally strong emphasis is placed on the need for expanding both the variety and nature of educational opportunities available to students. While career guidance personnel have, in many instances, expressed interest in these matters, they have not been considered part of either the professional preparation pattern or the job function of most professional counselors. They are of major importance to career education.

The Counselor As a Career Education Coordinator

The collaborative emphasis of career education would be sabotaged and destroyed were career education to seek to become a separate specialty or department to be added to all currently existing specialties in Education. Instead, its only hope is a continued interest and involvement of a wide variety of persons from both within and outside of Education. The trouble is, of course, that a concept that is supposedly a concern of everyone will become an action commitment of almost none unless some individual acts as a catalyst—a "ramrod"—to spur individual efforts. It seems inevitable to me that some persons carrying some such title as "career education coordinator" will be required for the effective implementation of the career education concept.

The question to be faced here is whether or not, in the public schools, the professional counselor should seek to play the role of career education coordinator. The problem is too complicated to be fully discussed here, but too important to be ignored. Four alternatives appear to be available for consideration at the present time. Please do not attach any implied preference by the order in which I discuss them here.

One available alternative would be for the career guidance movement to ignore the career education concept and concentrate, instead, on building up expertise and professional personnel for only the career guidance function. Obviously, there is much building of this nature required at the present time. It could be argued that the best way career guidance could serve career education would be to concentrate its primary attention on providing comprehensive and expert career development services to students of all ages in all kinds of educational settings. It could easily be argued that, if the counselor seeks to spread her or his preparation and job functions across the entire spectrum of career education, the net result may be a dilution in quality and effectiveness of that essential part of career education known as career guidance and counseling.

A second alternative would be for career guidance specialists to claim that they are today's most logical choices to serve as career education coordinators for a school system. It could easily be argued

that the career development expertise of the counselor is essential to share with all others who function in career education. With counselors now present in most schools, it would be quick and easy for such counselors to be named as career education coordinators. Similarly, many career guidance personnel would argue that there is no major area of career education—including its collaborative emphasis and its emphasis on the teaching-learning process—that has not been of interest and concern to career guidance specialists for years. Such persons could logically argue and defend a position that holds that, among all professionals currently employed in formal Education, the counselor could most easily be re-educated so as to assume a position as career education coordinator.

For this argument to prevail, two major changes would have to occur. First, counselor education programs would have to undergo major overhaul. Second, the number of professional career guidance personnel would have to be greatly increased at every level of Education—from the elementary school through the college and university system. That is, the career guidance service would still have to be performed and made available to individuals. Professional career guidance personnel simply could not expand their functions to cover the entire spectrum of career education and still meet career guidance needs of individuals unless the number of career guidance specialists were greatly increased. If these two conditions could be met, this is an alternative worth considering.

A third alternative would be to think of the "career education coordinator" as one who is prepared and who operates at the support, technician, or paraprofessional level. Such an alternative would be very consistent with a view that holds career education as a concept that seeks the active involvement of everyone, not the replacement of anyone. It would allow the career education coordinator to serve as a resource for bringing persons from various parts of society together, to gather and supply information, materials, and referral sources to all who work in career education, and to perform the clerical and administrative tasks essential for operation of a career education effort. It would serve to re-enforce and emphasize the importance to career education of all educational specialties as well as those available in the broader community. At the same time, it would have the disadvantage of never allowing the whole effort to be anything more than the sum of its separate parts.

Finally, a fourth alternative would be to make the "career education coordinator" a kind of "super-professional" with expertise in career development, curriculum, the teaching-learning process, the free enterprise system, vocational education, work experience, and the sociology of the family - plus more. Such a person would have to be prepared at the advanced graduate school level and would

logically be employed at a high administrative spot in the educational system. The preparation program would obviously have to be multi-disciplinary in nature and include extensive practicum and/or internship experiences in the broader community outside of Education. Such a person would have the obvious advantages of being able to spot where weaknesses existed in the total career education effort, of providing professional assistance to those in need of improvement, and of serving as a recognized professional leader for the collaborative efforts of career education. The viability of this arrangement would, of course, depend on placing this person in such a high level in the organization that she or he could, in no way, be seen as a substitute for any professional at the operational level. The obvious major disadvantage of this alternative is that, at present, there are not funds available to either prepare or to employ such individuals.

How Should Counselors Relate with Career Education?

Since none of these four alternatives is, as of today, funded at a level that would allow it to be effectively implemented, it would seem that there is some point in making a few suggestions regarding how career guidance personnel might most effectively relate with the career education movement as it currently exists. My biases can perhaps best be summarized by a series of short "Do's and Dont's" statements. I present them here, not as absolute truths, but only to illustrate my current position.

1. DO think and decide about the four alternatives I have outlined here. If one appeals to you, work hard to implement it. If none is acceptable to you, think up a better one for yourself.
2. DON'T ignore the career education movement. It *is* here and it *is* expanding rapidly. It is, in many ways, similar in nature to career guidance. It needs and deserves your careful study and thoughts.
3. DO recognize and seek to implement the many ways in which full implementation of the career education concept calls for change both in counselor education programs and in counselor practice. These changes can and should come about whether or not any further legislation is enacted by the Congress for either career guidance or for career education. (Hoyt, 1974 c.)
4. DON'T be discouraged by the fact that career guidance represents but one educational specialty with which career education seeks a mutually dependent relationship. The fact that career education's concerns extend beyond career guidance in no way means that they do not include career guidance in a key and crucial manner.

5. DO recognize why career education is vitally concerned with the classroom teacher, with expanding learning alternatives available to students, with the personal meaningfulness of work in the total lifestyle of all individuals, and with ridding formal education of an isolationist attitude. These are concerns that we hope all professionals in education including those in career guidance—will share with each other.

6. DON'T adopt a self-serving stance in planning the future of career guidance. If our movement stands for anything, it seems to me it stands for a primary commitment to those we seek to serve not to the career guidance movement itself. I have been saying this for years. I hope that, someday, most educators will know what I mean.

It should be apparent that I have spoken here more out of ignorance than out of knowledge. I freely admit that I am much more aware of the questions we face than of the answers to those questions. We can and we will find appropriate answers to each of these questions. To do so will demand that we all be willing to think independently, communicate openly, and work collaboratively to do what seems right. I hope these remarks may serve as one contribution toward that effort.

CAREER GUIDANCE, CAREER EDUCATION, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

About ten years ago, I recall speaking to the Illinois Guidance and Personnel Association on a topic entitled "SS Needs of Counselors." So far as I know, that speech was never published and I have no copies of it. The two kinds of counselor "SS needs" I identified were, as I remember them, "Security and Status" as opposed to a second I called "Service to Students." The basic question I raised was "which of these two kinds of SS needs is in first place?" Now, ten years later, I find the question still appropriate even though the current concerns behind it have changed somewhat.

At the time of the Illinois speech, I was primarily concerned about the disproportionate amount of time counselors were devoting in efforts to meet the guidance needs of college-bound students. My major effort was a plea to give equal attention and to develop equal expertise in meeting the guidance needs of the vast majority of students—those who will never attain the baccalaureate degree. Formation of the Guidance Division of the American Vocational Association in 1969 stands as clear evidence that I was not alone in this concern. The basic justification for this AVA Division, when considered in light of APGA and all of its national Divisions, is the potential the Guidance Division of AVA has for assuring that the guidance needs of students and prospective students of vocational education will be met. These students needs brought us together and should keep us together.

Enactment and implementation of Part D, Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, with its emphasis on career guidance beginning in the elementary school, has served as a primary source of Federal funding for initial demonstration efforts in career education. Initial conceptualization concept—particularly those of Dr. Gene Bottoms and of Dr. Edwin Herr—are recognized and emphasized by Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr. in his new book, *Career Education*. The record is clear on this point.

Now, in 1974, we find Career Education a part of the law of the land and career education efforts underway in almost one third of all school districts in the United States. We find a simultaneous national interest and concern for improving the quality of both career guidance and of vocational education. I submit that causal, not incidental, relationships exist here. The career education movement, with its emphasis on education as preparation for work, has found enthusiastic national acceptance because it speaks to a real need of

almost all citizens. Yet, the delivery of effective career education is directly dependent on our ability to strengthen greatly both career guidance and programs of vocational education. Unless this is recognized, career education will never work.

Today, we find ourselves right back to the same question I raised with Illinois counselors ten years ago; namely, is our primary concern one of building security and status for ourselves or providing services to students? I submit that those who, today, are asking the question "How can we promote and develop career guidance?" or "How can we promote and develop vocational education?" or "How can we promote and develop career education?" are all asking questions that can and will often be interpreted to be in the realm of "status and security" questions. It is only when we are willing to make, as our primary question, "What student needs exist and what contributions can we make to meeting such needs?" that a "services to students" emphasis will emerge. It is my deepest personal and professional belief that, whenever and to whatever extent we put our own needs above those of students, we have lost our basic reason for being and the justification of our professional existence.

Let us, then, try to think about students and their needs rather than about ourselves and our needs. I am firmly convinced that, if we do so, we will get and deserve credit for ourselves. I am equally convinced that, if we fail to do so, we will receive, and deserve, continued criticism.

When I ask myself "what do our students need?" it seems to me that they need career education to operate as a *concept*, career guidance to operate as a *service*, and vocational education to operate as a *program*. I make no claim that my thoughts on these matters are correct, but only that they exist. I would like to devote the remainder of this presentation to sharing these thoughts with you.

Career Education As A Concept

There are two basic students needs in our culture that combine to form the rationale for career education. The first is the need, on the part of all students, to recognize and capitalize on the increasingly close relationship between education and work that exist now and will exist in the future. The second is the need for work to become a more meaningful part of the total lifestyle of the individual.

Career education seeks to meet these student needs through a combination of both integrative and collaborative efforts. We seek integration, within the formal system of education in order that Education, as preparation for work, will become both a prominent and a permanent goal of all who teach and of all who learn at every level of education. Further, we seek collaboration, in meeting these

student needs, among the formal system of Education, the business-labor-industry-government-professional community, and the home and family structure. In all such efforts, the emphasis is on how much help accrues to the student, not on who gets credit for helping.

The key to success of career education is recognition that a wide variety of persons–students, teachers, counselors, administrators, parents, businessmen, labor union members, church workers, and government workers–have responsibilities to assume and roles to play if career education is to meet the two basic student needs identified here. While maintaining their primary roles, the infusion of career education efforts makes all such persons "career educators." That is why, for example, we say both career guidance and vocational education are key components of career education. True, a career education coordinator is needed as a "ramrod," but the key help to students is provided by "career educators," both within and outside of the formal educational system.

The crucial and critical costs of career education are measured in time, effort, and commitment much more than they are in dollars. It depends on the expertise and dedication of everyone, not the replacement of anyone. It is a *concept* that demands the presence of *programs* and the provisions of a wide variety of *services*. But, by itself, career education is not properly viewed as either a program or as a service–as something to compete with, substitute for, or replace any program or service that now exists. Rather, it is best seen as a unifying force that provides a centrality of purpose around which a wide variety of persons can rally and work together in meeting these two crucial student needs.

Career Guidance As A Service

A democratic society is rooted in the opportunity for free and informed choices of its citizens. It is the basic student need for freedom of choice, coupled with the need for systematic assistance in reasoned decisionmaking, that combine to form the rationale for career guidance. The career guidance movement is rooted in the psychology of career development, the sociology of work in our culture, and the economic necessity of work for the survival of our system of government. It combines assistance in decisionmaking with assistance in implementing decisions that persons have made. The provision of information about both the individual and about opportunities available to the individual is a critical part of the base of career guidance. Equally critical is the provision of expertise and assistance in the career decisionmaking process. Career guidance has a solid substantive base of knowledge and expertise. Those who acquire expertise in this field, while carrying a variety of titles, are generically, included in the professional family of counselors.

Conceptually, career guidance and career education have much in common. That is, both are concerned with *all* students at *all* levels of education and in *all* educational settings. Both are rooted, methodologically, in the career development process. Both are developmentally oriented with concerns that extend from the pre-school through the retirement years. Both depend, for their success, on involvement and assistance from a great variety of persons from a number of disciplines and in a number of kinds of settings. There is, however, one essential difference which, if recognized, makes career guidance be regarded as a *service* and career education as a *concept*. The difference lies in the absolute necessity for career guidance specialists to interact with and provide direct assistance to persons in an individual and/or group relationship. While, to be sure, the total career guidance process is dependent on the efforts of many parts of society, career guidance must, above all else, be dedicated to providing direct assistance to students by persons with some expertise in this field. A career education coordinator is charged with encouraging and coordinating the efforts of many persons and segments of society, but not with providing direct, programmatic assistance to individuals. That is why career education is a *concept*. A career guidance specialist, while also counting on assistance from many others, knows that part of her or his job is providing direct professional assistance to students in making and implementing career decisions. That is why career guidance is a *service*.

It is because of the need to provide direct assistance to students that there will always be a bigger need for career guidance specialists than for career education coordinators. Career education coordinators, if successful, will increase greatly the need for career guidance specialists. Career guidance specialist, if properly prepared and professionally assigned, will be crucial persons in the successful implementation of the career education concept. Career education and career guidance need each other, but they are not the same thing. One is a concept while the other is a service. The essential difference lies in the necessity for providing direct assistance to students. At least this is the way it seems to me at the present time.

Vocational Education As A Program

In the field of Education, the word "program" properly implies the concept of instruction–the vehicle of the teaching-learning process–and a body of knowledge and skills which hopefully will be sought by students. Educational "programs" are organized into curriculums, courses, and instructional activities. They depend on the teacher-student relationship for success. They demand a number of instructional staff members, building space, and instructional tools,

equipment, and materials. They are, without doubt, the most expensive (in terms of dollar investment) part of Education. With this description, it should be apparent why I do not wish to view either career education or career guidance as educational *programs*. It should be equally apparent why vocational education is an educational program.

The basic student needs to be met by vocational education are, it seems to me, two in number. The first is the need to acquire general career skills that will enable students to adapt to and be adaptable in a very rapidly changing occupational society. The second is the need to provide students with sets of job specific skills that will enable them to successfully make the transition from the world of schooling to the world of paid employment. While, in a career education sense, these two basic student needs are ones of all students and so responsibilities of all educators, vocational education has chosen to assume special responsibility for helping those students who do not plan to graduate from a four year college or university meet these needs. Since this, at present, is estimated to constitute approximately 80% of all secondary school students, it is clear that vocational education has large and growing responsibilities to meet. Vocational education has suffered for years because of a false societal worship of the value of a college degree. Our total society has, and continues, to suffer much more because of its failure to provide adequate support and recognition to vocational education. It will do career education no good to help students want to work unless the educational system changes in ways that will enable students to acquire the vocational skills necessary for work in these times. It will do career guidance no good to help students in the decisionmaking process so long as an adequate variety of vocational education decisions remain unavailable to most students. The rationale for and the future of both career education and of career guidance are, it seems to me, directly dependent on our success in improving the quality, variety, and levels of vocational education available to both youths and adults throughout the nation.

Because of the need for expensive equipment, enlarged areas for classroom instruction, and the absolute necessity for closer teacher-student relationships, vocational education does cost more than many other kinds of instructional programs. For years the general public, including many professional educators, have been stingy in their support of vocational education and generous in their criticisms. Both career education and career guidance are currently experiencing some success in their efforts to reverse this situation and to gain more support for vocational education. We must all, it seems to me, recognize that vocational education is a *program* that is crucial to the success of career guidance as a *service* and to the

success of career education as a *concept*. To whatever extent career guidance and career education lose sight of this basic fact, both will be unsuccessful in meeting student needs.

The Price to Pay

I have spoken here about a combination of six student needs that are crying to be met. These include the need to:

1. Recognize and capitalize on the increasingly close relationships between education and work that exist now and will exist in the future.
2. Allow the need for work to become a more meaningful part of the total lifestyle of the individual.
3. Protect freedom of choice for the individual.
4. Provide systematic professional assistance in career decision making.
5. Acquire general career skills needed for career adaptability.
6. Acquire sets of job specific skills that can be used in making a successful transition from the world of schooling to the world of paid employment.

It is my firm and clear belief that we will meet each of these needs best by keeping all six in mind and as high priority items on our individual professional agendas. I am equally convinced that, to the extent any of us attempt to meet any one of these needs at the expense of any other, our students will have lost, not gained, by the action. At the present time, I am seeing two kinds of activities going on, both of which I consider negative for those who seek to serve students. The first, and of least importance, is a matter of semantics. I cannot believe that we are being helpful to students when some of us use the term "career education," others use the term "career development education," and still others use the term "life career development" when we all mean essentially the same thing. We have plenty of "enemies" in various parts of society. For those of us who share the same beliefs and the same goals to argue or bicker among ourselves seems, to say the least, counterproductive to me. I think there are basic and essential differences to emphasize between "career education" and "career guidance" and have tried to indicate the basic differences here. We don't need to create differences that don't exist.

The second kind of activity that currently worries me is, I guess, perhaps best described as that of "turfsmanship." It is reflected in those who ask such questions as "Is your field a part of mine or is my field a part of yours?" or "How much money will I get and how much will you get?" or "Will I be in charge or will you?" To me, those who persist in asking such questions and worshipping, as "SS

needs," those that I described earlier as "Security and Status" much more than they are "Service to Students." That, I think, is most unfortunate.

My plea is simple and straightforward. I ask that all of us - those in career education, those in career guidance, and those in vocational education join together in a common concern and a cooperative effort to meet the six kinds of basic student needs I have outlined here. If we can all view career education as a concept, career guidance as a service, and vocational education as a program and, further, if all of us will recognize and acknowledge how greatly we need each other, we will all be more successful in meeting these student needs. After all, isn't that why we exist?

THE ROLE OF CAREER COUNSELING AND PLACEMENT IN THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY

These remarks are intended to serve as a set of constructively critical generalizations regarding the present, as opposed to the needed, role of career counseling and placement in college and university settings. In general, generalizations regarding campus conditions are easily refuted by specific examples. I will welcome refutation by those supplying such examples. That is, these remarks are built around a general "if the shoe fits, wear it" philosophy. I have a strong feeling that the "shoe" to be pictured here may "fit" a large number of colleges and universities in spite of the fact that its design may have little initial appeal.

This presentation is divided into three parts. First, I will briefly discuss the goal of education, as preparation for work, in terms of its appropriateness for American higher education in these times. Second, I will make a series of highly critical comments regarding the current status of career counseling and placement in college and university settings. Finally, I will outline a series of suggestions for change that seem, to me, to be needed. The basis for these remarks rests simply on my own background of knowledge, experiences, and beliefs. I have purposely avoided citing any statistics or research studies in order to emphasize the purely personal bias inherent in these remarks.

Education As Preparation for Work: A Goal of American Higher Education

This audience should need no reminder that higher education in America, with its emphasis on preparing persons for the ministry, began with a strong commitment to the goal of education as preparation for work. It is equally obvious that, over the years, the goals of American higher education have broadened to include preparation for living, rather than only preparation for making a living - i.e., for work in the world of paid employment. This broadening of goals is, in my opinion, laudatory. It becomes subject to criticism only when education, as preparation for work, is eliminated from or given a very low priority among the goals of American higher education.

I have no objections to those who hold that the prime goal of American higher education is to teach students to think. I only ask that we also value teaching students to think about something

constructive. I have no objections to those who seek to help college students appreciate life and living. I ask only that those who learn to appreciate life also learn to contribute to making life better for others. I have no objections to those who seek to help college students enjoy life. I ask only that we give equal attention to helping students learn how to pay for that which they enjoy. In short, I do not ask that education, as preparation for work, be regarded as the only, nor necessarily the single most important goal of American higher education. I ask only that it be regarded as one of the prime goals of our system of higher education.

In saying this, I am not asking that this goal be accepted or emphasized by all institutions of higher education. One of the greatest strengths of our system of higher education lies in its diversity. That diversity must be preserved and encouraged. If a particular college or university does not include education, as preparation for work, among its prime goals, I simply ask that it make this clear to the students who attend, the parents who pay the tuition, and, if appropriate, to the taxpayers who subsidize the institution. If, after making this clear, the institution can survive and flourish, I would congratulate it and wish it well.

If, on the other hand, the institution clearly purports to hold education, as preparation for work, among its major goals, then I simply ask that it demonstrate its commitment to this goal through comprehensive and conscious efforts aimed at attaining it.

The time is past when the simple existence of a college or university can be automatically assumed to represent a commitment to education as preparation for work. True, the generalization still holds that more education makes one better prepared to find work in the world of paid employment - and there is ample evidence available to justify this claim. At the same time, it is increasingly also true that the optimum amount of education required as preparation for work varies widely from occupation to occupation—that, in terms of job requirements, it is possible to be "over-educated," as well as "under-educated" for a particular job. The boredom of the "over-educated worker" can be as big a contributor to worker alienation as can the frustration of the "under-educated worker."

A college degree, by itself, is no longer a guarantee of employment. Increasingly, employers are looking for persons possessing specific skills that accompany the degree. This, of course, does not mean that the degree has lost all its value in the job marketplace because this certainly is not the case. It seems to me that the college degree will come to represent the quality of adaptability that becomes increasingly important as the rapidity of occupational change continues to increase. As such, it will continue to be valued and sought. The quality of adaptability will grow in importance as a

necessary condition for employment, but decrease in importance as a *sufficient* condition. The presence of a set of marketable job skills must, for most individuals, be seen as equally important as a prerequisite for successfully entering and competing in an increasingly complex service-information-technology oriented occupational society.

As major contributors toward acquisition of adaptability, the role and function of the liberal arts in higher education will, in my opinion, continue to be of major importance in two ways. First, it will be important in the world of paid employment. Second, the liberal arts will be increasingly important as preparation for work in which individuals engage representing productive use of leisure time. This seems to me to represent an important point, not only in emphasizing the importance of the liberal arts as preparation for employment, but also in emphasizing the importance of unpaid work, as well as paid employment, as a means of bringing personal meaning and meaningfulness to the lives of individuals.

Current Conditions in American Higher Education: A Critical View

If education, as preparation for work, is accepted as a major goal of most colleges and universities, it is proper to ask about the extent to which this goal seems to have been attained. Further, if this is assumed to be an institutional goal, then it seems proper to ask what actions the institution is taking to attain it. That is, the question cannot be answered solely in a "results" sense—for example, in terms of how many graduates found employment upon leaving the campus. Rather, a significant portion of the answer must be phased in terms of conditions existing on the campus itself. Unless this is done, changing economic and occupational conditions will be substituted for institutional accountability in goal attainment. That, I am afraid, is exactly what has happened far too often in the past.

In my opinion, most colleges and universities in America have been remiss in accepting and in implementing education, as preparation for work, as a major institutional goal. To illustrate my concerns, I would first like to paint the picture as dismally and bleakly as possible. I do so in order to illustrate the seriousness of the problem rather than to issue a series of blanket indictments. Following this, I would like to take a more positive view by pointing to a number of promising changes that have seemed to emerge in the last few years.

First, let me state the charges in a negative fashion. In my opinion, each of the following conditions has existed and still exists today to

a greater extent than is warranted by any institution that professes to value the goal of education, as preparation for work:

1. Too many college freshmen come to campus with no clearcut or even tentative occupational goals. They have used the decision to attend college, not as a means of implementing career decisions, but rather as a means of avoiding such decisions. They left high school asking the question "Should I go to college or should I go to work?" as though going to college was a means of avoiding going to work.

2. The career counseling function has been assigned a low order priority on too many campuses. With inadequate assistance available, students have chosen career goals based on such extraneous factors as whether a given course was taught at 8:00 a.m. or at 10:00 a.m., whether a particular professor was consider "hard" or "easy," or how far they had to walk across campus to take a given course.

3. The placement function, on too many campuses, has received an even lower priority and assigned even lower status than the career counseling function. As a result, many placement offices have been under staffed, under publicized, and physically located in remote locations that are difficult for students to discover.

4. Too many professors express little or no interest in what students may do with the content being taught. Relationships between course content and career decisions are under-emphasized by too many professors. Too many professors appear to have adopted a philosophy which holds, in effect, it is none of the professor's business what students may choose to do with the content being taught.

5. Too many professors spend little or no time talking with individual students about career plans. Office hours for individual student appointments are often too few to be devoted to anything other than immediate course problems.

6. Too many representatives from business and industry visit college and university campuses primarily for purposes of recruiting and selecting job applicants. Many have spent more time complaining about the poor job higher education has done in preparing students for the real world of work than they have spent in collaborative efforts designed to help higher education solve the problem.

7. Work experience and work-study programs, on too many campuses, are either non-existent or only token efforts when considered as part of the career decisionmaking process. More college students who hold part-time jobs while attending school do so for purely economic reasons than for reasons related to career exploration and career decisionmaking.

I make these statements as general charges based on my observations and experiences, not as research conclusions. I have tried to state each charge in a form susceptible to research in hope

that such research may be stimulated. For my part, I am sufficiently convinced that each charge has sufficient validity so as to justify some corrective action now.

Having made this set of charges, I would like to conclude these observations regarding the current scene with some more positively based statements. I sense a feeling on college and university campuses that our students are much more serious about career decision-making today than they were even five years ago. I know that, on several campuses, what used to be called the "placement office" has now been renamed the "career development center" and functions of such offices have been broadened considerably—even, on some campuses, to the extent that students are exposed to such services during freshman orientation activities. I know that college and university cooperative education programs are on the increase, however slowly, and are much more numerous today than they were only a few years ago. I know that the use of the concept of "executives in residence" is increasing on college and university campuses. In all these ways, it seems clear to me that the American system of higher education has moved and is continuing to move positively toward efforts to meet the goal of higher education as preparation for work.

Laudable as such trends are, it seems to me that, on most college and university campuses, it is still a matter of "too little too late." As a final part of this presentation, I would now like to make a series of proposals for change.

Proposals for Change in Career Counseling and Placement in Higher Education

Dwindling enrollments and economic difficulties are causing serious problems for American higher education at the present time. In my opinion, the creation of a comprehensive action program emphasizing relationships between education and work would do much to turn this situation around. I do not think this can be accomplished simply by increasing the numbers of career counselors and placement specialists on the campus. The problem is too serious and too complex to lend itself to any such simple solution.

Before proceeding to describe the elements I consider desirable to ensure high quality career counseling and placement on college and university campuses, I feel I must describe three fundamental directions for change in higher education which, while essential to successful career counseling and placement, go far beyond these functions in terms of their implications for higher education. First, it seems to me the time has come for American higher education to state its goals and mission in ways that make clear college is not an

appropriate nor desirable choice for everyone. While the need for some form of postsecondary education is sure to increase, the need for college and university graduates has finite limits in today's occupational society. It seems to me American higher education must share the responsibility for making it clear to both youth and adults that different kinds of postsecondary institutions exist for different purposes.

Second, I believe the time has come to emphasize both the adaptability and the occupational preparation functions of higher education as being of equal importance rather than in a competing relationship. Both are essential if the goal of education, as preparation for work, is to be attained. Top priority, it seems to me, should be placed on ensuring high quality instruction in all areas, not in emphasizing one function as more basic, more important, or more prestigeful than the other. An emphasis on quality instruction is the best way of assuring quality of degrees awarded. American higher education, it seems to me, owes this assurance of quality both to its students and to those who employ its graduates.

Third, it is my personal belief that the time has come to abolish faculty tenure and to substitute valid due process procedures for use in decisions to retain and promote faculty members. Faculty tenure has, for many years, been held as essential to protect the right of the individual faculty member to say what she or he believes to be the truth along with the freedom to seek for new truths. Such freedoms are part of the bedrock of the higher education concept and must be preserved. The tenure system is not the only viable means available for protecting such freedom. A true system of due process, under which each professor is judged in terms of contributions to teaching, research, and service in some mutually agreed combination, would, it seems to me, be infinitely superior to the tenure system in these times. Freedom to do is not freedom to do nothing. Yet, on too many campuses, the professor who has attained tenure seems to have forgotten this. I see no way in which higher education can be truly accountable to our society in these times unless the tenure system is replaced with a due process system based on performance evaluations. I say this as one who has held faculty tenure since 1957 and who continues to hold it today. I will be happy to trade my tenure for a due process system based on performance evaluation having valid and objective indicators. I think many of my colleagues would join me in this plea.

These three kinds of basic change in American higher education will not come easily or quickly. While awaiting their evolution, there are a number of other less traumatic changes that could be instituted, each of which holds potential for improving career counseling and placement on the college and university campus. To fully describe

each would require far more time than remains. Thus, I will limit these remarks to a matter of simply identification.

1. I believe the college admissions, orientation, career counseling, and placement functions should be centralized and coordinated into a single unit. The placement function should begin prior to the time the student is admitted on campus. A single campus organization dedicated to helping each student answer the questions of (a) Why should I attend this institution? (b) What am I readying myself for? and (c) How can I capitalize on the education I have received? makes very good sense to me.

2. I believe every college and university student should be encouraged to make career decisions during her or his college career beginning with the admissions process. The proportion of college students with no declared major on our campuses today is alarmingly high. To offer such encouragement to students in no way needs to be or should be regarded as forcing premature, irrevocable occupational decisions on persons who are not ready to make firm decisions. The right to change should be held as sacred as the importance of choosing. We can protect and encourage that right if we dedicated ourselves to this effort. I am convinced it would pay big dividends in terms of both student behavior and student academic performance on the college and university campus.

3. I believe a career education resource center should be established on the campus of every college and university that holds education, as preparation for work, among its top goals. Such a center, in addition to housing staff members assigned to the admissions, orientation, career counseling, and placement functions, would also house staff members required for work experience and cooperative education programs. It would include, among its facilities: (a) an extensive library of occupational and self appraisal materials; (b) a career simulation facility that would be available to students who, in the process of career decisionmaking, want to explore what work would be like in a particular occupation; and (c) interview rooms available for use by both faculty members and representatives from business and industry who are visiting with students about career plans.

4. I believe both work experience and cooperative education opportunities should be made available to students as part of the career decisionmaking process. Further, I believe students should receive college credit for participating in such activities that recognizes the viability of combining a "learning to do" with a "doing to learn" emphasis in the total educational program. While I do not believe students should be required to participate in such programs, I am convinced that large numbers would elect to do so

were bonafide opportunities available to them. Such opportunities should represent both paid and unpaid experiences.

5. I believe the business-labor-industry-professional community should share responsibility with faculty members in helping college students understand and capitalize on relationships between education and work. To this end, I believe representatives from the business-labor-industry-professional community should, from time to time, be released from their regular places of employment to work on the college and university campus. There, their services could be valuable in many ways including: (a) serving as resource persons to university faculty members concerned about relationships between education and work; (b) serving as consultants in establishing and furnishing the career simulation facility; (c) serving as career advisors to students who wish to inquire about various occupational areas, either individually or in career seminars; and (d) serving as part of the career counseling and placement staff. This idea, in my opinion, would be even more viable if it included opportunity for faculty members to exchange positions with persons from the business-labor-industry-professional community for finite periods of time. As one who is currently participating in such an exchange program, I can assure you that I believe my current experiences will be helpful to me and to my students when I return to the university campus.

Beginnings could be made on each of these five steps almost immediately without the necessity for great increases in expenditures. The primary cost would involve effort, not money. To invest in such costs holds high potential for paying valuable dividends.

Concluding Statement

This presentation has concerned itself with a series of pleas aimed at emphasizing education, as preparation for work, as a vital and viable goal of American higher education. I have tried to make clear my strong beliefs that, while this represents only one of a number of worthy goals for higher education, it is one that deserves and requires more emphasis than it has received to date. I also tried to make it clear that I am, in no way, asking all colleges and universities to hold or to cherish this goal. I am simply asking those who profess to hold this goal to do more than has been done to date to emphasize it.

Second, I tried to make clear my belief that ample evidence exists that demonstrates both the past failures of American higher education to give this goal high priority and the current needs of students that call for such an emphasis. Third, I purposely inserted three of my personal biases regarding basic needed directions for change in American higher education. I did so primarily because each holds great implications for affecting the ability of any institution to

effectively emphasize education, as preparation for work. Finally, I presented five action steps that any college or university could take almost immediately if they chose to respond positively to challenges presented here.

I would close with the same admonition with which I began this presentation - namely, "if the shoe fits, wear it." I am convinced, if considered soberly and objectively, this shoe does indeed "fit" a great many institutions in whole or in part. I hope that the initial resentment these words are certain to provoke will not delay long the thoughtful consideration of these pleas.

REFERENCES

1974a Hoyt, K. B. "Professional Preparation for Vocational Guidance," (In) *Vocational Guidance and Human Development*, (E. L. Herr, Editor), Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.

1974b _____ "Career Guidance, Career Education, and Vocational Education," Address presented to the Guidance Division, American Vocational Association. New Orleans, December 1974.

1974c _____ "Career Education: Challenges for Counselors," Address presented to the All Ohio School Counselors Association, Columbus, Ohio. September 1974.

GPO 908-696