DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 204 603 CE 029 546

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth B.
TITLE Refining the Career Education Concept: Part V. Monograph on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 80
NOTE 82p.: For related documents see ED 132 427, ED 146 362, ED 164 860, and ED 186 634.
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Articulation (Education): *Career Education: Change Strategies: Community Colleges: Community Organizations: Educational Change: Educational History: Educational Needs: *Educational Objectives: Educational Philosophy: Educational Planning: *Educational Policy: Educational Practices: *Educational Trends: Futures (of Society): Linking Agents: Position Papers: Postsecondary Education: Program Development: Program Effectiveness: *School Community Relationship: *School Role: Secondary Education: Sex Bias: Sex Stereotypes: Social Studies: State of the Art Reviews: Trend Analysis: Unemployment: Urban Areas: Vocational Education: Volunteers: Youth Employment
IDENTIFIERS National School Volunteer Program: United States

ABSTRACT

Intended to chronicle the still-emerging concept of career education, this monograph contains 10 papers prepared during the 1979-80 academic year. In the first paper career education is discussed in terms of its role in developing employability/adaptability/promotability skills. The strong emphasis in 1979-80 on making career education a community effort rather than an effort of the education system alone is the focus of four papers dealing with service learning and career education, the National School Volunteer Program and career education, career education in urban settings, and linking guidance efforts with community organizations. Also discussed is the concept of career education as a vehicle for educational change (in a paper on career education and social studies). Career education's concern for extending the concept of career education to all segments of the population is illustrated in papers on the career education of the visually handicapped, career education in community colleges, contributions of career education to reducing youth unemployment, and career education's role in combating bias and stereotyping. (The first four monographs in this series are available separately through ERIC--see note.) (MN)

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

REFINING THE CAREER EDUCATION CONCEPT: PART V

by
Kenneth B. Hoyt
Director, Office of Career Education

July, 1980

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Shirley M. Hufstedler, Secretary

Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education
Thomas K. Minter

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1981

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Table of Contents

Refining the Career Education Concept: Part V

Preface

As the fifth in w[illegible] me an annual attempt to chronicle the still emerging concept o[illegible]cation, this monograph contains selected examples of major pa[illegible] for presentation and/or publication during the 1979-80 acade[illegible]h other monographs in the "Refining The Concept of Career Educ[illegible]s, only those articles illustrative of major OCE conceptual directions [illegible]year have been included.

The single most important [illegible] prepared during the last year was entitled "CAREER EDUCATION: A RE[illegible]RT CARD FOR THE 70s AND SOME PREDICTIONS FOR THE DECADE OF THE 1980s." This paper, for the first time, defined career education in terms of *one* cognitive goal and *two* process goals. All other papers prepared during the year centered around one of these three basic goals. In addition to specifying and defining these three goals, this paper attempted to summarize progress made toward their attainment during the decade of the 1970s and to offer some predictions regarding career education in the decade of the 1980s. Hopefully, it will be of some historical interest, at least, to those who contemplate career education in the year 1990.

The emphasis on identifying and defining "career education," in part, based on the 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills outlined in the "Report Card" article referred to above will also be seen in several other articles appearing in this monograph. This effort, which has been evolving since 1974, can be said to have come to fruition during the 1979-80 academic year. Readers will note that, whenever these 10 "career education skills" are identified, they are typically accompanied by reference to the growing body of research/evaluation evidence attesting to the fact that, through career education, such skills can, in fact, be delivered to persons. There have been no claims that career education is the *only* approach viable for use in providing such skills. At the same time, challenges have been extended to others to match career education's clear evidence of effectiveness. Currently, efforts to extend still further the body of evidence attesting to the worth of career education are being given a top priority within the Office of Career Education.

Second, this series of articles also illustrates the strong emphasis made during 1979-80 on making career education a community effort—not simply an effort of the Education system alone. Two specific attempts to form linkages are seen in this series—one in the article entitled "SERVICE-LEARNING AND CAREER EDUCATION" and the second in the article entitled "THE NATIONAL SCHOOL VOLUNTEER PROGRAM (NSVP) AND CAREER EDUCATION." In a more generic way, this same priority emphasis can be seen illustrated in "CAREER EDUCATION IN URBAN SETTINGS" and in "LINKING GUIDANCE EFFORTS WITH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS." The emphasis of our Office of Career Education in establishing and implementing community "partnerships" for career education during 1979-80 was, in fact, even more pronounced than in the few examples found in these articles.

Third, the concept of career education as a vehicle for educational change is clearly emphasized in both "CAREER EDUCATION AND SOCIAL STUDIES" (which is only one of a series concerned with specific academic disciplines produced during 1979-80) and in "CAREER EDUCATION IN URBAN SETTINGS." In both of these articles, the principles of retaining career education as a *concept*—not as a *program*—and of placing primary faith in the classroom teacher for the effective delivery of career education are hopefully well illustrated.

Career education's continuing concern for extending the concept of career education to *all* segments of the population are illustrated by "CAREER EDUCATION FOR THE VISUALLY HANDICAPPED," "CAREER EDUCATION IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES: RETROSPECT AND REALITY," and by "CONTRIBUTIONS OF CAREER EDUCATION TO REDUCING YOUTH EMPLOYMENT," and by "THE VIABILITY OF CAREER EDUCATION AS A VEHICLE FOR USE IN COMBATTING BIAS AND STEREOTYPING IN SOCIETY."

Finally, career education's continuing concerns for building and maintaining effective working relationships with vocational education is illustrated in the article entitled "CAREER EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION: A RE-EXAMINATION." It is an emphasis that deserves continuing attention.

Kenneth B. Hoyt.

Career Education: A Report Card for the 70s and Some Predictions for the Decade of the 1980s

Introduction

People have talked about the antecedents of the career education movement in many ways. These include referring to: (a) establishment of the land grant college system in the 1860s; (b) formation of the National Association of Manufacturers in the early 1900s—with its emphasis on school/work relationships; (c) Dewey's emphasis on experimental learning and on relating schooling to life problems; (d) the NEA's "7 Cardinal Purposes of Education" that included "Vocation" as one of these; (e) a speech purportedly given by USOE Commissioner Howe in the mid-1960s in which he supposedly used the term "Career Education;" and (f) a resolution passed by the American Vocational Association in the late 1960s in which the term "Career Education" was used. Still others would add events such as the beginning of the vocational guidance movement in the early 1900s, the vocational education movement in 1917, and passage of the Manpower Development and training Act in 1962 to this list. These, and other antecedents, are carefully reviewed by Herr in a major document published in 1972. (Herr, 1972). Whatever the list, it is clear that "Career education," as a movement, was not something suddenly "invented" when Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr. became USOE Commissioner of Education in 1970.

As a formal, identifiable movement, however, career education can be said to have begun with a speech Commissioner Marland made at the National Association of Secondary Principals Convention on January 23, 1971. (Herr, 1976). Thus, as a "Movement," career education's first decade can be said to have been the decade of the 1970s. Those who wish to make predictions regarding the probable fate of career education in the decade of the 1980s must base such predictions on what has happened to this movement during the decade of the 1970s. This paper begins with such an assessment divided into four major portions. Following this, some predictions regarding the promise of career education during the decade of the 1980s will be made.

Career Education: A Report Card on the 1970s

A "Report Card" for career education during the decade of the 1970s properly begins with a summary report of financial efforts. Following this, results of career education efforts will be summarized in terms of evidence relative to attainment of the three basic goals of career education that have evolved during the 1970s. No attempt will be made here to document or summarize the many kinds of activities that took place in order to attain these goals.

Remarks prepared for presentation to the Northwest Connection National Career Education Conference, Seattle, Washington, March 1, 1980.

Financial Support for Career Education During the Decade of the 1970s

It seems evident, when one considers that: (a) a total of only 722 Federal grants in support of career education were made during the decade; and (b) more than 9,000 of the nation's 16,000 + K − school districts are reported to have initiated some form of career education effort (McLaughlin, 1975), that most of the financial support for career education has come from State and local funds, not from the Federal Government. There is no exact way of determining the amount of State and local funds expended for career education during the decade.

In terms of Federal funds, the picture is somewhat easier to assess. During the decade, a total of $149.6 million of Federal funds can be counted with exactness. This includes:

Period of Time	Source of Funding	Amount of Funding	Number of Projects
1970-76.....	Part D, VEA Amendments of '68	$ 47.0 Million	125
1971-75.....	NIE (Models I, II, III, & IV)	24.6 Million	12
1972-75.....	Part C, VEA Amendments of '68	18.0 Million	112
1974-78.....	P.L. 93-380, Sec. 406	40.5 Million	425
1979.....	P.L. 95-207	19.5 Million	49
		$149.6 Million	722

In addition, a special study conducted by the Congressional Budget Office estimated that, during the FY 74-78 period, a total of over $100 million per year from other USOE sources was being spent to demonstrate career education. Such sources included OE's Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Bureau of Postsecondary Education, and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. If these figures are accurate, a total of approximately $549.6 million Federal dollars were spent in support of career education during the decade of the 1970s.

In terms of many other OE programs, this is a relatively small amount to expend over a 10 year period—it is actually considerably less than what many OE programs receive on an *annual* basis. Yet, by most standards of comparison, this represents a considerable sum of money. Quite obviously, the future for career education in the decade of the 1980s will be influenced by the extent to which Federal funding support continues, expands or declines.

Evidence of Success During the 1970s: Goal 1

During the decade of the 1970s the career education movement evolved around three basic goals. One of these is a *cognitive* goal which can be stated as follows:

"To provide all students at all levels of the education system with a set of general employability/adaptability/promotability skills that will enable them to change with change in a rapidly changing society."

The 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills, as listed in official OE office of career education policy publications are:

1. Basic academic skills
2. Skills in practicing good work habits
3. Skills in developing and using personally meaningful work values
4. Skills in understanding and appreciating the private enterprise system
5. Skills in self-understanding and understanding of educational/occupational opportunities
6. Career decisionmaking skills
7. Job seeking/finding/getting/holding skills
8. Skills in making productive use of leisure time (unpaid work)
9. Skills in overcoming bias and stereotyping as they act to defer full freedom of career choice for all persons
10. Skills in humanizing the workplace for oneself

Great progress has been made, during the decade of the 1970s, to collect and disseminate hard data demonstrating career education's effectiveness in delivering these skills to persons. A dramatic example of such evidence can be seen in a 1979 OCE publication summarizing data from nine comprehensive career education evaluation studies, each of which has successfully passed through the division of education's joint dissemination review panel (OCE, 1979). Collectively, these studies produced statistically significant results demonstrating the ability of career education to deliver almost all of these 10 skills.

In addition, literally hundreds of other evaluation studies in career education were completed during the decade of the 1970s. Many of these have been summarized in monographs including those written by Enderlein (Enderlein, 1976), by Bhaerman (Bhaerman, 1977), by Datta (Datta, 1977), by Bonnet (Bonnet, 1978), and by Mitchell (Mitchell, 1978). Collectively, the evaluation studies summarized in such monographs clearly demonstrate that a career education approach *can*—when correctly applied—provided students with the general employability/adaptability/promotability skills included in this first career education goal. While the evidence is not uniformly or overwhelmingly positive, it is certainly much more positive than negative.

As we enter the decade of the 1980s, three things seem clear regarding this goal: (a) the need for these general employability/adaptability/promotability skills is still present—and certain to continue; (b) career education has demonstrated itself to be an effective delivery system for providing such skills; and (c) no alternative system purporting to provide persons with such skills has demonstrated itself to be more effective than career education. These facts, too, have implications for the future of the career education movement during the decade of the 1980s.

Evidence of Success During the 1970s: Goal 2

The second basic goal of career education that has evolved during the decade of the 1970s is a *process*, not a cognitive, one. It can be stated as follows:

> "To encourage, develop, and implement "partnerships" between the education system and the broader community aimed at helping to solve the employment/unemployment problems of youth and adults."

Implementation of this goal has been accomplished through seeking to picture career education as a community, collaborative effort—not as something the education system seeks to accomplish by itself. Some evidence of success in meeting this process goal can be seen by observing that, of the 131 K-12 school systems participating in 1978-79 OCE miniconferences, every one—without exception—had established working relationships with the private sector. Participants in this series of miniconferences came from 46 States thus demonstrating this to be a nationwide effort.

Further evidence is seen in the fact that formal working relationships have been established and are now being maintained between OE's office of career education and 9 national organizations, each of which represents elements of the private sector. These include:

1. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.
2. National Alliance of Business
3. National Federation of Independent Business
4. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs
5. National Association of Manufacturers
6. American Society for Training and Development
7. National Association for Industry-Education Cooperation
8. Industry/Education Councils of America
9. National Manpower Institute

Many of these national working relationships have now filtered down to the State and local levels. This trends is continuing at the present time.

In addition, formal working relationships have been established and are currently being maintained between OE's office of career education and several major national corporations, each of which has become a "partner" in the implementation of career education. Such corporations include:

1. General Motors Corporation
2. American Telephone and Telegraph Company
3. General Electric Company
4. McDonalds Corporation
5. New York Life Insurance Company

As with the national associations, these efforts, too, have been translated into "partnership" efforts to implement career education in many, many communities throughout our nation.

In terms of organized labor, there is an official AFL-CIO policy statement passed in 1977 supporting career education. Two major OCE contracts, each of which aimed to promote involvement of organized labor in the implementation of career education, have been endorsed by the AFL-CIO. Official

policy statements supporting career education have been written and approved by both the United Auto Workers of America and the United Rubber, Plastic, and Linoleum Workers of America. Two OCE "miniconferences" have been held soliciting input from members of organized labor. One official OCE monograph on "organized labor and career education" has been published— including a complimentary forward by the Director of the Education Division, AFL-CIO. Thus, there is ample evidence that organized labor has become an effective "partner" in community career education efforts at least at the national level.

Evidence that career education has established "partnerships" with community groups in addition to those directly involved with the private sector can be seen in the 13 national community organizations with whom OE's office of career education has established close and effective working relationships. These include:

1. Association of Junior Leagues, Inc.
2. American Legion
3. American Legion Auxiliary
4. Boy Scouts of America
5. 4-H Clubs of America
6. Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.
7. Goodwill Industries, Inc.
8. N.R.T.A./A.A.R.P.—American Association of Retired Persons
9. Junior Achievement, Inc.
10. Rotary, International
11. Women's American ORT
12. National School Volunteers Program
13. NBC's "Parents Guide to Television"

Official OCE "miniconferences" have been held for each of these 13 national community organizations—and OCE monographs have been published and distributed for 8 of them. Marked movement is evident, on the part of most of these national community organizations, to form career education "partnerships" at the State and local levels at the present time.

Thus, while much obviously remains to be done, there is an abundance of sound evidence existing now attesting to the fact that career education has met this process goal during the decade of the 1970s. Career education, as a community "partnership" effort, has been translated, during the 1970s, from a philosophical idea to a set of clear, demonstrated actions.

Evidence of Success During the 1970s: Goal 3

The third basic goal of career education, like the second, is a *process* goal. That goal can be stated as follows:

> "To change the education system in many ways that make that system a contributor to the *solution*, rather than to the *problem*, of employment/unemployment for youth and adults."

This goal of educational *reform* was, in 1971 when Commissioner Sidney P. Marland, Jr. made his first speech on career education, the prime goal stated

for the career education movement. There has never been any doubt that Dr. Marland views career education as a vehicle for use in the reform of American education. This can easily be seen by Marland's definitive book on career education. (Marland, 1974). It can also be seen in almost every official OCE conceptual statement on career education published during the decade of the 1970s. The goal of educational reform has never been hidden. On the contrary, it has stayed up-front and obvious.

Faced with the great amount of publicity resulting from this goal, how has career education fared in seeking to meet it? Some obvious evidence of success can be seen in the 9,000+ K-12 school systems who have initiated some form of career education effort on their own. Similarly, the fact that 49 of the 50 States, along with the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and each of the trust territories voluntarily agreed to participate in P.L. 95-207—"Career Education Incentive Act" is significant. Were the notion of educational reform unacceptable to them, it is doubtful that this picture would have emerged.

Supporting evidence can be seen in statements of support and/or voluntary actions taken by 19 major education associations, each of which operates primarily at the K-12 level. Without exception, these 19 national organizations have voiced formal endorsements of career education. Fifteen of the 19 have participated in national career education projects. These 19 K-12 education associations include:

1. National Education Association
2. Council of Chief State School Officers
3. Education Commission of the States
4. National School Boards of Association
5. National Association of State Boards of Education
6. American Association of School Administrators
7. National Association of Secondary School Principals
8. National Association of Elementary School Principals
9. National Congress of Parents and Teachers
10. Council for Exceptional Children
11. American Vocational Association
12. American Personnel and Guidance Association
13. American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages
14. American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
15. National Art Education Association
16. National Science Teachers Association
17. National Business Education Association
18. National Council for the Social Studies
19. National Council of Teachers of English

In addition, major career education publications and statements of support have been received from both the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and the American Industrial Arts Association.

At the postsecondary level, career education has been formally endorsed by a number of national associations including:

1. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
2. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
3. American Association of State Colleges and Universities
4. Adult Education Association of the U.S.A.
5. College Placement Council

In addition to such endorsements, concrete actions on behalf of career education have been evident in many segments of postsecondary education. For example, the AACJC has conducted two series of regional conferences—and two national conferences—on career education in community college settings. The AACTE has conducted a series of regional conferences and published a formal monograph on career education. The AASCU held a national conference on career education in 1978. Two national conferences on the topic of "career education and liberal arts education" have been held in the last twelve months. In short, clear evidence exists that indicates interest and participation in career education, as an educational reform movement, is in no way limited to the K-12 levels of American education.

While, as with goal 2, much more remains to be done, it seems safe to say that, during the decade of the 1970s, career education clearly demonstrated its acceptance, within the formal education community, as a vehicle for educational reform.

Summary: Evidence of Success in the 1970s

In an article entitled "Something Happened: Education in the Seventies," Brodinsky reviewed 10 major events affecting American education during this decade. After noting that the average life of an educational reform in the U.S. is about three years, he pictures career education as still "alive and doing well" after a full decade and as "the decade's moderate success story." (Brodinsky, 1979). Career education *has* survived for a decade. Moreover, there is now abundant evidence that: (a) career education can deliver employability/adaptability/promotability skills to persons; (b) career education can gain community support and involvement as a community effort; and (c) career education has been widely accepted, within the education profession, as a vehicle for educational reform.

This, of course, is not to say that career education's future success during the 1980s is assured. We know career education has received substantial Federal support during the decade of the 1970s—but we do not know if such support will continue during the 1980s. We know that career education *can*, under proper conditions, deliver employability skills to persons—but we have many evaluation studies with less than convincing results to go along with the large number whose results are positive. We know that career education has been accepted and endorsed by many community groups—but we do not know if such groups will continue their support or if still other community groups will join in the effort. We know that career education has been widely endorsed within the education profession—but we do not know how long that support will last. In short, while we can, it seems to me, feel justifiably proud of our accomplishments during the decade of the 1970s, we are certainly in no posi-

tion to feel comfortable about career education's future as we enter into the decade of the 1980s. I would now like to turn the task of making some reasoned—and, I hope, reasonable—predictions regarding the career education movement in the decade of the 1980s.

Predictions Regarding Career Education in the 1980s

There will be both challenges to meet and obstacles to be overcome if the career education movement is to continue to flourish during the decade of the 1980s. I do not know if we can meet these challenges or overcome the obstacles we are likely to face. I *do* know that the first requirement for doing so is to recognize their existence. For this reason, I would like to begin this section by outlining both the challenges and the obstacles. Following this, I will close by presenting some thoughts regarding how we can continue to keep the career education movement "alive and well" during the 1980s.

Challenges to be Faced During the 1980s

The key challenges for career education facing us in the 1980s can, I think, be stated in a simple and straightforward fashion. They include:

Challenge 1: To continue our efforts to maintain an equal emphasis on each of the three basic goals of career education. The term "career education" embodies all three basic goals I have discussed here. If we concentrate our efforts on anything less than all three, the term "career education" will fade away and the career education movement will die.

Challenge 2: To increase our efforts to provide a personally meaningful reward system for all the "actors" in the career education effort. The "honeymoon" is over in terms of using a "kids need it" approach for motivating persons to participate in career education. As we move from a "start up" to a "sustaining" phase in career education, there will be an increasing need to provide all participants in career education—teachers, counselors, school administrators, parents, members of the business/labor/industry/professional community, and community organizations with a clear "What's in it for me?" motivation to continue their participation. If we fail to meet this challenge, career education cannot last.

Challenge 3: Continue to emphasize the need for hard data demonstrating the worth of career education. We will not be able to sell career education as "a good thing" during the decade of the 1980s. We must increase our use of the several good manuals on methods and procedures for use in evaluating career education. (Mitchell, 1978) (Bonnet, 1978) (Young & Schuh, 1975). Our JDRP approved projects in career education must greatly increase in number and variety. If we fail to do so, others with claims similar to ours may well move in to replace us.

Challenge 4: Greatly increase the involvement of parents, of community volunteer groups, and the public sector in the implementation of career education. This must be done without lessening, in any way, our partnerships with the business/labor/industry/professional community. Unless we meet

this challenge, the true potential of career education, as a community effort, can never be realized. We badly need the added quality of effort that meeting this challenge can provide us.

Challenge 5: Increase markedly both the demonstration and the implementation efforts of career education at the postsecondary level. If we allow career education to become primarily a K-12 effort, we will have lost much of the rationale behind its creation—and much of the justification for its continued existence.

Challenge 6: To continue the importance of each of the 10 employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education. There are sure to be pressures to play up one or more of these skills at the expense of others. Such pressures must be resisted. These 10 skills must continue to be regarded as of equal importance. If we, because of pressures of the moment, allow any one of these 10 skills to overshadow the others, we will have lost much of the promise of—and so the prospects for—career education.

Obstacles to Be Overcome During the 1980s

It does not require either great wisdom or insight to see some of the major obstacles to be overcome if career education is to flourish during the 1980s. They are all too obvious and too close to reality already. A brief listing is all that should be required.

Obstacle 2: We can expect less Federal financial support for career education during the 1980s than existed during the decade of the 1970s. The only Federal career education law currently on the books (P.L. 95-207) is due to expire in 1983. The prospects of renewing that law do not appear bright at this time. This means that plans to secure and use State and/or local funds for career education must be made and implemented quickly.

Obstacle 2: We can expect pressures to increase our emphasis on employability skills and on school/community partnerships at the expense of the goal of educational reform. Such pressures have already begun. Their basic threat, of course, is to the "infusion" strategies of career education within the education system. If we lose our ability to apply "infusion" strategies, we will have lost our ability to meet the goal of educational reform. This would make many—including some career education leaders—happy. It would sadden me greatly.

Obstacle 3: We can expect pressures to concentrate our career education efforts on only certain portions of the population. These pressures, too, have already started. Their proponents base these pressures on (a) the need to bring equity of opportunity to disadvantaged persons; and (b) a belief that most persons do not need the career education effort in order to develop employability skills. A bedrock premise of career education is that it is intended for all persons. We must meet the needs of the disadvantaged without losing our interest in serving all.

Obstacle 4: We can expect pressures to move responsibility for providing persons with employability/adaptability/promotability skills to agencies outside the education system. Again, we see a set of pressures that have al-

ready begun. Proponents of this kind of pressure contend that the prime function of the education system is to equip students with basic academic skills—and that other parts of society can better prepare them for adapting to change in the broader society. We must continue our efforts aimed at demonstrating the utility of a "careers" approach as a vehicle for motivating persons to learn the basic skills.

Obstacle 5: We can expect pressures to limit the career education effort to secondary school age students. There are, apparently, many who do not subscribe to our view of the need to regard career development as a longitudinal process beginning in the early elementary school years. Many others seem content with ignoring the need for career education at the postsecondary and adult education levels. We must continue the "womb-to-tomb" emphasis underlying the entire career education movement.

Career Education: Keys to Success During the Decade of the 1980s

Career education will flourish during the decade of the 1980s if governing boards and top educational administrators support it strongly. There is some recent evidence indicating that, at least at the K-12 level, they are willing to do so. I am referring to a nationwide pool of school board members and superintendents conducted by the National School Boards Association during the summer of 1979. (NSBA, 1980). Two questions asked in that poll are pertinent here. The first asked respondents to indicate which, of 16 "new topics" introduced during the 1970s is *most* and *least* deserving of increased attention in their school district. Career education was one of the 16 "new topics" included on the list. When results were tabulated, it was clear that career education was *number 1*—i.e., the topic *most* deserving of more attention. It was mentioned more than twice as often as the "number 2" topic (citizenship education) and far, far ahead of all the others.

A second question asked in this NSBA poll was "which of the following areas of the program, in your district, are likely to get greatly increased interest and financial support within the next five years?" Of the 31 areas judged by respondents, "career education" ranked number 3—with only "basic skills" and "competency testing" ahead of it. Career education was ranked ahead of all others—including such important areas as: (a) vocational education; (b) use of community resource persons; (c) economic education; and (d) each of the individual academic disciplines.

These new NSBA data clearly indicate that both school board members and superintendents are ready to lend further support to career education. Obviously, there will be many "mandates of the moment," new financial pressures, etc., that, unless overcome, will prevent them from giving career education the kind of support they believe it deserves. There are, it seems to me, three "keys to success" that can—and must—be used to help school board members and superintendents implement career education as the kind of high education priority they believe it to be.

Key 1: Professional pressure from within the education system. The basic ingredient needed here is to make career education goals become an integral part of the instructional goals of teachers at various levels in the education system and from various disciplines. Department heads and supervising teachers must take the lead role here. Career education has put its trust in the classroom teacher. If classroom teachers accept that trust and embrace career education, I have no doubt but that their voices will be heard by school board members and superintendents. We *must* count on this happening. I have great confidence that it will.

Key 2: Community pressure to continue career education. This support—or lack of support—will, more than any other single factor, determine the fate of the career education movement during the 1980s. If that support continues and increases, career education will flourish. If it slackens off, career education will die. Educators have, during the last decade, demonstrated both their willingness to change and their willingness to work with the broader community. It is the broader community—including parents and community volunteer groups as well as the business/labor/industry/professional community—who must now decide whether or not they want the career education movement to continue. If they speak up for career education as a community effort, school board members and superintendents will hear them loud and clear. If they keep quiet, the silence will be overwhelming and career education will die.

Key 3: Continuing commitment to the ideals and basic strategies of career education. For career education to survive and flourish during the 1980s, it will be essential that we continue to have a core group of true career education "crusaders" who are ready, willing, and able to promote the career education concept and defend against those who seek to weaken or destroy it. These "crusaders" do not have to be large in number, but they must be very large in "spirit" and must come from all segments of the community involved in the implementation of career education. Whether a particular "crusader" is a parent, a classroom teacher, a labor union official, a business person, or a community volunteer, it is essential that we all "sing from the same hymn book" when defending and supporting the career education concept. Our bedrock beliefs, values, and commitments must be clear.

Concluding Remarks

As I look at the total picture, I find myself moderately proud of career education's accomplishments during the 1970s. It would be difficult to say that no significant accomplishments occurred. At the same time, it is obvious that we have much more to do. The decade of the 1980s will be a crucial one for career education. I am worried. But I am not afraid. I hope you share these feelings.

References

Bhaerman, Robert. *Career Education and Basic Achievement: A Descriptive Analysis of the Results*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Bonnet, Deborah G. (a) *A Synthesis of Results and Programmatic Recommendations Emerging from Career Education Evaluations in 1975–76*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

_____. (b) *Evaluation Design and Reporting in Career Education*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Career Education, USOE, 1978.

Brodinsky, Benn. "Something Happened: Education in the Seventies." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1979, 61, 238-2141.

Datta, Lois-ellin, et al. *Career Education: What Proof Do We Have That It Works?* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Herr, Edwin L. *Review and Synthesis of Foundations for Career Education*. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, 1972.

Herr, Edwin L. *The Emerging History of Career Education: A Summary View*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing office, 1976.

Marland, Sidney P., Jr. *Career Education: A Proposal for Reform*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Mitchell, Anita. (a) *Final Technical Report: Identification of Evaluated Exemplary Activities in Career Education (K#12)*. Palo Alto, California: American Institutes for Research, 1978.

_____. (b) *Ways to Evaluate Different Types of Career Education Activities*. Palo Alto, California: American Institutes for Research, 1978.

McLaughlin, Donald H. *National Survey on the Current Status of Career Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

National School Boards Association. "What Priority for 'Global Education?' An NSBA Survey of School Board Members and School Superintendents" Washington, D.C.: National School Boards Association, 1980.

Office of Career Education, USOE. *Career Education Programs That Work*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

Young, M.B. and R.G. Schuh. *Evaluation and Educational Decision-Making: A Functional Guide to Evaluating Career Education*. Washington, D.C.: Development Associates, Inc., 1975.

Career Education and Vocational Education: A Re-Examination

Introduction

In spite of almost a decade of co-existence, widespread confusion remains regarding differences in meaning between the terms "career education" and "vocational education." Early attempts to include "vocational education" in a broad definition of "career education" failed primarily because of resistance from other parts of the education system. Current attempts, on the part of some vocational educators, to include "career education" in an expanded definition of "vocational education" seem destined to also fail for the same basic reason. As we prepare to enter the decade of the "effective 80's" in American education, it is time for a re-examination of relationships between "career education" and "vocational education." This paper represents a beginning attempt to undertake such a re-examination.

To do so, it will first be necessary to examine briefly the history of support these two efforts have provided each other during the decade of the 1970's. Following this, I want to examine what seems to me to represent the five major ways in which "career education" serves to enhance "vocational education." Finally, I want to devote some thought to implications of "career education/ vocational education" relationships for American education in the decade of the 1980s.

Support of Vocational Education for Career Education During the 1970s

The career education movement was launched at the beginning of the decade of 1970's primarily through the leadership efforts and financial resources of vocational education. These efforts were greatest in the early part of this decade and have declined substantially during the last few years. The record is clear on this point and can be easily illustrated.

It can be seen, in part, through examining actions of the American Vocational Association. In 1971, "career education" was the theme of the entire AVA national convention. It has not been a popular topic at this convention since 1976. During the period extending from 1971 through 1976, numerous articles on career education appeared in the *AVA Journal* (including an entire special issue in March, 1972). Since 1977, I can find no articles in the *AVA Journal* carrying the words "career education" in their title. The 1973 AVA Year Book was entitled *Career Education*. No others on this topic have since appeared. From 1971 through 1976, at least one resolution on "career education" was adopted at each AVA national convention, but none have appeared, to the best of my knowledge, in the last three years.

A similar pattern can be seen if one examines federal support for career education using vocational education funds during the decade of the 1970s.

Remarks prepared for presentation at the Guidance Division luncheon, American Vocational Association National Convention, Anaheim, California, December 1, 1979.

During the 1970-76 period, a total of 47.0 million dollars were expended from vocational education Part D funds to support 124 K-12 career education demonstration projects, each of which was a three-year effort. From 1972-75, vocational education funds, under Part C, were used to support an additional 112 K-12 career education demonstration projects, each 18 months in length, at a total cost of 18.0 million dollars. From 1975 through 1978, an additional 20.0 million dollars of Federal vocational education funds were spent in support of EBCE demonstration projects. Thus, a total of at least 85.0 million dollars of Federal vocational education funds were expended during the 1970-78 period in support of career education demonstration projects. No Federal vocational education funds are being used, at the USOE level, for this purpose at the present time.

Three additional bits of information are required to put this 85.0 million dollar expenditure in a proper perspective. First, this is more than double the $40.4 million appropriated for use in career education demonstration projects during the 1975-78 period under provisions of P.L. 93-380, Sec. 406—"Career Education." Second, during this 1975-78 period, a total exceeding $400 million Federal funds were expended in support of career education by agencies other than OE's Office of Career Education. Since Federal vocational education funds expended for career education during this period were relatively small, it is obvious that most of this $100+ million per year came from such other Federal programs as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Federal legislation for education of the handicapped, the Bureau of Postsecondary Education, and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. The *annual* amount from such sources during the 1975-78 period exceeded the *total* amount of Federal vocational education funds expended in support of career education during the entire 1970-78 period. This has obviously had a marked impact on the evolving nature and operation of career education.

Finally, it must be noted that, at the State and local levels, the use of vocational education dollars in support of career education has continued at a sizable level during the entire decade of the 1970s. The States with the strongest career education efforts at the present time are, by and large, those who have continued to benefit from a combination of State and local vocational education funds. This, too, is an important part of the picture.

Support of Career Education for Vocational Education During the 1970s

Since the career education movement was initiated largely through the efforts of vocational education, it should surprise no one to learn that, in the beginning, career education advocates were highly supportive of vocational education. It may surprise some to contemplate the fact that the strong support career education advocates give to vocational education has continued throughout the decade of the 1970s. To the best of my knowledge, no one has yet attempted to make the case for career education by attacking or criticizing

vocational education. On the contrary, strong support for vocational education has consistently been present.

This strong support can be seen, in part, from official policy statements published by OE's Office of Career Education during this decade. The following quotes are illustrative:

> ". . . Thus, career education advocates support an increased societal emphasis on vocational education . . ." (*A Primer for Career Education*, page 1)
>
> ". . . This (provision of entry level vocational skills) has been seen as a prime purpose for vocational education . . . the need for such specific entry level skills continues to increase in importance." (*Refining the Career Education Concept*, page 7)
>
> "Career education is neither a substitute for nor a competitor to vocational education. Rather, career education regards vocational education as a necessary, but not a sufficient, mechanism for bringing a proper emphasis to the goal of education as preparation for work on the part of all who teach and all who learn at all levels of American education." (*Refining the Career Education Concept*, page 23)
>
> ". . . 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." (*Relationships Between Career Education and Vocational Education*, page 1)
>
> ". . . 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 national strategies we adopt for solving these various serious problems" (*Relationships Between Career Education and Vocational Education*, page 8)
>
> "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." (*Relationships Between Career Education and Vocational Education*, page 11)

The basic reasons why career education advocates have issued such strong statements of support for vocational education extend considerably beyond only a sense of gratitude for the early support vocational educators gave to career education. Such reasons include the following:

1. Persons seeking to enter the world of paid employment need a set of specific vocational skills that will convince employers to hire them. Without vocational education, such skills cannot be provided as part of the American system of public education.
2. The educational motivations of many persons are oriented primarily around a desire to acquire a skill or set of skills that will enable them to secure employment. For such persons, vocational education represents an attempt on the part of American education to both recognize

the legitimacy of their educational motivations and to protect their right to choose educational programs that appeal to them.

3. Vocational education represents an opportunity for many students to excel and to see themselves, for the first time, as bona fide learners. "Learning to learn" is an increasingly important goal of American education. Only through vocational education can this goal be met for many students.
4. Vocational education, with its inherent educational appeal to many persons, has surely contributed to increasing the holding power of the American high school. Without strong vocational education programs, the dropout rate would surely be much higher.
5. Vocational education has, for more than 50 years, legitimized and championed "preparation for work" as one of the basic goals of American public education. The need to continue doing so is becoming even greater at the present time.

The basic points I am trying to make here are: (a) career education advocates know why vocational education is important and why they must continue their efforts to support it; and (b) vocational educators seem, at the present time, to be less sure of why they should support career education. As we prepare to enter the decade of the 1980's it seems appropriate to try to specify the major reasons why vocational educators should renew their strong leadership support for career education. It is that topic I want to consider now.

Ways in Which Career Education Serves to Enhance Vocational Education

There exists a wide variety of reasons why vocational educators should reassume a national leadership role in supporting career education. I will use only five broad categories of reasons here and specify some additional reasons under each of these five categories.

1. **Career education's emphasis on providing persons with general employability/adaptability/promotability skills is sorely needed to meet the educational goal of preparing persons for work.** Providing students with such skills has always been a part of vocational education, but it has not been highlighted enough. As a result, some have accused vocational education of narrowing occupational options for students through giving them only one set of entry level vocational skills. If vocational education were now to strongly endorse the emphasis career education places on the importance of such skills and make the delivery of these skills an important and obvious part of vocational education, these criticisms can be easily answered.

2. **Career education's efforts to link all parts of the education system together in a joint effort to provide general employability/adaptability/promotability skills is essential.** No matter how great an emphasis vocational educators may place on providing persons with these skills, they cannot do the job by themselves. This effort must begin in the early elementary grades and must be evident in all parts of the curriculum. To participate actively in career education will provide vocational educators opportunities to interact

with and gain acceptance from many other educators who, in the past, have opposed vocational education. This, in turn, increases chances for students to choose vocational education. Moreover, as a joint effort, probabilities of students actually acquiring such skills are enhanced—thus enhancing the credit that accrues to all parts of American education for preparing students to work in today's society.

3. **Career education's efforts to form partnerships with the broader community represent a needed direction for educational change.** Career education has been demonstrably effective in gaining broad community support for the educational goal of preparing persons for work. Vocational education can certainly profit from such increased community support for this goal. Moreover, as members of the broader community come into educational settings to participate in career education, they develop an increased understanding and appreciation for all of American education—including vocational education. Career education can serve as a valuable vehicle for use in increasing interactions of vocational educators with the broader community far beyond those that are available to vocational educators working only by themselves.

4. **Career education's emphasis on work values as part of a system of personal values and on unpaid work as well as paid employment represent significant additions to the meaning of preparing persons for work.** The advantages this emphasis provides vocational educators include: (a) it helps vocational educators in their attempts to conceptualize the necessity for vocational education as an integral part of the American Education system; and (b) it provides vocational education with an added basis for serving a greater portion of the school population over and beyond those persons who specialize in vocational education. In this sense, it certainly increases opportunities for vocational educators to interact with other educators thus further bridging the gap between vocational educators and other professional educators.

5. **Career education's emphasis on the career development process is crucial to meeting the goal of preparing persons for work.** The advantages accruing to vocational education from this emphasis include: (a) by beginning the career education effort in the early elementary school years, chances are increased for getting more and better students to enroll in vocational education at the high school level; and (b) the career development emphasis can be a useful vehicle in gaining an increased commitment to career guidance on the part of professional school counselors—and thus improved relationships with vocational education. Moreover, it certainly represents a vehicle available to vocational educators in meeting their current responsibilities for overcoming bias and stereotyping as they act to deter students from considering vocational education.

This list, while illustrative rather than comprehensive in nature, will hopefully be sufficient to illustrate the point that there are as many reasons for vocational education to support career education as there are reasons for career education to support vocational education. I want now to turn to a still broader and more important basis for contending that vocational education

and career education should be mutually supportive parts of American education.

Education as Preparation for Work: The Importance of the Goal

The American system of public education continues to come under heavy criticism from wide segments of society. One of the criticisms most frequently heard is that this system has failed to adequately prepare today's youth for work. This criticism is often accompanied by pointing to the growing numbers of youth and adults who are today experiencing difficulty in finding, getting, and holding jobs. Great support exists currently both for: (a) providing intensive remedial services to those our system of public education is accused of having failed; and (b) promoting alternative educational efforts to our traditional system of free public education. There are, it seems to me, four basic answers that American education should provide, in a unified voice, to such criticism.

First, we should clearly acknowledge that, no matter how much American education is improved, this system cannot, by itself, be expected to solve problems of employment/unemployment/underemployment that currently exist in our nation. A wide variety of societal forces have created and contributed to these problems and must be involved in their solutions. The American system of education should, it seems to me, be willing to accept a part of the blame only if it is simultaneously recognized as having positive potential for contributing to the solution. Those who blame the education system for the condition and then assign responsibility for correcting the condition to societal elements outside of education should be called upon to acknowledge the false logic behind that argument.

Second, American education needs to strongly defend the concept of education as the single best passport to freedom that exists for persons in our society. No other major part of our society exists under the basic assumption that society will profit most indirectly if our direct efforts are placed on serving the individual. Freedom to choose—and to change—one's occupational choices are among the most sacred of all freedoms available to our citizens. These freedoms can be protected for all Americans only through the American education system. To put resources into building alternatives to that system must inevitably drain away resources needed to improve it. The goal of preparing persons for work has long been one of the basic goals of American education. It is a goal that should not be abandoned and given to other segments of society.

Third, to whatever extent American education has failed to meet its proper responsibilities for preparing persons to work, a very large portion of the cause can be found in the inadequacy of resources made available for reaching that goal. Given equal dollar resources, the American system of education is perfectly willing to demonstrate its capability of competing with alternative systems. Such resources have not yet been made available to the entire American system of education for reaching the goal of preparing persons to work. It is unfair and unwise to either: (a) judge our education system

as having failed to prepare persons for work in the past when inadequate resources for doing so have not been made available; or (b) create alternatives systems at a much higher per pupil cost and then compare our current education system with more highly expensive alternatives.

Fourth, American education must speak out in a clear and forceful manner in defense of the contention that preparing persons to work can be done most efficiently, effectively, and correctly if viewed as the kind of longitudinal, developmental process that it really is. This effort is one that must be begun in the early elementary school years and continue through all of adult education. It is not something that can best be done by waiting until age 14 to begin. Neither can it best be done as a remedial effort. Of all societal elements, only the American system of public education holds the potential for carrying out this task in ways that provide a maximum return for each dollar expended.

If these contentions are to be supported, the entire American education system must become involved in the effort. It is not something that only a combination of persons committed to both career education and to vocational education can do by themselves. A first prerequisite for accomplishing this is to demonstrate to all other segments of American education that career education and vocational education are united in their dedication to these goals and to the mutual support of each other. The time to move in this direction is now.

Concluding Remarks

It may seem strange to some that these remarks have been prepared for presentation to a meeting of professional counselors. In my opinion, the members of the Guidance Division of AVA represent a perfect audience for these remarks. The Guidance Division of AVA was originally created, in part, so that professional counselors could learn more about vocational education and so better serve prospective and actual students of vocational education. In part, this division was created in order to help professional counselors better serve as a vehicle for bridging the gap between vocational education and other parts of our education system. The membership of this division has great potential for acting in a positive and constructive fashion to meet the challenges I have tried to pose here. I very much hope that you will do so.

References

Hoyt, K.B. *A Primer for Career Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

———. *Refining the Career Education Concept*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

———. *Relationships Between Career Education and Vocational Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Service-Learning and Career Education

Introduction

I am ashamed to admit that, only 12 months ago, I had never heard the term "service-learning." Since that time, I have been asked to study selected articles appearing in recent issues of *Synergist*. Based on what I *think* I have learned from studying those articles—and what I *think* I know about career education—this paper has been prepared. Several of the articles I was asked to read attempted to link the concepts of "service-learning" and "career education." The basic purpose of this article is to make yet another attempt to attain that goal.

To do so demands that this article he divided into three major parts. First, it will bc necessary for me to convey what the term "service-learning" now means to me. It is essential that this be done so that experts in the "service-learning" domain can have an opportunity to further reduce my ignorance on this subject. Second, it seems important to try to contrast "service-learning" and "career education" in terms of what appear to be basic similarities and differences involved in these two concepts. Finally, I would like to expose those elements in my basic value system that lead me to engage in "career education" as one means of indicating the several ways in which "service-learning" can make significant contributions to implementation of career education. It will then be up to experts in service-learning to specify ways in which "career education" might make helpful contributions to service-learning.

"Service-Learning:" Perceptions With Respect to Meaning of the Concept

The most concise definition of "service-learning" I have found in the limited reading assigned to me was given by Sigmon (Sigmon, 1979) in which he used the following definition: *Service-learning . . . is the integration of the accomplishment of a public task with conscious educational growth.*" Sigmon provides the following 3 principles for service-learning:

Principle One:	Those being served control the service(s) provided.
Principle Two:	Those being served become better able to serve and be served by their own actions.
Principle Three:	Those who serve also are learners and have significant control over what is expected to be learned.

He goes on to emphasize Greenleaf's definition of "service" in terms of benefits accruing to those being served and states, in this connection, *"learning objectives are formed in the context of what needs to be done to serve others."*

My perceptions from studying the Sigmon article are: (1) in "service-learning," the *primary* emphasis is placed on the word "service" not on the word "learning;" (2) the primary emphasis of "service-learning" is on "learning *by* doing," not on "doing *to* learn"—a most important distinction (first

made clear to me by my friends in 4-H Club work) (Boyce and Carper, 1980); and (3) the basic philosophical commitment to a belief in and concern for both the worth and basic human rights of all persons underlies the service-learning movement fully as much as the career education movement.

Other perceptions of the nature of the service-learning concept that I gained from reading various articles include the following: (1) service-learning apparently started at the college/university level and was provided primarily for students in liberal arts education (Ungerer et al, 1977); (2) the concept of service-learning now exists as operational efforts in more than 1,800 of this Nation's 16,000+ K-12 school districts (NCSL, 1980); (3) service-learning is a term applied to paid as well as to unpaid work (Kiernan, 1979); (4) the service-learning effort, while most closely identified with the general field of experiential education, is now seeking applications in a wide number of different kinds of efforts that involve school/community collaborative efforts (Sexton, 1979); (5) there seems to be a trend, in service-learning, to move its operational responsibilities from specialists to members of instructional staff at both the secondary school and higher education levels (Althoff, 1977) (NCSL, 1980) (Hodgkinson, 1979); and (6) service-learning efforts appear to have a significant concern for gaining academic credit for students as part of the total effort (NCSL, 1980).

I gather that the primary reason leaders in the service-learning field insist on placing a hyphen between the word "service" and the word "learning" is that they want to emphasize the face that *service to others* is the primary concept to be emphasized.

To the extent leaders in the service-learning movement agree that the kinds of perceptions listed here are accurate, there is some basis for now moving into a brief discussion of contrasts between the "service-learning" and the "career education" movements. To the extent that I may have incorrectly interpreted what was given to me for study and/or the extent to which I failed to study the right literature, the following section may have little value. Each reader should decide these things for herself/himself before proceeding.

Contrasts Between the "Service-learning" and "Career Education" Movements

As I read the literature on service-learning and contrasts that literature with what I know about the career education movement, a number of basic similarities appear to exist. So, too, do a number of differences. The differences, however, appear to be more a matter of degree than they do of kind. Similarities, on the other hand, appear to be numerous in terms of basic, bedrock concepts. In this section, an attempt will be made to specify both similarities and differences.

The first similarity that appears obvious to me is the high degree to which both of these movements rests on a bedrock faith in the worth of the individual and the essentialness of protecting freedom of choice for every human being. When, for example, I see that Sigmon (Sigmon, 1979) says:

> "Service-learning, as discussed herein, is rooted in the belief that all persons are of unique worth, that all persons have gifts for sharing with others, that persons have the right to understand and act on their own situations, and that our mutual survival on the planet Earth depends on the more able and the less able serving one another"

I can see no basic conflict in values between the service-learning and the career education movements. The language is slightly different in that career education, for example, emphasizes the "freedom to choose" and the "freedom to change" as two of the most sacred God-given rights held by each individual. The basic principles of human worth, however, are essentially similar.

Second, there is a high similarity in philosophy between service-learning and career education in that both appear to emphasize the fact that the term "education" is considerably broader in meaning than the term "schooling"—that people can and do learn in places other than educational institutions, from persons other than professional educators, and in ways other than studying from books. In this sense, both service-learning and career education are inextricably tied, in their basic philosophical structure, to the general concept of experiential learning. Two operational differences appear to exist: (a) career education is relatively more apt to use private sector facilities whereas service-learning appears more likely to use public sector facilities for experiential learning opportunities; and (b) service-learning appears to be relatively more concerned about gaining academic credit for experiential learning whereas, in career education practices, questions of academic credit for experiential learning have been of relatively minor concern.

Third, and closely related to the second, both service-learning and career education appear to be deeply committed to providing those they serve with work experience opportunities. High agreement exists on this basic point. The apparent difference I see is that service-learning seems to place primary value on the extent to which the work experience helps those being served whereas career education places it primary value on the extent to which work experience contributes to career awareness/exploration/planning/decision-making for those persons receiving the work experience. In a generic sense, the basic purposes of work experience can be any one of the following: (1) as a supplement to academic, cognitive learning; (b) as a substitute for academic, cognitive learning; (c) as a means of making money; or (d) as a means of career awareness/exploration/planning/decisionmaking. While, in some instances and to some degree, work experience in both service-learning and in career education is used for all four of these basic purposes, it seems to me that the overriding interest of service-learning appears to be in purpose (a) whereas the overriding interest of career education appears to be in purpose (d).

Fourth, service-learning and career education appear to share a common concern for making their efforts developmental and longitudinal covering almost the entire life span. Both today appear to be keenly aware of and in-

terested in how their efforts can be most appropriately extended to adults—including older adults—as well as youth. In this area, theory and philosophy appear to be well ahead of common practice for both service-learning and for career education. Within the youth population, service-learning appears to be better established than career education, at the present time, for college-age youth whereas career education appears to be better established for K-12 youth—particularly for youth at the K-8 level of education. This is, to me, one clear example of a condition that calls for service-learning and career education to join forces in ways that will benefit the implementation efforts of both at ALL levels of the education system.

Fifth, it seems to me, based on the limited reading I have done, that both career education and service-learning are interested in and concerned about relating the experiential education aspects of their efforts to the academic content of subject matter in the classroom. While sharing this common concern, it appears that service-learning is relatively more interested in using such learning as a supplement to what is taught in the classroom whereas career education is relatively more concerned about using such learning as a motivational vehicle for use in increasing student interest in the cognitive content being taught in the classroom. That is, career education advocates place a very strong emphasis on the potential of a "careers" approach to increasing basic academic achievement (Hoyt, 1977a). I could find no corresponding emphasis in the literature on service-learning that I was asked to read.

Sixth, service-learning and career education appear to share common strategies of using a combination of *infusion* within the education system and *collaboration* among the education system and the broader community as primary vehicles for use in their implementation efforts. Operationally, it appears to me that, currently, service-learning is ahead of career education in making community collaboration work—in spite of the fact that the career education literature seems to have done more to conceptualize the process. In terms of the "infusion vs program add-on" controversy, career education appears to me to currently be ahead of service-learning. As I read the literature, it appears to me that, while service-learning began with more of an "add-on" approach to educational change, it is currently heading toward an "infusion" strategy within the classroom. Career education, on the other hand, began with an "infusion" strategy but now finds itself with a growing minority who believe that an "add-on" strategy will produce quicker results. It seems that leaders in both fields will tend to agree that an "infusion" strategy in all parts of the curriculum is preferable to an "add-on" strategy that results in a new course or set of courses. I feel confident about this in terms of career education, but am not sure that I am interpreting the service-learning literature correctly on this point.

Seventh, in terms of goals related to preparing students for work, both career education and service-learning appear to share a concern for equipping students with general employability/adaptability/promotability skills for use in changing with change rather than with specific vocational skills useful for entry into particular occupations. The concerns of service-learning

advocates for the basic importance of liberal arts education at the postsecondary level is one that is deeply shared by career education advocates (Hoyt, 1978). The 10 basic general employability/adaptability/promotability skills being championed by career education include: (a) basic academic skills; (b) good work habits; (c) personally meaningful work values; (d) skills in understanding and appreciating the private enterprise system; (e) skills in self-understanding and understanding of educational/occupational opportunities; (f) career decisionmaking skills; (g) job seeking/finding/getting/holding skills; (h) skills in overcoming bias and stereotyping as they impinge on full freedom of career choice; (i) skills in making productive use of leisure time through unpaid work; and (j) skills in humanizing the workplace for oneself. While career education advocates place equal emphasis on each of these 10 general employability skills, it appears to me, based on the reading I have done, that service-learning advocates would place their primary emphasis on skills (c) and (i) with, a relatively smaller emphasis on skills (a), (e), (h), and (j), and little, if any emphasis, on skills (b), (d), (f), and (g). Once again, while I am sure these statements are correct in terms of career education, I am not confident that I have interpreted the literature on service-learning correctly. I stand ready to be corrected on this point.

Eighth, *and by far the most important of all,* service-learning and career education seem to share a common concern and commitment to using their efforts for purposes of making life more personally meaningful and rewarding to those receiving the benefits of their efforts. There appears to me to be a very basic and a very strong agreement among leaders in both service-learning and career education with respect to the societal needs for both movements. The apparent differences in the literature from these two movements appears to me to be basically one of semantics—not of purpose. This semantic difference is clearly seen when one considers that the bedrock work for the service-learning movement appears to be "*service*" whereas the bedrock word for the career education movement is "*work.*" The concept of "servant leaders" being championed by Greenleaf is one that places a high value of the personal benefits that accrue to those who devote themselves to serving their fellow human beings (Greenleaf, 1977). This concept bears a strikingly strong resemblance to the definition of "work" used by most of us in career education. (Hoyt, 1977b). "Work," in the way I have defined it, is "*conscious effort—other than that whose primary purpose is either coping or relaxation—aimed at producing benefits for oneself or for oneself and others.*" In this definition, "work" includes unpaid as well as paid activities. Whether or not a particular activity is "work" depends more on the purpose(s) of the individual performing the activity than on the nature of the activity itself. Under this definition, the "world of work" and the "world of paid employment" overlap only incompletely—i.e., much of "work" does not take place in the world of paid employment and much of what does take place in the world of paid employment is more correctly labeled as "drudgery" than "work."

When those of us in career education speak about the "human need to work," we are talking about the basic need and right of all human beings to

do—to *achieve*—to become someone through doing something—to know that the world needs them for what they can do to help others—that, because they have *worked*, the world is, in some way and to some degree, a better place. I can discern no basic philosophical differences between the way the word "work" is used in career education and the way the word "service" is used in service-learning. If I have mis-read the service-learning literature, I badly need to be corrected on this point.

In an effort to summarize what has been said in this section, I have constructed the following chart. Those who read only this chart without reflecting on the contents of this section must be prepared to pay the price of receiving a most incomplete message. Those who study the chart after reading the contents of this section will hopefully find it to be a helpful summary of major points.

Commonalities and Shades of Differences Between the Service-Learning and the Career Education Movements

Shades of Differences—Service-learning and career education

Commonalities	Service-learning	Career Education
1. Belief in worth of the individual and in human	Importance of serving one another	Freedom to choose—and freedom to change
2. Belief in and support of experiential education	(a) public service sector (b) Concern for academic credit is high	(a) private sector predominates (b) concern for academic credit relatively low
3. Emphasis on work experience	As a supplement to academic instruction	As a means of career awareness, exploration, planning, decision-making
4. Developmental—over entire life span	Better established for college-age youth	Better established for K-12 youth, particularly for K-8
5. Relating experiential education to academic instruction	To supplement academic learning	To motivate students to learn more cognitive content in school
6. Infusion and collaboration are primary implementation strategies	Ahead of career education in making collaboration work	Ahead of service-learning in making infusion work
7. Emphasis on general employability skills rather than specific vocational skills	Emphasis on 6 of the 10 general employability skills	Emphasis on all 10 employability skills
8. Making life more personally meaningful and rewarding	"Service" is the bedrock word	"Work" is the bedrock word

Service-learning and Career Education: The Need to Join Forces

It seems strange to me that service-learning and career education—two movements who share so much in common and both of which are deeply committed to and involved in collaborating with others—have spent so little time forming partnerships with each other. I do not know, of course, the extent to which those involved in service-learning desire such partnerships. I *do* know, based on what I have now learned about service-learning, that I, as one person engaged in career education, feel there are a host of reasons for these two movements to work more closely together. As a final portion of this paper, I want to specify my basic motivations for wanting to do so.

First, it now seems obvious to me that service-learning and career education share many common professional interests, concerns, and commitments. The eight commonalities described in the preceding section, in and of themselves, constitute a powerful argument, it seems to me, for seeking closer working relationships.

Second, both service-learning and career education appear to me to be seeking the same basic kinds of change in American education system—changes that involve (a) relating educational content more closely to its utilitarian value in the total society and (b) fostering working relationships between the education system and the broader society. Further, both movements have operated—partly by choice and partly through necessity—primarily from the standpoint of the "power of persuasion" rather than the "power of position." Both movements depend more on personal effort than on financial resources for their successful implementation. Both are dependent on gaining support from a wide variety of existing programs within and outside of education rather than creating one more new, expensive "program" to be added to all others in existence. I have written about this, with respect to career education, in terms of what I have called the "impotence image"—i.e., our dependence on existing programs for our continuing survival and growth. I have a strong feeling that the "impotence image" applies to service-learning fully as much as it applies to career education.

Third, service-learning and career education appear to share both the danger and the promise of operating as "solution systems" for a variety of kinds of educational problems rather than an add-on system" for a particular educational mandate of the moment. Educational "mandates" come and go in American Education and are typically heavily influenced by the addition—or withdrawal—of substantial Federal funds. Neither service-learning nor career education has ever been "blessed" (or "cursed"—depending on one's philosophy) with large amounts of Federal dollars. Yet, both have survived the decade of the 70s and appear to be stronger than ever as we enter the decade of the 80s. When one considers that the average life of an educational "reform" in America is less than three years, this is amazing. Both service-learning and career education apparently discovered some of the reasons for educational "survival." Would not both movements benefit if we shared some of our reasons with each other?

Fourth, both service-learning and career education see themselves as efforts that extend over the entire span of Education—from the early elementary school years through all of adult education. The career education movement, it seems to me, holds real potential for further expanding the service-learning movement at the K-12 level. The service learning movement holds great potential for further expanding career education at the college/university level. Both movements could better meet the obvious current challenges to better serve adult learners if we find ways of working more closely together.

Fifth, I see fantastic potential for better meeting career education's goal of equipping each person with a personally meaningful set of work values if career education practitioners will enthusiastically endorse and join with service-learning advocates in communities where both exist. I suspect, similarly, that there may be some basic goals of the service-learning movement that could be better met if practitioners in that movement were to join forces with career education practitioners in their communities. The beginnings that have been made here are most encouraging. They are in need of great expansion.

Both "service-learning" and "career education" are movements that, in operation, have been more concerned with serving others than in protecting their own names. Both have been much more concerned with how much help accrues to those we serve than with how much "credit" comes to either "service-learning" or to "career education." It is entirely possible, of course, that one or both of these terms may disappear before the end of the decade of the 1980s. If our common concepts, concerns, and commitments survive, I have a strong feeling that neither leaders in "service-learning" or in "career education" will worry much about the terms themselves. It is the survival of our common concepts, concerns, and commitments that must be our primary concern.

References

Althof, James E. "Forecasting The Future Of Service-Learning" *Synergist*, 1977 (Fall), 10-12.

Boyce, Milton and Elsie Carper. "Combining Forces With 4-H" *Synergist*, 1980 (Winter), 34-36.

Greenleaf, Robert K. *Servant Leadership*. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.

Hodgkinson, Harold. "Trends Affecting Service-Learning In Higher Education" *Synergist*, 1979 (Fall), 27-28.

Hoyt, K.B. *A Primer For Career Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977(a).

_____. "The Human Side Of Work" (In) *Refining The Career Education Concept: Part II*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977(a).

_____. "Some Thoughts On Career Education And The Liberal Arts" (In) *Considerations of Career Education In Postsecondary Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Kiernan, Owen B. "Trends Affecting Service-Learning In Secondary Schools" *Synergist*, 1979 (Fall), 26-27.

National Center For Service-Learning "Service-Learning In Secondary Schools" *Synergist*, 1980 (Winter), 2-5.

Sexton, Robert. "New Times, New Alternatives" *Synergist*, 1979 (Fall), 36-38.
Sigmon, Robert. "Service-Learning: Three Principles" *Synergist*, 1979, (Spring), 9-11.
Ungerer, Richard, et al. "Community Service As A Career Education Opportunity: NSVP Forum" *Synergist*, 1977 (Winter), 12-21.
Van Aalst, Frank. "Career, Experiential, Liberal: 3 Educations Or One?" *Synergist*, 1977 (Fall), 13-15.

Career Education in Urban Settings

Introduction

Career education, as a *community* effort, is fully as applicable to: (a) out-of-school youth, (b) youth in postsecondary educational institutions, and (c) adults as it is to youth enrolled in K-12 school systems. The K-12 school system is but one among many community segments who must share joint authority, responsibility, and accountability for this total effort. Yet, until K-12 school systems in urban areas make and implement major commitments to career education, the need for career education on the part of all others in urban settings can only continue to increase. The K-12 school system has been part of the *problem* of employment, unemployment, and underemployment in urban areas. It must move toward becoming part of the *solution*. Career education is one possible vehicle for use in moving in this direction.

Thus, this paper has been divided into three major portions. First, an attempt will be made to describe the need for career education in terms of the broad general employability/adaptability/promotability skills it seeks to provide all persons in the community. Second, a major portion of this paper will discuss the nature of career education in K-12 urban school districts. Finally, primarily for purposes of providing a broader perspective, a brief portion of this paper will address the nature of career education as applied to out-of-school youth, students in postsecondary educational institutions, and adults.

The Need For Career Education

The need for career education, in terms of a combination of both cognitive and process goals, is properly stated differently for various portions of the total population. When one considers the need for career education in terms of the community as a whole, it is only the cognitive goals of career education that can be discussed as a generic kind of need. This article properly begins with such a generic discussion.

The common cognitive goal of career education is to equip persons with a set of general employability/adaptability/promotability skills that will enable them to change with a rapidly changing occupational society. It is the certainty of uncertainty—the certainty of rapid change—facing both youth and adults that forms the prime basis of need for career education in the total community. In seeking to emphasize this need, career education advocates are, in no way, seeking to downplay the equally great need for equipping persons with specific vocational skills useful for gaining initial entry into the occupational society. Like the need for career education skills, the need for such specific vocational skills is also increasing. Let no one accuse career education of seeking to compete with, or substitute for, vocational education. Career education is talking about something *more*—not just about something that is *different*.

Article prepared, by request, for publication in *The Urban Educator*.

There are 10 equally important general employability/adaptability/promotability skills that combine to represent the cognitive goals of the career education effort. These 10 skills include: (a) basic academic skills; (b) skills in practicing good work habits; (c) skills in developing and applying a *personally meaningful* set of work values leading to a desire to work; (d) skills in understanding and appreciating the American system of private enterprise (including organized labor); (e) skills in self-understanding of career interests/abilities and understandings of both educational and occupational opportunities available for using them; (f) career decisionmaking skills; (g) job seeking/finding/getting/holding skills; (h) skills in making productive use of leisure time (including unpaid work); (i) skills in overcoming bias and stereotyping as they impinge on full freedom of career choice; and (j) skills in humanizing the workplace for oneself. There is good evidence that, at least at the K-12 level, such skills can be transmitted to and acquired by persons. (OCE, 1979), (Mitchell, 1978), (Bonnet, 1978), (Bhaerman, 1977), (Enderlein, 1976).

Several key observations are in order with respect to these skills. First, these are the basic skills that employers have been seeking for many years in persons who seek employment in their organizations. Increasingly, both because of new technology and because of the need for change, employers have been forced to provide a great deal of specific vocational skill training uniquely appropriate to their operations themselves. They can afford to do so provided those they train possess the 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education.

Second, this set of skills is not something the education system can provide by itself. Both the expertise and the physical resources of the broader community must be added to those available within the education system if persons are to acquire such skills. Those who place total blame on the education system for failure of persons to possess such skills are being both unfair and unrealistic. Career education *must* be viewed as a community responsibility with the education system being but one of the "partners" in this effort.

Third, this set of skills places equal emphasis on the rights of individuals in our society to *choose* along with their right to *change* career decisions. It is a set of skills that maximizes freedom for the individual rather than locking the person into a narrow set of opportunities or forcing premature career decisions on individuals. It recognizes that many persons have not made clear, specific career decisions and should not *be forced* to do so. Nothing could be more important in these uncertain times.

Fourth, these skills are best provided persons as a developmental, longitudinal effort rather than as a set of remedial programs. It is better to develop good work habits than to try correcting bad work habits. It is better to develop basic academic skills in young children than to provide remedial instruction to older youth and adults. It is better to help people choose career decisions wisely than it is to correct bad career decisions that have been made. The pool of out-of-school, out-of-work, out-of-skill, out-of-luck, out-of-hope youth and adults in our Nation has been growing for years. It will be better to

launch a developmental effort aimed at cutting off the "flow" into that pool than to continue devoting our efforts almost exclusively to "draining" that pool. The "draining the pool" approach has been tried since the MDTA days of 1962. Now, 18 years and countless of billions of dollars later, that "pool" is larger than it was when we started. A developmental, longitudinal approach —such as career education—is obviously very much needed.

Finally, it should be observed that it is obvious the need for these 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills will be increasing in both the short and long run future. America's current energy crisis, by itself, will obviously force very rapid and very sizeable changes in our occupational society and in our total lifestyles. Recent National and international events add to this certainty of still more rapid occupational change. The need for career education is not properly seen only in terms of the employment/unemployment statistics of today. Rather, it is more properly seen as a need that will continue to increase into the foreseeable future—no matter what may happen to employment statistics. It is *not* a short term, temporal need. Rather, it is a need that must be of concern to all of us for generations to come.

Career education In Urban K-12 School Districts

I know of no major urban K-12 school district in our Nation that has failed to launch and operate some kind of career education effort. That same generalization cannot be made for school districts in either suburban or in rural America. This, by itself, is significant. Moreover, if one were to compile a listing of the very best, most exemplary career education efforts in our Nation, many urban K-12 school districts would certainly be included in that listing. This, too, is significant. True, it would be difficult to find any large urban K-12 school district where career education has been successfully implemented in *every* classroom in *every* school building. It would be even more difficult to find an urban K-12 school district with what could be regarded as a truly adequate career education budget. In spite of these limitations, it seems safe to say that career education *is* being implemented in urban K-12 school districts, from coast to coast, throughout our Nation. The record is clear on this point and is most impressive indeed. In many, although certainly not all, of these urban school districts, major credit for this significant record of accomplishment must go to local directors of vocational education who, having seen the need for career education, have spearheaded efforts aimed at its adoption and implementation.

A number of promising potentials now exist for carrying career education even further in urban K-12 school districts. While space limitations will not permit full discussion of any of these here, several will be identified using, as an organizational basis, the two *process* goals of career education that exist at the K-12 level.

Process Goal 1: To Change The K-12 Education System

One of the two major *process* goals of career education, at the K-12 level, is to change the entire education *system* so as to provide a more proper and a

more appropriate emphasis on career education's 10 employability/adaptability/promotability skills in *every* part of that system. This is an effort that is seen as beginning in the earliest elementary school years and extending through Grade 12 in a longitudinal developmental fashion consistent with what is known about both the process of career development and the teaching/learning process. The classroom is at the heart of this effort. Career education seeks, in every classroom, to introduce and apply a "careers" emphasis, where appropriate, as a vehicle for use in increasing academic achievement—and in equipping youth with the 10 career education skills. Such a "careers" emphasis can be helpful both in motivating teachers to want to teach and in motivating students to want to learn. These two kinds of motivations are, of course, a key part of the secret to increasing educational productivity—i.e., academic achievement. Far too often, in many urban K-12 school districts, one or both of these sources of motivation has been lacking and educational achievement of students has suffered. Career education makes no pretense of being *the* sole answer to the problem of increasing educational productivity. It does claim to be able to help some—and the kinds of evidence cited earlier in this article supply clear proof that this claim does possess validity.

Several things exist indicating that resources for using career education as a vehicle for increasing educational productivity are on the rise. They include: *P.L. 207—"Career Education Incentive Act."* Funds appropriated by Congress under this Act flow from the Federal Government to State educational Agencies (SEAs) on a per pupil formula basis and, from the SEAs, to local education agencies (LEAs) by a grant application procedure. Under such arrangements, urban school districts have, with past Federal legislation, had difficulty receiving what they believe to be their "share" of such funds. That same situation exists today with respect to funds curently being distributed under P.L. 95-207. In spite of this—and in spite of the very small congressional appropriations made, to date, under this law ($19.5 million for FY 79 and $20.0 million for FY 80) urban K-12 school districts should expect sufficient funds under this act to provide some help in at least meeting inservice education needs for career education. It would require both an amendment to the current legislation and greatly increased Federal funding before P.L. 95-207 funds could be regarded as a *major* source of help to urban K-12 school districts.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Emergency School Aid Act. Funds expended for career education by urban K-12 school districts under these two major pieces of educational legislation have exceeded, by a wide margin, those from Federal legislation carrying the term "career education" in their title. They have been especially useful in establishing career education efforts in elementary school settings, but have covered the entire K-12 spectrum. With the recent increase in new evidence demonstrating the viability of career education as a vehicle for increasing basic academic achievement, it seems likely that the use of these funds for career education may well be on the increase. This potential will be enhanced if we can con-

vince some urban K-12 school districts to submit their career education efforts to OE's Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) and carry this through to inclusion in the National Diffusion Network (NDN). This trend has begun and stands ready for rapid, sizeable expansion.

P.L. 94-142—"Education For All Handicapped Children." This significant piece of Federal legislation provides, among other things, for an "Individual Educational Plan" (IEP) for each eligible student. Recent significant actions on behalf of the Career Development Division of the Council For Exceptional Children are leading to insertion of a "careers" component into the IEP in many settings. A fine example of how such an effort has aided in implementation of career education in K-12 urban school districts can be seen in Milwaukee, Wisconsin where it is being directed by Ms. Alice Kudlata. The Council For Exceptional Children continues to provide strong leadership, along with numerous good examples of successful career education practices, to its members aimed at encouraging a comprehensive career education effort for persons with handicaps. Part of the funds urban K-12 school districts receive under this legislation can—and should—be used for career education for persons with handicaps.

Counseling and Guidance Legislation. In Fiscal Year 1980, $18.0 million dollars has been budgeted to support K-12 counseling and guidance efforts using, again, a per pupil formula distribution. The American personnel and Guidance Association has recently completed a major study of "The Role Of The School Counselor In Career Education" and has published a comprehensive report based on that study. Federal vocational education funds have been used, in several major projects over the last few years, to study and encourage a greater emphasis in career guidance on the part of practicing school counselors. With such studies and recommendations available, it is reasonable to expect that a sizeable portion of this new $18.0 million dollars may be appropriately used to encourage a more proper involvement of school counselors in the total career education effort. This, too, should be of significant help to K-12 urban school districts.

CETA Youth Legislation. The Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP), Youth Incentive Entitlement Program (YIEP), and the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) portions of the CETA youth legislation are all very directly tied into career education. As these words are being written, that legislation is now coming up for legislative review. It seems very likely that some significant changes wil be made in terms of better coordinating such youth programs under a single effort. It is also quite likely that some changes may be made in terms of ways in which LEAs secure funds under this legislation from their CETA Prime Sponsors. In spite of these sources of uncertainty, it seems very likely that: (a) some substantial Federal funds under this legislation will be available to urban K-12 school districts; and (b) the use of such funds, as part of the school district's total career education effort, will be very possible and highly desirable. Such funds can be especially useful in those portions of the school district's career education program serving students age 14 and older. Many outstanding examples of such

use now exist in K-12 urban school districts. It is important to recognize that, so long as this CETA youth legislation talks about such things as (a) providing youth with general employability skills; (b) providing youth with career awareness/career exploration opportunities; and (c) relating work experience to academic classwork, it bears more directly on career education than on any other part of the K-12 school system.

Proposed New Youth Employment Initiative. As of the time these words are being written, the Administration has requested a special $2.0 billion dollars for use in combatting the youth employment/unemployment problem. Of this, approximately $1.0 billion has been proposed for use in those 3,000 K-12 school districts enrolling high proportions of economically disadvantaged youth. This would certainly include every major urban K-12 school district in the Nation. Most of these funds are to be used for purposes of supplying youth (especially secondary school age youth) with: (a) basic academic skills; and (b) employability skills. A strong career guidance component is to be included. Once again, the possibility exists for using such funds to help implement major portions of an urban school district's career education effort. It is too early to know if this proposed legislation will pass the Congress—or receive adequate funding—just as it is too early to know the kinds of restrictions that may be placed on use of funds. It is not to soon to begin to plan to use these funds, in a sizeable way, to support career education efforts.

Major National Teacher Sources Initiatives. In my opinion, the greatest potential for increasing career education's emphasis on introducing change into the education system is *professional*, not *financial*, in nature. I am referring to significant major National efforts taken, during the past two years, on behalf of a number of National associations of classrooms designed to provide their members with illustrations of how and encouraging them to implement career education within various specific academic disciplines at the secondary school level. These efforts include major projects on the part of: (a) National Council of Teachers of English; (b) National Council For The Social Studies; (c) National Science Teachers Association; (d) American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages; (e) American Association For Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; (f) National Business Education Associations; (g) National Art Education Association; (h) National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and (i) American Industrial Arts Association. Each of these projects has been carried out *by* classroom teachers *for* classroom teachers in the specific academic disciplines represented in this list. The teacher handbooks and materials produced by each of these Associations are, without exception, exemplary in nature. Their efforts to gain an internal professional commitment on the part of their members is even more outstanding. Career education has, from the beginning, placed its basic trust in the classroom teacher. These National associations of classroom teachers have produced clear evidence that this trust was justified. The potential for increasing both the quantity and the quality of career education in K-12 urban school districts resulting from these projects is very great indeed. All that remains is for the K-12 school districts to use it.

Process Goal 2: To Form Career Education "Partnerships" With The Broader Community

The second major *process* goal of career education, at the K-12 level, is to form "partnerships" with wide segments of the broader community in such a way that a coordinated, collaborative community effort is directed toward providing youth with the 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education. This goal is based, in part, on recognition of the fact that the education system possesses neither the expertise, the financial resources, nor the facilities to provide these skills to youth solely through their own efforts. In part, it is based on recognition of the fact that many kinds of community efforts to provide youth with some of these 10 skills already exist and that, if our goal is really to maximize the amount of help being made available to youth, we should take advantage of such resources.

Of the major kinds of community resources currently expressing interest in becoming involved as "partners" in career education, almost all are represented in every major urban area of the Nation. The list of all possible community resources is too long to include here. Instead, only brief statements will be made regarding illustrative examples of some of these which, at present, hold great potential for increasing the effectiveness of career education efforts for K-12 pupils in urban school districts. *The following is NOT a comprehensive listing.*

Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A. has issued two formal papers supporting and endorsing career education. Many local Chambers of Commerce have become actively involved in providing resources and support for career education in their communities. Several are currently paying part, or all, of the salary of their school system's Career Education Coordinator. Some are housing that person in offices at the local Chamber of Commerce. The expertise and prestige the Chamber of Commerce brings to a school system's K-12 career education effort can both improve the quality and guarantee continuation of the effort.

Organized Labor. Every major urban area has an AFL-CIO Labor Council. Both the United Autoworkers and the United Rubber, Plastic, Linoleum, and Cork Workers have issued formal policy statements supporting career education. The AFL-CIO also has a strong National policy statement supporting career education. Numerous examples of ways in which organized labor has contributed positively to local career education implementation efforts exist. It is a rich resource that should be used in every urban career education effort.

Women's American ORT. Women's American ORT, at their 1979 National Convention, passed a major resolution supporting both career education and vocational education. Significant career education leadership activities on behalf of career education have been undertaken by WAO in many communities across the Nation. This organization has a long and distinguished history of interest and involvement in helping to promote both quality education and better education for disadvantaged persons. It is in-

conceivable, to me, that any urban K-12 career education effort would want to do anything but work, in all possible ways, with Women's American ORT.

National Alliance of Business (NAB). The NAB Metros in the United States are, by and large, located in urban areas. NAB has a long and distinguished history of providing both general employability skills and work experience opportunities to economically disadvantaged youth. In addition, they have had an extensive program of "Career Guidance Institutes" which, in recent years, have involved both teachers and principals, as well as counselors, from the same school building. In such Institutes, participants receive the kinds of inservice education required for effective participation in career education. A substantial portion of an urban school district's career education in-service education needs could potentially be met through the NAB Career Guidance Institute opportunities. For this, and other reasons, it seems imperative that any urban K-12 career education effort seek "partnership" arrangements with their local NAB Metro.

American Legion/Legion Auxiliary. The American Legion/Legion Auxiliary has, at the National level, a joint Education Committee. That Committee has indicated a strong interest in career education and has prepared a number of publications directly related to career education. They have definite plans with respect to ways in which local American Legion Posts and/or Legion Auxiliary Chapters could become "partners" in career education at the local community level. Not nearly enough local school districts have yet sought out these resources. Obviously, not nearly *all* such local units can be expected to have received the "word" from their National Headquarters about career education yet. In spite of this, the American Legion and Legion Auxiliary represent a potential "partner" for career education that should not be overlooked. They can become one of the community's strongest resources.

Association of Junior Leagues, Inc. The Association of Junior Leagues is primarily concerned with promoting volunteerism in the local community. As part of their total effort, they have developed an excellent "Career Development Course" which can be made available to local school districts as a unit to be infused within the total curriculum. They are particularly interested in supporting and engaging in projects related to serving economically disadvantaged persons—youths and adults—in the community. This is a most powerful community organization whose resources can provide very valuable assistance to a total K-12 career education effort. They have not yet been utilized as fully as they should be.

Goodwill Industries. In addition to their many other community service undertakings, Goodwill Industries has, for years, operated a comprehensive and valuable program of vocational assessment—particularly for handicapped persons. The expertise available from professional persons in Goodwill Industries extends beyond their skill in vocational assessment to include a great deal of knowledge regarding how best to use services of volunteers in the community. Again, this is a community resource with whom many operating K-12 career education efforts have not yet established viable "partnerships." It can and should be done.

Rotary International. Rotary, International is one of several community organizations with "service to others" as a primary goal. In several communities, Rotary's Education Committee has been active in forming "partnerships" with career education personnel from the local school system. New York City is a prime example of a large urban area where this has occurred. At the same time, this kind of "partnership" has not, to date, become a common one in large urban areas. The potential of involving the kinds of community leaders who belong to Rotary, International is very great indeed. It is a potential that should be used more.

National School Volunteer Program. Almost every K-12 urban school district employs one or more persons to serve as coordinators of school volunteers. In the past, the primary efforts of such persons have been focused, by and large, on providing volunteers to help with instructional problems in classrooms. In recent years, there has been a National interest and movement, within NSVP, to move toward a more active involvement in career education. The prime example of where this has been converted into an effective operational reality is Boston, Massachusetts. The "Boston experience," is linking NSVP with career education efforts, is one that should be replicated in every K-12 urban school district in the Nation. This is yet to be done.

National Center for Service-Learning. The National Center for Service-Learning (NCSL) is now established in approximately 1,800 K-12 school districts in the Nation. Devoted to learning derived from serving others, this effort is obviously closely related to career education in many ways. Service-learning advocates, while giving a priority to unpaid work, have also participated, in many communities, in CETA youth activities under conditions where youth receive wages and/or allowances. The potential, in any community, where both a service-learning specialist and a career education specialist are employed by the same school district, for forming collaborative "partnerships" is obviously very great indeed. Here again, we see a form of linkage that, to date, has not been fully utilized.

Community Work-Education Councils. Thanks primarily to the outstanding leadership of Dr. Willard Wirtz and his colleagues at the National Manpower Institute, a number of communities have now established formal "Work-Education Councils" at the local community levels. Such Councils, wherever they exist, include the local school system as a "partner." In some communities, however, these have not, apparently, formally involved the close working relationship with the school system's total career education effort that obviously should exist. Instead, some communities have formed "Community Career Education Councils" which, in operation, serve to compete with the Community Work-Education Council. This should not be allowed to occur. We need all the resources we can gather in support of community career education efforts. The Community Work-Education Councils represent one such resource.

PIC Councils. Private Industry Councils (PICs) have recently been formed in many urban communities under provisions of Title VII of the CETA legislation. Other communities are in the process of forming such Councils at the

present time. Wherever such Councils exist, they are mandated to include the local education system within their membership. While the primary responsibilities of such Councils revolve around CETA concerns, they are obviously overlapping, in their relationships with school system, and with career education concerns. An urban K-12 career education effort that does not attempt to form "partnerships" with its local PIC Council has missed a golden opportunity. This should not be allowed to happen.

National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB). While local "chapters" of NFIB are nonexistent, there are, in every urban community, a large number of small, independent businesses whose owners belong to this 5.5 million person organization. The importance of forming "partnerships" with independent business in a community's total career education effort cannot be overemphasized. It is in independent business where a majority of the new, entry level jobs of the 1980s will be located. Today's youth need to learn much more about the general topic of entrepreneurship than most of them know at presen.. If a particular independent business is too small to participate in a formal "ADOPT-A-SCHOOL" program, they can make a valuable contribution by participating in an "ADOPT-A-TEACHER" program—or even in an "ADOPT-A-STUDENT" program.

National Retired Teachers Association/American Association of Retired Persons (NRTA/AARP). Strong local units of NRTA/AARP exist in every urban area. As a National organization, NRTA/AARP has expressed strong interest in becoming more involved in career education as a community effort. Members of this thirteen million person organization have expressed interest in both volunteer and paid opportunities for participation in career education. They have also expressed interest in the great need to serve career education needs of retired persons. As with other National organizations, it is unlikely that all local units have yet heard of career education—or would choose to become involved in it. In spite of this, NRTA/AARP represents a community contact that should be explored by every urban K-12 career education effort.

National Youth Organizations. Every K-12 urban school district has numerous vocational youth organizations within its structure, each of which has clear career education emphasis for its members—including, for example, FFA, DECA, VICA, FBLA, OEA, AIASA, and HOSA. Each holds great potential, not only for delivering effective career education to its own members, but also in using its members in other phases of the school district's total education effort—particularly in K-8 portion of that effort. Much more emphasis is needed here.

In addition, a number of other National youth organizations, each of which operates in every urban community outside the formal Education system, are actively involved in and committed to delivering the general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education to their members. These include: (a) Junior Achievement, Inc.; (b) 4-H Clubs of America; (c) Boy Scouts of America; and (d) Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. At the National level, each of

these major youth organizations has been actively involved in forming "partnerships" with career education. Each has published a variety of excellent career education materials (many of which are readily available to public schools). Each richly deserved the strongest possible support and cooperation from career education advocates in the urban K-12 school district. The kinds of linkages that need to be established with such organizations hold tremendous potential for better meeting the career education needs of millions of youth. They should be fully utilized.

National Minority Organizations. In the beginning, many national organizations representing minority persons were suspicious that career education might be used to either (a) track minority students into vocational education; or (b) discourage minority youth from considering college attendance. The track record of career education during the decade of the 1970s has clearly erased the validity of such suspicions. Further, career education's emphasis on both the freedom to choose and the freedom to change career choices is one most minority organizations can support. In spite of this, career education advocates, in many K-12 school districts, have been slow to involve such community organizations as National Urban League, NAACP, National Council for Negro Women, SER, OIC, ASPIRA, or the National Urban Coalition in their career education efforts. Each represents a potentially valuable "partner" in career education's efforts to help youth enrolled in urban K-12 school districts. It is not past time when such "partnerships" should be actively sought. We should wait no longer to do so.

Major National Corporations. Several major National corporations, each of whom has plants and/or other kinds of operations in most major cities, have endorsed and are actively participating in career education at the present time. Examples include: (a) General Motors Corporation; (b) General Electric; (c) American Telephone and Telegraph Company; (d) American Cyanimid Corporation; and (e) McDonalds Corporation. In addition, while not National corporate operations, many other major National corporations have also been deeply involved in career education in selected cities—including Raytheon Corporation (in the Boston Area), Lockheed Corporation (in San Jose, California), TRW Corporation (in the Los Angeles area), Xerox Corporation (in Rochester, New York), McCormick Spice Company (in Baltimore), Rexnord Corporation (in Milwaukee), and many others, Career education advocates in urban areas should certainly attempt to link with corporations such as these in community career education efforts. The point is, in many urban settings, one or more major corporations exist with some "track record" of involvement in career education. In addition to large companies uniquely located in a particular city, urban career educators should investigate possibilities of working with large corporations such as the examples presented here.

The kinds of examples presented in this section of this paper will hopefully make it clear that career education is truly a community effort. Much of the future of career education is dependent on our making this statement even more true during the decade of the 1980s.

Career Education For Out-of-School Youth and Adults

The true need for and promise of career education can never be met if it is regarded as an effort involving linkages only between the K-12 school system and the broader community. It will be impossible to do more than mention the broader problem here. It would be disastrous to ignore it.

Out-of-School Youth. The numbers of out-of-school and out-of-work youth in major urban areas continue to increase. The need, on the part of many such youth, to consider "work" as an "alternative life style" is similarly increasing. A career education effort is very badly needed by such youth. To the extent that the urban K-12 school district can change toward providing a career education emphasis, it may be possible to serve such youth through encouraging them to return to the public school K-12 system. For many such youth, some form of alternative school is the best answer—whether that "alternative school" is part of the K-12 system or run by some community based organization. The number of community based organizations attempting to help out-of-school youth solve work/education relationships problems in increasing. Many such organizations understand minority, economically disadvantaged youth far better than they understand career education approaches useful in helping such youth. A great service could be rendered if some career education expertise were to be made available from the K-12 school system to such community based organizations.

Unemployed Adults. Many unemployed adults in urban areas are facing problems of occupational and/or career change. A "community career education resource center," located somewhere in the broader community, that is designed to serve adults as well as youth is badly needed. (Hoyt, 1978). Career Education advocates from K-12 school districts could provide a much needed community service were they to participate in forming, equipping, and operating such a Center.

Mid-Career Change Adults. This problem is especially severe for women seeking to return to the labor market from full-time homemaking positions. The problems such persons face in acquiring general employability/adaptability/promotability skills are equally as great as their problems in acquiring specific vocational skills. Their problems related to career decisionmaking, to ways of overcoming bias and stereotyping, and in acquiring job seeking/getting/finding/holding skills are obviously especially great. Once again, the expertise of career education advocates, if made available to community agencies seeking to meet the needs of such persons, could represent a significant community service.

Community College and Four-Year College/University Students. Every major urban area houses at least one community college and one four-year college or university. Career education is badly needed by youth and adults enrolled as students in such institutions. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges has launched a major career education information effort for their members. At least three National conferences—including two for liberal arts colleges—have been held on career education in four-year college/university settings. Efforts of K-12 career education advocates could

be highly helpful in stimulating the organization and implementation of career education in postsecondary educational institutions.

Concluding Statement

The career education effort has clarified both the need for its one cognitive and two process goals—and its ability to meet these needs--during the decade of the 1970s. Urban educators have been among the leaders in both developing and implementing the career education concept. As we enter the decade of the 1980s, great opportunities and obligations exist to further refine and extend the application of career education concepts. There seems little doubt but that, as was true during the 1970s, urban educators will provide much of the leadership that is needed.

References

Ansell, E.M. & J.C. Hansen. "Patterns In Vocational Development of Urban Youth" *J. Counseling Psychology*, 1971, 11, 505-508.

Bhaerman, Robert. *Career Education And Basic Academic Achievement: A Descriptive Analysis of the Results.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Bonnet, Deborah G. *A Synthesis of Results and Programmatic Recommendations Emerging From Career Education Evaluations in 1975-76.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978

Datta, Lois-ellin, et al. *Career Education: What Proof Do We Have That It Works?* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Enderlin, Thomas. *A Review of Career Education Evaluation Studies.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Hamdani, Asma. "Facilitating Vocational Development Among Disadvantaged Inner-City Adolescents" *Vocational Guidance* Q., 1977, 26, No. 1, 60-68.

Hoyt, K.B. "The Community Career Education Resource Concept" (In) *Refining The Career Education (K-12).* Palo Alto, California: American Institutes For Research, 1978.

Office of Career Education. *Career Education Programs That Work.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

Contributions of Career Education to Reducing Youth Unemployment

Most American youth have made no clear-cut career decisions. This should be neither surprising nor discouraging. In part, it is due to the process of career development which, while beginning early in life, can be expected to delay firm career decisions until about the mid 20s. In part, it is due to the increasing rapidity of change in the occupational society which, for most persons, will necessitate more than one occupational change during their adult working life. Both the right to choose and the right to change vocations are among the most sacred of rights for all Americans. Youth, as well as adults, deserve these rights.

If today's youth are to capitalize on such rights, it is essential that they be equipped with a set of general employability skills and attitudes that will provide each with maximum flexibility and adapatability throughout their adult working life. Such skills and attitudes include: (a) basic academic skills; (b) good work habits; (c) a desire to work; (d) a basic understanding of career interests and abilities; (f) understanding of educational and career opportunities available for choice; (g) career decisionmaking skills; (h) job seeking/finding/getting/holding skills; (i) skills in overcoming bias and stereotyping; and (j) skills in humanizing the workplace for oneself. These are skills and attitudes needed by all youth and ones that are welcomed by most employers. Providing all youth with such skills is a central concern of the career education effort.

The development of such skills and attitudes requires a longitudinal effort beginning in the early elementary school years and continuing into adulthood. To wait until age 16 to begin this effort is to invite failure. The American system of public and private education holds great potential for making significant positive contributions to this effort. Our failure to use the entire *system* of Education to attain this purpose has resulted in many viewing Education as part of the problem rather than as part of the solution. As a result, some have given up on the American education system and have devoted their primary efforts to searching for alternatives. No single segment of society—including Education—is, by itself, an adequate answer to solving the employment/unemployment problems facing today's youth. A community linkage of efforts is needed. The American system of Education should be part of that community linkage effort.

The American system of Education consists primarily of courses, teachers, and students. The potential for helping to equip students with general employability skills is already present in the curriculum if teachers can be shown how to use this potential. If this is to happen, it is essential that: (a) preparing students for work be seen as a basic goal of Education which complements, rather than competes with, other basic goals: (b) *all* classroom teachers be seen as key delivery agents for this effort; and (c) the broader business/labor/industry/Government community accept responsibility for forming a partnership with educators for delivering these general employability skills and attitudes to youth. Both the use of community persons, including parents, as resource persons in classrooms and the use of the occupational community as a

learning laboratory for students is an essential part of career education. The efficacy of career education has been adequately demonstrated over the last eight years. Its implementation as part of a national effort to alleviate problems of youth employement/unemployment is yet to take place.

The needs of youth for acquiring general employability skills as a basis for exercising their right to freedom of career choice cannot be met by the Education system alone. In terms of the especially great need for such skills and attitudes on the part of economically disadvantaged youth, the most logical link for career education is with the Youth Employment Training Program (YETP) of CETA. The CETA law itself calls for such linkages between YETP and career education. We have made a small but significant beginning during the past year with a contract aimed at identifying issues, problems, and concerns involved in YETP/career education linkages.

One of the major problems we discovered is related to the kinds of youth jobs made available under the "career employment experiences" portion of YETP. Instead of emphasizing, as the YETP legislation calls for, using such jobs to improve the ability of youth to make career decisions, too many of these jobs have concentrated primary attention on helping youth acquire specific, entry level vocational skills. I have no objections to such an emphasis for those YETP eligible youth who have made clearcut career decisions. For the many who have not, work experience that concentrates on helping youth acquire the general employability skills of career education is much more appropriate.

Major changes are needed both in the nature of youth jobs provided under YETP and in better linking YETP with career education efforts of Education. Youth jobs for career undecided youth should be judged in terms of their contributions to readying youth for unsubsidized employment that will be productive for society and satisfying to the individual. The prime criterion for judging such jobs should be the kinds and amount of learning that accrues to the youth, not the degree to which such jobs contribute to productivity for the employer.

Thus, I propose use of the term "CAREER DEVELOPMENT JOBS" to describe those that should be created for career undecided YETP eligible youth. I do so for three basic reasons. First, use of this term would make clear to both youth and to their employers why the youth is employed. Second, it provides a sound basis for the Education system to use in awarding academic credit for work experience gained through such jobs. Finally, it makes clear the fact that such youth jobs are not created, nor do they operate, so as to take jobs away from employed adults. Organized labor must have such an assurance if their support for this effort is to be expected.

Both the kinds of CAREER DEVELOPMENT JOBS described here and the kinds of WORK-STUDY JOBS typically associated with vocational education need to be made available for choice by economically disadvantaged youth. Either kind can be thought of as a "LEARNING JOB" which will provide youth with many of the general employability skills they need. The essential difference is that, while the primary focus of CAREER DEVELOPMENT JOBS is

on career awareness, career exploration, and career decisionmaking, the primary focus of WORK-STUDY JOBS is on acquisition of specific entry level vocational skills needed by those who have made some first career decisions. A sound national policy would be to provide both, not attempt to choose between these two alternative kinds of LEARNING JOBS. Either can be used as an avenue to unsubsidized employment.

If today's economically disadvantaged youth were asked what they most need, many would reply by saying they need a job. It is obviously too simplistic to respond by just creating more jobs for youth. To do only that would, in effect, postpone rather than solve employment/unemployment problems faced by our Nation's youth. All youth jobs created must be LEARNING JOBS. If this is to occur, the entire *system* of American Education—not just that component called vocational education—must become involved in the effort. Assuring such involvement is what career education is all about.

Career Education and Social Studies

It is sometimes more difficult to specify relationships between things that are highly similar in their goals than it is to discover relationships between things that are largely dissimilar. The high degree of similarity between the goals of career education and the basic purposes of social studies is a good case in point. This can be easily illustrated through viewing career education in terms of both the purposes and the content of the social studies curriculum.

The career education effort calls for a longitudinal, developments effort—beginning in the early elementary school years and extending throughout the entire education system—to equip ALL students with 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills useful in helping persons cope with the increasing rapidity of occupational change. These 10 skills are listed here using, as categories, the three basic purposes of social studies as given by the National Council For The Social Studies:

A. *Social Studies Purpose I:*	Education for citizenship in a democratic State and a global society
1. Career Education Skill:	Skills in basic understanding and appreciation of the private enterprise system
2. Career Education Skill:	Skills in understanding educational/occupational opportunities—and their relationships
3. Career Education Skill:	Skills in making productive use of leisure time
B. *Social Studies Purpose II:*	The enhancement of human dignity through learning
4. Career Education Skill:	Acquisition of basic academic skills
5. Career Education Skill:	Skills in practicing good work habits
6. Career Education Skill:	Skills in developing a personally meaningful set of work values; i.e., a personal desire to work
7. Career Education Skill:	Skills in humanizing the workplace for oneself
C. *Social Studies Purpose III:*	A commitment to rational processes
8. Career Education Skill:	Career decisionmaking skills
9. Career Education Skill:	Job seeking/finding/getting/holding skills
10. Career Education Skill:	Skills in overcoming bias and stereotyping as these impinge on full freedom of career choice

Some may want to classify the 10 "career education skills" differently under the basic NCSS "purposes." That is not of basic importance. Rather, it is important to recognize that social studies teachers who provide their students with these "career education skills" are carrying out the basic purposes of social studies as stated by NCSS. *Providing students with these 10 "career edu-*

cation skills" is ONE way of achieving the basic purposes of the social studies. In this sense, career education is, in no way, an "add-on" for the social studies. Rather, it is a vehicle for use in attaining the basic purposes of social studies.

If the social studies are viewed in terms of "subjects," NCSS has listed such "subjects" as including: (a) sociology; (b) history; (c) economics; (d) geography; and (e) political science. Without exception, a discussion and study of both "work" and "workers" must, it seems to me, be considered as a logical part of the subject matter to be taught. A basic problem facing every teacher is to make the subject(s) being taught interesting and meaningful to students. It is career education's contention that inclusion of the topics of "work" and "workers" within any of the subjects of social studies is *one* way of doing so. Once again, it should be obvious that career education does not call for "adding on" to the subject. Rather, it simply represents a different emphasis for use in teaching the subject. The subject itself remains of paramount importance. We are NOT asking social studies teachers to teach "career education," for example, in lieu of history. Rather, we are asking teachers to use basic concepts of "work" and "workers" as a vehicle for making history more interesting and meaningful to students.

To implement career education in the classroom, career education asks four basic things of teachers: (a) use a "careers" emphasis as *one* way of motivating students to learn the subject matter; (b) reward "work" of students when it occurs--i.e., use a positive rather than a negative approach to teaching; (c) introduce variety into the teaching/learning process through using the resources of the broader community; and (d) emphasize and reward the practice of good work habits in the classroom. Both (b) and (d) are simply parts of good teaching. To use (c) through emphasizing the "careers" emphasis of career education is one way of building community relationships that can be used for many purposes in addition to attaining the goals of career education.

It is (a) that deserves a special note here. Career education advocates are convinced that use of a "careers" emphasis is a very powerful and effective way of making subject matter more interesting and meaningful to students. There are many more ways of using "careers" emphasis for motivating students to learn than most teachers have typically used in the past. We want to encourage the use of the "careers" emphasis. At the same time, we do NOT want to make it an *exclusive* emphasis for two reasons: (1) to do so would detract from many other good and viable reasons for students to learn the subject matter; and (2) to use *any* emphasis as a motivational device ALL the time is to automatically make that emphasis ineffective—i.e., students will soon tire of being motivated in only one fashion. Thus, the social studies teacher who is "doing career education right" will be that teacher who, while searching for ways to insert a "careers" emphasis into the subject matter as a motivational vehicle, is simultaneously searching for and using other vehicles also aimed at motivating and encouraging students to learn. The NCSS "Handbook for Career Education In The Social Studies" is an excellent document. If social studies teachers will use it as only one of several approaches to

motivating students, it will be a valuable tool indeed. I hope that no social studies teacher tries to use a "careers" emphasis as an exclusive approach to teaching.

Because of the obviously high similarity in purposes and goals between social studies and career education, an increasing number of attempts are being made to "infuse" a wide variety of career education materials into the social studies curriculum. I find myself worried about this and want to share my basic concern with you. The generalization I think is appropriate to make is that, IF the materials being urged on the social studies teacher can obviously be seen as enhancing the *instructional* goals and purposes of the *social studies,* then they can be legitimately considered for use. If such materials are urged to be used only in the name of "career education," then they should be viewed with suspicion. That is, the job of the social studies teacher is to teach "social studies" — not to teach "career education." While "social studies" and 'career education" are obviously not incompatible, it is still essential that the social studies teacher clearly see and understand how career education materials proposed for use fit in with the subject matter being taught.

A good example here is the current efforts being made in many school districts to introduce the PROJECT BUSINESS Materials of Junior Achievement into junior high social studies classes. For those junior high social studies teachers who see the subjects of "economics" and "understanding the private enterprise system" as *legitimate* parts of the subject matter to be taught, the PROJECT BUSINESS materials may well prove to be a most valuable way of teaching that content. Those junior high social studies teachers who do not see such content as relevant and/or appropriate in their classrooms should resist the use of such materials. *This is a professional decision that should be made by the individual social studies teacher.*

Career education has, from its inception, regarded the classroom teacher as the key, pivotal "actor" in its implementation efforts. The reasons for this include: (a) the career education concepts to be taught demand a longitudinal, developmental approach that extend over the entire education system — they are not appropriately taught at only one grade level or at only one time; (b) the goal of preparing students for work is a basic goal of American Education. *Basic* goals are those implemented in every part of the curriculum, not in only one subject area or at only one grade level; (c) teachers are powerful influencers of student attitudes and actions. If we want students to view "work" and themselves as "workers" in a more positive light, then it is essential that their teachers first increase their positive attitudes about "work" and "workers"; and (d) the employability skills of career education are already imbedded in the curriculum in many places. It will be far better to "draw them out" of the existing curriculum than it will be to "add on" a new subject called "career education."

The basic trust and confidence career education has placed in the classroom teacher is well justified by the many outstanding examples found in the NCSS "Handbook for Career Education In The Social Studies." I very much hope that NCSS members throughout the Nation will carefully consider the contents of this important handbook as they plan ways of making their sub-

jects still more interesting, appealing, and meaningful to students. A career education approach, if used wisely and judiciously, *can* help teachers attain the instructional goals of social studies. I hope you will give it a chance to do so in your classroom.

The Viability of Career Education as a Vehicle for Use in Combatting Bias and Stereotyping in Society

Introduction

The very first monograph published by OE's Office of Career Education committed OCE to reducing bias and stereotyping. That document was written more than three years before Federal career education legislation obligated the Office of Career Education to this goal. Since that time, OCE has published three additional major documents related specifically to problems of using career education to overcome bias and stereotyping. In addition, we have produced and used a special manual for OCE project directors aimed at helping each of them include an emphasis on overcoming bias and stereotyping in their career education demonstration projects.

During the FY 75-FY 78 period in which career education operated a demonstration effort within the United States Office of Education, a total of 76 of the 325 regular projects funded were aimed specifically at demonstrating career education for special segments of the population. These 76 demonstration projects were conducted at a cost of $7.7 million. This represents 18.8 percent of all career education funds appropriated by the Congress. Had all Federal programs devoted a similar portion of their efforts and financial resources to combatting bias and stereotyping during this period of time, it seems to me we would be much further ahead in the total effort than is currently the case. At the very least, it seems safe to contend that OCE has not ignored the problem.

In spite of these past OCE efforts, much more obviously remains to be done. If progress is to be continued to be made through using career education as one of many vehicles for use in combatting bias and stereotyping in American society, then it seems to me that two basic things must happen including: (a) the potential of career education for combatting bias and stereotyping must be clearly understood; and (b) those whose primary mission in life is combatting bias and stereotyping must be encouraged to take a more positive and active role in using career education as one "weapon" in their "arsenal." It is these two problems that I want to discuss here.

The Potential of Career Education for Combatting Bias and Stereotyping

There seems to be clear recognition and good agreement that the "careers" emphasis of career education is a potentially valuable vehicle for use in combatting and overcoming bias and stereotyping. That is, relatively few persons in our society can be expected to raise strong objections to our contention that all individuals have a right to choose their careers from among the widest possible set of opportunities. True, some persons will take no affirmative actions to convert this principle into reality, but few would object to the principle

---

Remarks prepared for the National Conference on Stereotyping conducted by the American Institutes for Research, Washington, D.C., November 27, 1979.

itself. In this sense, a "careers" basis for overcoming bias and stereotyping is a much safer one to use than other issues such as E.R.A., open housing, or integration of school district pupil populations. At least, with a "careers" emphasis, one need not expect the immediate presence of a large and vocal group of dissenters.

While this reasoning appears to be currently used by many specialists in the bias and stereotyping domain, it is not, in my opinion, a sufficient reason for choosing career education as a vehicle for use. Much more important are the strategies currently being advocated for use in implementing career education. Each of these strategies seems to hold high potential for use in combatting and overcoming bias and stereotyping. For this reason, I want to specify seven career education implementation strategies, and for each, illustrate its potential for use in overcoming bias and stereotyping.

Strategy 1: "People change" rather than "program add on." Career education, from the beginning, has operated under an assumption that, if educational change is the desired goal, the the most effective way to obtain such change is to change people—both educators and students themselves—within the education system. Approaches that depend on simply adding a new component to the existing system of education are viewed as efforts to "tinker" with the system, but not really *change* it. I wrote an article about this strategy once entitled "Psychosclerosis and Career Education" in which I defined the word "psychosclerosis" to mean "hardening of the attitudes." It seems to me that a strategy built on changing attitudes—and thus actions—of people is one that holds some potential for use in overcoming bias and stereotyping. I hope it also seems promising to you.

Strategy 2: "Infusion" rather than "separate courses." Career education has sought to be implemented through a "threading," "weaving," "drawing out" process within the existing curriculum rather than as an attempt to add new courses and/or curriculums to those already in existance. The basic assumption has been that the potential for inserting a "careers" emphasis is already present and is simply waiting to be used. The goals of career education can be met without, in anyway, changing or diluting current instructional goals. This strategy, too, appears to be one useful in overcoming bias and stereotyping. A simple illustration of how it might be applied can be seen in a classroom where the teacher is trying to meet an instructional goal of teaching students to spell words correctly. If the word selected for use is "letter carrier" rather than "postman," some progress is possible in reducing sex bias and stereotyping without, in anyway, detracting from the institutional goal of teaching pupils how to spell words correctly.

Strategy 3: A developmental effort extending through the life cycle. Career education advocates have pushed very hard for a "womb to tomb" emphasis of effort. We have done so, in large part, for two basic reasons. First, the attitudes and skills we seek to impart are ones that must begin their development in the very early years and continue, in a systematic scope and sequence fashion, during the entire formal education system. Each of the basic career education concepts is repeated at several points during this period with

some appropriate grade level variation from the same set of basic themes. It is this approach that is used to make sure that work values become an integral part of the person's total system of personal values. Second, we have used this approach because career maturation, unlike physical maturation, is a process that most persons experience more than once during the life span. We have considered the career education effort to be important, for example, both at the time of mid-career change and at the time persons choose to retire. This strategy, too, is one that seems to me to be of some possible utility to those whose primary mission is overcoming bias and stereotyping.

Strategy 4: Using classroom teachers as key delivery agents within education. Career education has operated, from the beginning, using a strategy that plays down the employment of a new breed of "Career Education Specialists" at the building level. Instead, we have relied on classroom teachers as prime delivery agents for career education at the building level. To implement this strategy, we devote a very great deal of career education's limited resources to teacher inservice education efforts aimed at acquainting teachers with career education concepts and helping them discover how to convey such concepts to students within the regular instructional program. A significant part of this inservice education effort is devoted to changing teacher attitudes toward work—both paid and unpaid—and toward their responsibilities for helping to meet the goal of preparing persons for work. It seems to me this is yet another basic strategy that could be easily utilized by those who view career education as a vehicle for combatting bias and stereotyping. I continue to wonder why it isn't being utilized more.

Strategy 5: Viewing career education as a community effort. Career education is being pictured as a community effort—not as something the education system can do by itself. Thus, a very great deal of attention is being paid to building partnerships between the education system and various community elements—including, for example, local Chambers of Commerce, local chapters of Women's American ORT, and local chapters of the Association of Junior Leagues, in hopes that the strengths of such groups can be added to those of the education system in promoting and delivering career education to persons in the community—adults as well as youth. With the help of such organizations, a very great deal of involvement of persons from the business/labor/industry/professional/government community has been generated. One of the obvious advantages of using such individuals in the career education "partnership" is that, by doing so, we are able to help them better understand and appreciate what we are trying to do in education. By working with them in a "partnership," they come to share several mutual concerns with us. This, too, is a strategy that seems to me to hold great potential for use by those concerned with reducing bias and stereotyping. Career education's potential for contributing in this fashion has not yet been widely recognized.

Strategy 6: Using education as one among several community delivery systems. In addition to forming "partnerships" with a wide variety of adult community organizations and specific business/labor/industrial operations in the community, career education has sought to join forces with such community

youth organizations as Junior Achievement, 4-H Clubs, Boy Scouts of America, and the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. in a system that recognizes that each of these organizations, in addition to the formal education system, holds high potential for effectively delivering career education to youth. Almost without exception, such community youth organizations seek some kind of working relationships with the education system. By helping them establish and maintain the kinds of relationships that best meets the goals of each such youth organization, we have found the youth organizations themselves more willing to join forces with the education system in a comprehensive career education effort. Each such youth organization holds as much potential for reducing bias and stereotyping as it does for any other aspect of career education. It does not seem to me that this aspect of career education is being utilized as effectively as it could or should be.

Strategy 7: Involving the home/family structure. The philosophy and goals of career education mandate close working relationships with parents as well as with youth themselves. Many classroom homework assignments having "careers" emphasis are purposely structured so as to involve parents in the process. So, too, are parents often asked to participate as resource persons and/or role models in career education activities and as providers of field trip opportunities for youth. Increasingly, attempts are being made to acquaint parents with basic career education concepts and to assist them in their efforts to discuss career options with their own children. The potential for influencing parental attitudes and actions in ways that help make them a positive force in the career development of their own children is very great indeed. An essential component of this is the potential for influencing parental attitudes and actions related to bias and stereotyping. This potential has yet to be widely recognized, let alone used.

Career Education's Need for Help in Reducing Bias and Stereotyping

Three things seem eminently obvious to me as I view the career education movement and its seven basic delivery strategies that I have outlined here. First, I am well aware of the fact that, because I had something to do with developing these strategies, they are probably not as potentially good or powerful for use in combatting bias and stereotyping as I believe them to be. I can make no excuses for my deep belief in and commitment to career education. Second, I am equally well aware of the fact that, even if these strategies are judged by experts in bias and stereotyping to be of some value, the career education movement is currently so small and so weak that it can do relatively little about using these strategies in combatting bias and stereotyping. For example, with the funds now available for use under P.L. 95-207, there are only 9 States with sufficient funds to employ a specialist in bais and stereotyping at the State department of education level in career education—in spite of the fact the law itself provides for such as person in every state education agency.

Third, and related to the second, it is obvious that, if career education is to make any sizeable contribution to reducing bias and stereotyping, it will re-

quire a very great deal of assistance and support from experts in the bias and stereotyping domain. Such experts, like many other community segments have already done, will have to agree to join the career education "crusade." Based on past performance, I do not know the chances of this becoming a reality. Of those elements concerned, only that concerned with reducing bias and stereotyping based on handicapping conditions has, to date, mounted a nationwide effort aimed at the effective delivery of career education. The prime thing we have heard, to date, from those concerned with sex bias and stereotyping has been criticism of our past and current efforts. The prime thing we have heard from those concerned with race bias and stereotyping has been silence. I can only hope that the future will see more positive efforts to join in the career education "partnership." Let me try here to outline briefly the kinds of help we are seeking.

First, we need a great deal of help in the current inservice education efforts aimed at helping teachers deliver career education in the classroom. We would welcome such help even if it consisted only of some practical examples of ways in which teachers could reduce bias and stereotyping in their daily instructional activities related to career education. It would be much more helpful, of course, if community organizations concerned with bias and stereotyping were to offer some personal expertise in conducting some of this inservice education in career education. Were this to happen, it would, of course, be necessary that such community persons first learn something about career education. I do not know the likelihood of this happening.

Second, we need help in finding and using role models who can illustrate to youth how they have overcome bias and stereotyping in their career patterns. One of the common complaints career education practitioners express is that, while they know they should use such role models, they don't know where to locate them or how they could secure their services—free of charge of course —in their career education efforts. To meet this need will require community assistance which, to date, has not been made readily available to career education persons.

Third, we need much greater involvement of community organizations whose prime concerns are the reduction of bias and stereotyping. When one examines the list of community organizations currently participating widely in the delivery of career education, there is typically a marked absence of such community organizations. Our past efforts to enlist participation of such groups has been notably unsuccessful. There is no need to go into detail on this point, but I can assure you it is true. Even a list of such possible community organizations with specific names and addresses would be helpful. Those few such organizations whose leaders have come to my office appear much more frequently to have come to complain rather than purposes of offering help.

Fourth, there is a great need, at the present time, for assistance from those concerned with bias and stereotyping in furthering "partnership" arrangements between career education efforts in schools with Department of Labor efforts in DOL's Youth Programs Office. We have worked very hard to establish such relationships, but have had little success so far in doing so. We are

well aware of the fact that effective delivery of career education to economically disadvantaged youth will demand an effort greater than the schools can provide—and that current DOL youth programs represent a logical opportunity for providing effective career education for such youth. We are also well aware of the fact that problems of overcoming bias and stereotyping are often very great for those served through DOL youth programs. We need help in making and sustaining the CETA/Career Education "connection."

Fifth, career education, as a "womb to tomb" effort, is in grave danger at the present time of being reduced primarily to an effort that takes place at the K-12 level of education. The practical reason why this is so is that the Congress has, for the current fiscal year, decided to fund only the K-12 portion of the Career Education Incentive Act. Faced with this, our efforts to serve persons at the postsecondary and adult education levels have to take place without any Federal funds for use as incentives. It is very hard to make such progress under such circumstances. If some substantial progress is to be made, we need the expertise and the assistance of experts is bias and stereotyping who deal with adults in mid-career change and with college/university students. To me, there is no doubt but that career education is needed by such persons fully as much as it is needed by youth at the K-12 level of education. We need a very great deal of help in order to convert this hope into some kind of practical reality.

Sixth, there exists a real need, at the present time, for many more materials illustrating women, minority persons, and persons with handicaps in a wide variety of occupations. It is not at all uncommon to find teachers perfectly willing to use such materials, but they do not know where to find them. Some kind of career education clearinghouse charged with the collection, collation, and dissemination of career education materials helpful in reducing bias and stereotyping is badly needed. In addition to the need for such materials for teacher use, the need for these kinds of materials for use in helping parents play a more appropriate role in career education is also needed.

Finally, the greatest need of all is for all these efforts to be undertaken within a career education framework. The generic problem of bias and stereotyping obviously extends far beyond the concerns of career education for protecting the right of all persons to full freedom of educational and occupational choice. While many career education advocates are supportive of this broader mission, they have great difficulty participating in it as part of their regular job responsibilities. On the other hand, for those bias and stereotyping reduction efforts directly related to matters of careers, persons engaged in career education have both a right and a responsibility to become involved. The need is to provide concrete assistance directly related to career education without insisting —or even expecting—that the involvement of career education advocates will, as part of their regular job duties, extend beyond that point.

Concluding Remarks

I have tried here to "tell it like it is" with respect to both the potential and the problems of career education as it relates to reduction of bias and stereo-

typing in our society. In doing do, I have very probably pictured career education as a more positive vehicle than, in fact, it will become in many communities. The fact that some who work in career education will be less enthusiastic about matters relating to bias and stereotyping than will others is simply a part of the reality that all of us must face.

I hope that I have not insulted some of you by making remarks indicating that the past efforts of experts in bias and stereotyping have sometimes been less than fully supportive of and helpful to the career education effort. If I have, I apologize for my remarks but I do not retract them. I hope, most of all, that some of you will regard career education as having sufficient positive potential so as to warrant your attempts to meet some of the requests for help and assistance I have presented here. I have asked for nothing that is not needed—and nothing that you cannot deliver to some considerable degree.

As we now move from the demonstration to the implementation phase of career education, the commitment of OE's Office of Career Education to contributing to reduction of bias and stereotyping through the vehicle of career education remains strong. I hope that some experts in the bias and stereotyping area will develop a similar sense of commitment to career education. If this happens, great benefits are sure to come to those we both are committed to serve.

References

Hoyt K.B. *An Introduction to Career Education: A Policy Paper of the U.S. Office of Education.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

———. *A Primer for Career Education.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

———. *Career Education for Special Populations.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Jackson, Roberta. *Career Education and Minorities.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Verheyden-Hilliard, Mary Ellen. *Reducing Sex Stereotyping in Career Education: Some Promising Approaches to Persistent Problems.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

Linking Guidance Efforts With Community Organizations

Introduction

An increasingly popular "parlor game" in America appears to be one that could be entitled "criticize the counselor." In every section of our nation, we have all witnessed persons—youth and adults alike—playing this game. The game is typically played by first specifying the guidance problem faced by a particular individual and then describing how a counselor failed to help solve it. This is usually followed by a blanket indictment of all professional counselors.

The most obvious explanation is the human tendency to find criticism a more popular topic of conversation than praise. Because of this, much of the good work counselors do goes unnoticed while counselor failures are magnified. All human service professions find this a price to be paid. Thus, we cannot be content with this explanation.

A second possible explanation, of course, would be to admit that counselors lack expertise and/or commitment. Based on the 30+ years I have spent in this field, I feel confident in rejecting that explanation outright. Today's professional counselors are the best that ever existed—far better than those of 30 years ago when criticism of the counselor was far less popular than it is today. That statement is one that can be easily verified by any who study counselor qualifications and existing certification/licensure requirements.

A third possible explanation is that the counseling and guidance needs of persons in our society have increased at a faster rate than the growth in professional counselors employed to help meet those needs. This is the explanation best defended by both theory and research. We know that the presence of guidance and counseling problems is a function of: (a) the rapidity with which the variety of possible choices is increased; and (b) the rapidity of societal change. The last 30 years have witnessed dramatic increases in both of these basic causes of guidance and counseling problems. The rate of increase in both factors continues to exceed the rate of increase in the presence of professional counselors. As a matter of fact, there exist many communities where, as the need for guidance and counseling has grown, the actual presence of professional counselors has declined.

One additional domain of concern belongs in these introductory remarks. I am referring to both the rapid growth in the number of Federal laws calling for counseling and guidance and the growth in student expressions of need for guidance and counseling found in various kinds of needs assessments carried out in recent years. Two factors stand out for me when I study these kinds of figures. First, both the Congress and the youth/adults we seek to serve have been much more vocal in their support of the counseling and guidance *function* than of professional counselors as the primary *functionaries*. Second,

Remarks prepared for presentation at the American Personnel and Guidance Association National Convention, Atlanta, Georgia, March 26, 1980.

both the Federal laws and the needs assessments have placed a higher priority on career guidance than on any other part of the job of the professional counselor. These facts, too, become pertinent to consider as we consider the future of our movement.

With this background, I would now like to briefly consider three topics: (a) a possible generic solution to these problems: (b) some examples of this generic solution in action; and (c) some basic challenges facing professional counselors in using this generic solution in the future.

The Solution: Increasing Community Linkages with Counselors

The generic solution I want to propose here is that counselors should become much more active in seeking linkages with community organizations who themselves are interested and active in meeting career guidance needs of persons. In making this proposal, I do not, of course, pretend that it is *the* answer. I do contend that it is one possible solution that needs to be tried in a very active manner.

This solution has become evident to me as I have worked, during the last several years, in the career education movement. During this period of time, I have discovered many community organizations who are unwilling to limit their actions to criticizing counselors. Instead, each has recognized both the increasing need for career guidance and the obvious inability of professional counselors to meet such needs by themselves. As a result, each has moved actively to initiate actions designed to help make positive contributions to the total problem. Further, each has expressed an interest in and a willingness to form partnerships with the education system—including professional counselors in that system—aimed at providing better and more effective career guidance to youth and adults.

Counselors have reacted differently to these efforts. Some, to be sure, have and are already utilizing these additional resources fully. Many others remain effectively unaware of their existence. Unfortunately, in my opinion, some counselors have resisted such community efforts claiming that the only really effective solution lies in increasing the quality and quantity of professional counselors employed in the education system itself.

There are four basic reasons why I believe such community organizations should be more fully utilized by professional counselors. First, many offer career guidance resources which cannot possibly be duplicated by the education system. Second, these organizations can easily become strong advocates for counselors at the local, State, and national level if we form effective partnerships with them. Third, these organizations need the professional expertise of counselors in order to make their operations maximally effective. Finally, if our concern is truly centered in providing the greatest possible help to those we serve, professional counselors should be willing to join forces with any segment of the community who can assist in meeting that goal. Our concern must be centered on the total amount of help that can be made available, not on the degree to which counselors receive "credit" for providing that help.

To better illustrate what I have in mind, let me now turn to some examples of such community organizations through providing overly brief "thumbnail" descriptions of the potential each holds for forming the kinds of partnerships with counselors I am proposing here.

Examples of Community Organization Involvement in Career Guidance

Career education has formed linkages with each of the organizations I want to mention here. I do not want to waste our time now talking about differences in meaning between the terms "career education" and "career guidance." Suffice it to say that career guidance is an important and major component in the total career education effort. My plea is that counselors become as involved in working with these organizations as are others now engaged in career education. Granted, opportunities to work with *all* the organizations I want to mention here do not exist in every community. Opportunities to work with *some* of them do.

To adequately describe the many ways in which these organizations are already contributing to meeting career guidance needs could occupy every program spot available at an APGA convention. The few words I can use in calling attention to each will be most inadequate indeed. In spite of this, I must try.

First, I want to say a few words about each of four key youth organizations involved in this effort. Each richly deserves the full support and active help of professional counselors everywhere. The Boy Scouts of America has a "career awareness" program in cub scouting built around parent involvement, a more advanced "carer awareness" effort in boy scouting organized around 111 merit badges, many of which are directly related to careers. And, of course, exploring posts include many organized specifically around career exploration.

The Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. has one of the most sophisticated and effective efforts in the nation aimed at combatting sex stereotyping. Their "Careers to Explore" program for girls 6-11 years of age is outstanding. So, too, is their "From Dreams to Reality" program—including a [25] hour career exploration internship—for junior and senior high school age girls.

4-H Clubs of America have designed and are using a wide variety of high quality career guidance materials with their members. In addition to such materials, the activities 4-H members engage in are highly pertinent to increasing self-understanding, economic understanding, and understanding of the world of work.

Junior Achievement, Inc., has five separate programs for youth, each of which makes valuable career guidance contributions. These include (a) "Job Education" for disadvantaged youth; (b) "Project Business"—with a heavy career exploration emphasis for junior high school youth; (c) "Business Basics" with a career awareness emphasis for 5th and 6th graders; (d) "Applied Management" for college students; and (e) the regular "JA" program for senior high school students.

Counselors could be of significant help in both increasing membership in each of these major youth organizations and in forming linkages with each in a comprehensive career guidance effort. Too few attempts to do so currently exist.

Second, there are a variety of adult organizations providing a significant career guidance emphasis which should be more effectively linked with actions of professional counselors. One example is seen in the Association of Junior Leagues, Inc., which now operates both an adult (5 week) and a youth (1/2-1 semester) course in career development. Members of Junior League are trained to conduct this course and the course, itself, is of high quality. This significant effort needs badly to be more effectively linked with efforts of both youth and adult counselors. The central emphasis on volunteerism championed by the Junior League is a major resource for counselors.

In promoting volunteerism as an avenue leading to self-understanding and career exploration, programs conducted both by staff persons affiliated with the National School volunteers program and with the National Center for Service-Learning represent two very important linkages for school counselors. Professionals associated with both of these programs are typically employed by school districts. Both report a desire to work more closely and effectively with professional counselors.

Both the American Red Cross and Goodwill Industries have developed career development systems for use by their own staffs and by those they seek to serve. Both hold high potential for increasing the effective delivery of career guidance to persons in the broader community—including many youths in schools. Too few professional counselors seem to be aware of—let alone working effectively—with either of these two significant efforts.

The American Legion/Legion Auxiliary is well-known to many professional counselors for its excellent scholarship publication "Need-A-Lift." It is less well-known for its publication entitled "Guide for Students and Parents" which includes a "careers" emphasis, for its actions in supplying resource persons for career guidance to schools, or for career guidance implications of such programs as their Boys State/Girls State, High School Oratorical Contests, or sponsorship of "Career Nights."

Similarly, many local units of Rotary, International have, through their education committees, expressed a strong desire to make contributions to career guidance for youth. So, too, have many local units of the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A. While career education advocates have linked with each of these significant community organizations, professional school counselors have often chosen not to become involved. I would consider this to be a mistake.

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs initiated their "Career Awareness Project" in cooperation with APGA several years ago. Designed for use at the elementary school level, this program is effectively nonoperative at the present time due, to some significant extent, to lack of involvement of professional school counselors. Counselors have been similarly neglectful to support BPW "Nike Clubs" for career exploration at

the high school level. As a result, BPW currently concentrates its efforts largely on meeting career development needs of adult women.

Women's American ORT is dedicated to promoting quality education in general and to promoting both vocational education and career education in particular. Their interest and involvement in career guidance is high. Their involvement in formal partnerships with professional counselors has, to date, been minimal.

Third, a variety of significant career guidance efforts have been sponsored by various segments of the private sector. Perhaps the one most recognized by counselors is the "Career Guidance Institutes" sponsored by the National Alliance of Business which involve a variety of educational activities aimed at helping teams of counselors, teachers, and school administrators from particular schools learn more about our occupational society. NAB also sponsors a variety of other career guidance programs—including their "Youth Motivational Task Forces"—which provide direct services to youth.

The General Electric Company has made major contributions to career guidance through its "Educators in Industry" program. Like the NAB Career Guidance Institutes, this program provides opportunities for teams of educators—including professional school counselors—to learn more about the occupational society. In addition, GE operates a major "World of Work" program aimed at getting better career information to youth. Its emphasis on structuring such information around hobbies and leisure time interests is outstanding. Its emphasis on career guidance for minority youth considering careers in engineering is equally outstanding.

The American Telephone & Telegraph program has a comprehensive program of career awareness/career exploration covering the entire K-12 structure. Their materials—including their several films—would make a most valuable addition to any counselor's library. Their field representatives are also available to link with professional counselors in career guidance activities.

The General Motors Corporation now has 66 "Career Education Coordinators" in GM plants across the nation who are involved in a wide variety of career education/career guidance efforts. Their film and booklet library, along with their summer training program for teachers and counselors in career education, are valuable resources. So, too, is their recent set of materials emphasizing work values and career exploration in junior high classrooms.

The McDonalds Corporation has originated a special career guidance effort entitled "Programmed Assistance in Career Exploration"—a computerized system containing a wide variety of kinds of educational and occupational information. APGA has been actively involved in the development of that program but, to date, not in its actual operation. This corporation also produces a series called "Action Pacs," the latest of which is on career exploration. As the nation's largest single employer of teenage youth, McDonalds Corporation certainly holds great potential as a career guidance resource.

The New York Life Insurance Company has, to date, distributed over 750,000 copies of their 15 "Career Books" for use by high school students. In addition, more than 10 million youth have now seen their film on "Careers" Their publication on "How to do a Job Interview" is a classic used by many youth and adults. The official recognition of these significant efforts on the part of professional counselors has, to date, been minimal.

Obviously, many more examples of national, State, and local career guidance contributions by the private sector – including small business as well as large corporations – could be given. It should not be necessary to expand this list further in order to illustrate that: (a) programs and materials from these efforts hold high potential for increasing the effectiveness of career guidance; (b) these segments of private industry are seeking closer working relationships with professional counselors; and (c) these relationships have not yet been fully developed.

At the risk of over-generalizing, it seems relatively safe to say that the kinds of examples given here hold high potential for: (a) increasing both counselor and client understanding of the world of work; (b) providing current up-to-date career guidance information and materials; (c) effectively involving parents in the total career guidance process; and (d) effectively assisting in the effort to involve classroom teachers, as well as counselors, in the total career guidance process. Taken as a whole, they represent a new and valuable dimension to career guidance which, to date, has not been recognized or utilized by many professional counselors -- and even less by counselor education institutions.

Challenges Facing Counselors in Increasing Community Linkages

If professional counselors are to use the strategy being proposed here of increasing linkages with community resources, there are several obvious challenges to be met.

First, it will be necessary for counselors to become even more active in the total career education effort. The beginnings of each kind of linkage I have mentioned here have already been made by career education advocates. There is no reason for counselors to seek to "re-invent the wheel." There is every reason for them to join the "career education team."

Second, the most basic message this strategy holds for counselors is to adopt a position that it will be far better for those we seek to serve if counselors will share their expertise with community organizations than it will be if counselors continue to "hoard" such expertise for themselves. It will be far better to collaborate than to compete. It will be far better to support than to object to these kinds of community efforts.

Third, this strategy, if adopted, will obviously place heavy responsibilities on professional counselors for coordinating all such efforts in a way that increases the effectiveness of the total package. This can be done only if an ambitious campaign is undertaken to explain to the broader community – as well as to educational decisionmakers – why it is essential that professional

counselors be present. Without the professional insights and involvement of well qualified counselors, there are certain to be gaps and mistakes in the quality and the delivery of some community career guidance services. This is a responsibility which today's professional counselors can, it seems to me, no longer avoid.

Finally, there is an obvious and important challenge to professional counselors to continue their efforts to build both the knowledge base for career guidance and to evaluate the effectiveness of career guidance as a total community effort. Without a high commitment to expanding our knowledge and to demonstrating the worth of career guidance, no long term, sustaining progress can be made.

Concluding Remarks

The problem of overcoming criticism of counselors at a time when guidance needs are rapidly increasing and the number of professional counselors is not is a major one indeed. Sometimes the most complex problems are best approached with simplistic and obvious solutions. I believe the proposal made here to increase counselor linkages with career guidance efforts of the broader community represents such a situation. I hope it will have some appeal for you who are today's leaders in our field.

The National School Volunteer Program (NSVP) and Career Education

Introduction

One year ago, I prepared a paper entitled "School Volunteers and Career Education" for presentation to the NSVP convention. (Hoyt, 1979). That paper, admittedly naive in nature, spoke primarily in terms of aspirations rather than expectations for involvement of school volunteers in the career education movement. Since that time, NSVP has afforded me two great learning opportunities which, in combinations, should let me now speak a little more knowledgeably about the subject. The first of these opportunities was a special "miniconference" in which leaders from 10 outstanding NSVP programs in our nation shared with me the issues, concerns, problems, and practices they see in linking the school volunteer movement with the career education movement. The second opportunity was that of serving as one of the judges for the 1980 NSVP "Tupperware Awards" in the category of contributions of business to NSVP efforts. I think I learned a very great deal from both of these experiences.

This is not to say that I know enough to formulate some set of sound policy suggestions on "school volunteers and career education" for consideration by NSVP. I would have to learn much more before feeling qualified to undertake that task. It is more correct to contend that, based on these experiences, some progress has been made in reducing my ignorance and I am now ready to move to a slightly higher plateau in considering this topic. To do so, I want to divide these remarks into four major sections. First, I would like to share with you some of the bits of information I think I have now learned about NSVP that have the greatest personal meaning for me. Second, I would like to comment on what appear to me to be some natural reasons that advocates for school volunteers and advocates for career education work together. Third, it seems essential that some comments be directed toward proper use of persons from the business/labor/industry community in NSVP activities in general and in NSVP career education activities in particular. Finally, this presentation would be most incomplete if I failed to comment on students as volunteers in NSVP career education efforts.

Things I have Learned from NSVP Members

In order to help you better understand some of my motivations for seeking closer working relationships between NSVP and career education efforts, I would like to begin by sharing with you some of the new things I have learned about NSVP during the past 12 months. An additional reason for engaging in this initial exercise is to give you an opportunity to correct whatever wrong impressions I may have gained.

Remarks prepared for presentation at the NSVP National Convention, Houston, Texas, March 15, 1980.

First, I was surprised to learn that very few of the NSVP formal programs are apparently run by "volunteers." Instead, I have been led to believe that, among the approximately 2,500 NSVP programs in the nation, most are run by paid professional persons. In the NSVP/career education "miniconference" we ran, there was not a single unpaid volunteer selected by NSVP to be in attendance. I was further impressed by the fact that, apparently, the largest single portion of costs for NSVP efforts at the local community level come from local school district funds supplemented, in many cases, by various kinds of Federal funds that have found their way to the local school district level. The truly amazing part of all this is that the "school volunteer program" has apparently become part of the bureaucratic "yum yum tree" in thousands of local communities—in spite of the fact that there has never been a Federal Government funding initiative aimed at making this a reality. It is, in many ways, a real "first" among efforts to introduce basic change into American education. I hope the significance of this accomplishment is as meaningful and as important to you as it is to me.

Second, if I understand the NSVP movement correctly, this is an effort to be evaluated, in a "bottom line" sense, in terms of added benefits and assistance provided to the *individual*—not to the class as a whole, the school as a whole, nor the school district as a whole. Equally important, if I understand it right, is the NSVP position that the teacher, too, must become, in effect, a "volunteer" in terms of providing some form of special help to the student. That is, the intended effect will not result if it assumes that the only "special" help the student receives is from the "school volunteer" and that the teacher will continue to operate "as usual." If these two perceptions are correct, they hold very important and very positive implications for the desirability of a merger of efforts between the school volunteer and the career education movements. Everything we know about career development, for example, indicates that this is a highly individualized process—that what is needed by and appropriate for each student at a particular time can be expected to differ. Part of the "bedrock" of the career education effort is the concept of changing the attitudes and actions of teachers within that system. The high degree of compatibility here should be obvious to all of us.

Third, I have been very favorably impressed by the apparent good working relationships that exist between NSVP efforts and efforts of other community volunteer programs at the local level. As I listened to NSVP representatives in our "miniconference" talk about ways in which they are currently working with community groups such as Junior League, the YMCA, YWCA, Girl Scouts, and Junior Achievement, it was almost as if I were in a meeting with career education practitioners. Apparently, both the school volunteer movement and the career education movement have discovered—and are seeking to capitalize on—the fact that a wide variety of community efforts aimed at helping youth exist over and beyond those available within the education system itself. Further, if our goal is to maximize the amount of help accruing to youth (rather than the amount of credit accruing to ourselves) we must find ways of linking with a variety of such community organizations. This, too, was a very helpful and a most positive sign to me.

70

Fourth, I was also highly impressed by the breadth of ways in which efforts of school volunteers extend over almost all parts of the education system at all grade levels. I was greatly impressed and highly pleased to see that, in terms of the instructional program, efforts of school volunteers have been developmental, as well as remedial, in nature and purpose. Similarly, I was pleased to see such efforts extending to such special segments of the school population as persons with physical handicaps as well as gifted/talented individuals. So, too, was it encouraging to me to see such efforts including subjects such as art, music, and literature appreciation as well as the so-called "basic academic subjects." When I first started looking at examples of NSVP programs nominated for the "Tupperware Awards," I found myself surprised and confused to see, not only activities involving business and industry, but also activities covering almost every other aspect of the educational program. It was only after careful thought and reflection that it became clear to me that this diversity of effort is a "plus" in terms of any kind of "careers" emphasis that exists.

Even these few examples will hopefully illustrate that I have better understanding of and appreciation for the NSVP effort that I had one year ago when I first addressed this audience. Other examples will hopefully become apparent later in this discussion. I am very appreciative of NSVP member efforts to help me learn more about your effort's purposes and basic modes of operation.

Additional Common Concerns of the School Volunteer and the Career Education Movements

When concerns and problems are shared by two or more movements in education, they can best be resolved by combining efforts rather than trying to work in isolation. Several excellent examples of this general principle appear to exist with respect to the school volunteer and career education movements.

First, both of these movements operate more as "solution systems" within American education than as new, separate, "add-on" programs. In this sense, both often find themselves faced with the "Pull the rabbit out of the hat" challenge with respect to various kinds of educational "mandates of the moment." If the current cry is for "back to basics" – or "reduce school dropouts" – or "cut down on vandalism" – or "solve the youth unemployment problem" – or "gain more community support for our school system" – both career education and the school volunteer movement are likely to find themselves called upon for assistance. There is nothing basically wrong with this provided it is put in proper perspective. To do so demands that both the career education movement and the school volunteer movement need to be viewed as *part* of the educational solution rather than *all* of it – as two among many vehicles that should be brought to bear, in a coordinated effort, on the problem. Further, the possible utility of both "school volunteers" and "career education" as "solution systems" makes it mandatory that both devote continuing efforts to illustrate, for educational decisionmakers, the *basic*

reasons why they exist—and should be continued on a sustaining basis. We both need to retain the obvious advantages of being regarded as "solution systems" without, in anyway, running the risk of being eliminated because we failed to meet the expectations growing out of a particular crisis in the school system.

Second, both the school volunteer and the career education movements are deeply dependent on effective inservice education for teachers and the enthusiastic support of building principals for success in their implementation efforts. That is, neither "school volunteers" or "career education" represents an effort that can be effectively implemented only through the provision of specialists. Instead, such specialists—and both movements seem to see specialists employed at the school district but not at the building level—must serve as motivational forces and linkage mechanisms among a wide variety of kinds of persons—both from within and from outside the education system—if the total task is to be accomplished. This means that the building principal must see some benefits accruing to the teacher if either or both of these efforts is to be successfully implemented. The primary problem facing both movements is finding the *time* and the resources required for the inservice education that is necessary. Currently, a considerable amount of such inservice time is being paid for by funds available from the career education incentive act. It makes good sense to me to use part of that time to further explain and promote the school volunteer effort—particularly if that effort includes a "careers" component. Similarly, it would seem to be an advantage for NSVP inservice education efforts to include a discussion of career education as part of the total agenda. We both have much to gain by working together in this way. This holds true both for inservice education of educators and that of community volunteers, it seems to me.

Third, I am impressed by the fact that both the career education and the school volunteers movements appear to rest on a basic assumption that it is a *community* effort that is involved, not just an effort of the education system alone. This means that both are faced with challenges of stating their concerns in such a way that they become concerns of the community, not just of the education system. Further, it means that both movements are faced with challenges of making the total effort a collaborative one involving joint authority, joint responsibility, and joint accountability. Closely related to the challenge of collaboration is that of making the collaborative effort work in ways consistent with basic school board policy—not always an easy trick to turn. These challenges are also obviously related to a community fund raising effort—i.e., of not depending on all operating funds coming from the school district budget. I am very impressed by efforts of both Isabel Besecker in Boston and Mildred Jones in New York City illustrating their ability to raise funds from the broader community to support their school volunteer efforts. There are many communities where analogous examples can be given within the career education movement. Because there is so much to learn in this domain of making the total effort a true *community* undertaking, it seems most natural and appropriate to me for school volunteer "types" and career educa-

tion "types" to share their successes, failures, and basic strategies with each other.

Finally, I am impressed with the fact that both the school volunteer movement and the career education movement seem to share a need to be recognized, in part, as something that is needed because *we* can deliver the service better than anyone else. That is, because both movements depend so heavily on the involvement of such wide segments of the community—including providing each such segment with as much credit as possible—both run the risk of being regarded by some educational decision-makers as simply "alternative vehicles" for use—or, worse yet, as "expendable." Both movements have had to develop a host of strategies for making sure that the "impotence image" each has purposely created—i.e., the message that others deserve the credit—does not drown out the equally strong message that the movement itself must be continued on a sustaining basis. Once again, it seems to me that it would be helpful to both movements if strategies that have been found to work could be shared. We both have much to gain from doing so.

Involvement of the Business/Labor/Industry Community

Three things are worrying me with respect to NSVP efforts to use resources of the business/labor/industry community in their total effort. I may be very wrong in the perceptions I have and, if so, I hope you will correct them. I gained these perceptions primarily from reading the "Tupperware Award" materials given me by NSVP. They are serious enough to deserve at least brief mention.

First, I have a perception that, to date, resource persons from the business/labor/industry community have been used relatively more in the NSVP instructional effort than in the career education effort. I certainly have no objections—on the contrary, I applaud—use of such persons as tutors of youth within the school system. This, from the reports I have studied, is obviously a source of great reward and satisfaction to such resource persons. At the same time, it seems to me obvious that the expertise of persons from the business/labor/industry are in terms of what they know about our world of work—and our American system of private enterprise—should also certainly be used as part of the total NSVP effort. An "adopt-a-school" program, for example, that concentrates help of resource persons from a given company only on instructional needs of pupils seems most incomplete to me. It would certainly not be difficult to correct this situation and, if this is done, I have a feeling that an even greater participation could be obtained from that community.

Second, I looked very hard—and was almost completely unsuccessful—in finding examples in the reports given me of involvement of small, independent businesses in the total NSVP effort to involve the business/labor/industry community. With such small business operations constituting, in many ways, both the backbone of our American system of private enterprise and the source of many of the new jobs that will become available to our youth, it

seems essential to me that persons from small, independent businesses be included in career education efforts. Hopefully, NSVP persons will see a similar need for such persons in their efforts. I am well aware of the fact that, for many small business operations, it is extremely difficult to release one of the few employees for even an hour during the school day to participate in either an NSVP or a career education activity. Yet, both the school volunteer movement and the career education movement are faced with obvious challenges to extend their total efforts well beyond the limited hours of the school day—including many activities carried out during evening hours. It would seem that here, at least, greater efforts could be made to involve persons representing small, independent businesses. I hope this problem appears as serious to you as it does to me. I think it is of major importance.

Third, despite all my efforts, I was unable to find, in the materials given me for study in the "Tupperware Awards" exercise, any systematic mention of the involvement of organized labor in NSVP community efforts. Gaining the involvement and support of organized labor has been a major goal of the career education movement—and, as we have moved toward attaining that goal, the rewards, in terms of help provided to youth, have been very rewarding indeed. Perhaps I simply failed to find examples of involvement of organized labor in NSVP community efforts. If so, this may not be a real problem. If my perceptions are correct, however, it seems to me that this represents an immediate challenge for the NSVP leadership—and one that should not be ignored.

Students as Volunteers

One of the fascinating things I learned in our NSVP miniconference was that, nationwide, approximately 5 percent of all NSVP are youth themselves. Further, I learned that, for many such youth, their involvement work experience in NSVP was, in fact, a career exploration type activity that helped many such youth in the career decisionmaking process. Here is an area that has tremendous implications for good working relationships between advocates of "school volunteers" and advocates of career education.

The implications of NSVP efforts to involve youth in volunteer work go far beyond only relationships between NSVP advocates and career education advocates. Recently, in studying the literature from the National Center for Service-Learning, I discovered that formal programs of service-learning now exist in approximately 2,650 high schools in our nation. Note this is about the same number as the 2,500 NSVP members. The service-learning movement is, as most of you probably know, committed to the idea of serving others through volunteer work. Like the use of students engaged in career exploration as part of the total NSVP area, the service-learning movement holds great implications for career education.

As I have learned more about both NSVP and about service-learning, it seems to me that these are surely two efforts that have every reason to join together with each other—and with career education. In studying the "Tupperware Award" nomination materials, I found one school system—

Independence, Kansas—where there is a strong, obvious collaborative relationship between the NSVP effort in that community and the service-learning effort. Further, both of these have been effectively linked with the career education effort in that community. In my opinion, Independence, Kansas stands as a model worthy of very close and careful study by leaders in all three of these fields.

To add to this, one must, it seems to me, further consider the tremendous emphasis on volunteerism seen in the work of local chapters of the Association of Junior Leagues. I have learned of many examples where Junior League has joined forces with NSVP efforts in particular communities. Similarly, Junior League has also been a very effective "partner" in collaboration with career education advocates in other communities. Here, again, is a natural way to merge forces in ways that will have direct benefit to youth.

Even if the multitude of additional community efforts aimed at helping youth explore careers through unpaid work experience as volunteers were ignored (and, of course, we don't want to ignore them) it seems very obvious to me that, in community after community today, there is a natural opportunity for at least a merger of efforts among advocates for NSVP, for service-learning, for Junior League, and for career education. If even these four community efforts could be effectively merged in the hundreds of communities that must have all four in common, we would be a long way down the path of increasing the amount of help we are able to make available to youth -- and to our communities (including the education system in each community). It does not seem to be too early to push hard for at least this four-prong community effort.

Concluding Remarks

When I first became initially acquainted with NSVP as a national organization, it seemed likely to me that there must be a [illegible] basis for good working relationships between NSVP advocates and advocates for career education. Now, based on what I have learned in the past twelve months, I am even more convinced that this is so. I recognize that career education can never become more than one of the program priorities for NSVP. We would want it no other way. It seems to me the need for and potential of NSVP/career education collaborative relationships is great—and becoming greater. I am committed to doing all that I can to meet that need. I hope you share in that commitment. If so, those we seek to serve will surely benefit.

Career Education in Community Colleges: Retrospect and Reality

Introduction

Both the need for and the potential of career education in community college is awesome. It is undoubtedly a combination of both that have seen career education efforts in this setting continue to be launched in recent years—in spite of an almost complete absence of new Federal funds for use in stimulating this movement.

Of course, the career education movement has flourished much more at the K-12 levels of education than at the postsecondary/adult levels during the decade of the 1970s. There seems little doubt but that this has been due more to the Federal influence than to any differences in either need for or opportunity to undertake career education effots. The Federal influence, in turn, is a direct outgrowth of congressional actions in enacting and funding two pieces of career education legislation: (a) P.L. 93-380, Sec. 406—"Career Education": and (b) P.L. 95-207—"Career Education Incentive Act."

The first of these two pieces of legislation, while enacted as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1965, did allow a limited number of career education demonstration projects to be carried out at the postsecondary level. A total of $929,356 was expended for demonstration projects specifically in community college settings between FY 75 and FY 78. The "Career Education Incentive Act," in Sec. 11, authorizes $15 million per year for a period of 5 years to be used in conducting comprehensive demonstrations of career education in postsecondary education settings. During the first two years in which this law has been operational—FY 79 and FY 80—The Congress has appropriated no funds for use in carrying out provisions of section 11 of P.L. 95-207. The administration has again requested no funding for this section in its FY 1981 budget recommendations to The Congress.

The primary portion of P.L. 95-207 for which funds have been appropriated is that concerned with K-12 school systems. Similarly, section 406 of P.L. 93-380 also called for major concentration at the K-12 levels of education. This appears to have been a major factor in influencing the relatively more rapid growth of career education efforts at this level.

During the decade of the 1970s, however, efforts to refine the conceptualization of career education continued to be carried out under a broad, lifelong learning emphasis. While applications of such conceptual efforts have been made primarily at the K-12 level, the concept of career education as an effort covering almost the entire life span has remained steady and firm. This, too, has probably contributed some to the several hundred career education efforts that have been launched at the community college level dur-

Remarks prepared for presentations at the National Conference on Career Education and Community Colleges, New York City, May 27, 1980.

ing the decade of the 1970s. Certainly, it holds great implications for the decade of the 1980s.

My specific purpose today is to offer some thoughts regarding career education in community college settings during the decade of the 1980s. To do this, it will first be necessary to review the evidence with respect to the extent to which the basic goals of career education have been met during the decade of the 1970s at the K-12 level. Following this, it seems appropriate to outline some of the major parameters of *need* for career education in community colleges during the 1980s. Finally, I would like to present a list of what represents to me the major challenges facing community colleges with respect to career education in the decade of the 1980s.

The Efficacy of Career Education: Evidence From the 1970s

During the 1970s, three broad goals emerged for career education which, in combination, gave it a clear definition. One of these was a cognitive goal and two were process goals. These three goals are: (a) to provide persons with a let of 10 general employability/adaptability/promotability skills useful in any career—and in helping persons cope with the expected rapid changes in our occupational society: (b) to form "partnerships" between the education system and various elements of the broader community which, in combination, will help deliver these employability skills: and (c) to reform the education system in ways that will allow a more proper and appropriate emphasis on providing *all* students with these employability skills.

The first of these three goals—providing persons with general employability/adaptability/promotability skills—is, of course, the cognitive goal of career education. During the decade of the 1970s, 10 such general skills have been identified and our ability to deliver then to persons has been tested. The 10 general employability skills include: (1) basic academic skills: (2) good work habits; (3) a personally meaningful set of work values—i.e., a desire to work; (4) skills in understanding and appreciating the American system of private enterprise; (5) skills in self-understanding and understandings of educational/occupational options related to career choices; (6) skills in making career decisions; (7) job seeking/finding/getting/holding skills; (8) skills in making productive use of leisure time—i.e., unpaid work; (9) skills in overcoming bias and stereotyping as deterrants to full freedom of career choice; and (10) skills in humanizing the workplace for oneself.

Based on several hundred evaluation studies conducted at the K-12 level during the decade of the 1970s, it seems safe to say that career education has demonstrated its ability to deliver each of these 10 employability skills to youth. Enough have produced positive and statistically significant results—including 13 which, to date, have passed through the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) and so are certified as "educational programs that work"—to enable us to say that career education *can* work. Enough inconclusive evaluation studies exist to prevent us from saying that career education *will* work. On balance, it seems safe to observe that no other

approach to providing youth with general employability skills has demonstrated itself to be as effective—or more effective—than career education. That is the evidence.

The second goal of career education—to form "partnerships" between the education system and the broader community for purposes of delivering employability skills—is obviously a process goal. Evidence with respect to which this goal has been reached can be seen in both the number and variety of major national community organizations with whom such "partnerships" have been formed at the K-12 level. A total of 22 such national organizations—including 9 representing the private sector and 13 representing the general community—can be clearly counted. In addition, equally strong—"partnerships" have been formed with 3 distinct segments of organized labor and with at least 10 major corporations on a nationwide basis. Again, this evidence is seen in K-12 career education operations. In spite of this limitation, it seems safe to say that no other part of the education system has formed so many—or so varied—linkages with the broader community as has career education.

The third goal of career education—to reform the education system in ways that place a more proper and appropriate emphasis on delivering employability skills to students—is obviously also a process goal. Evidence of career education's effectiveness in attaining this goal, at the K-12 level, can be seen in the 19 major education associations operating at this level who have voiced formal endorsements of career education. These range from administrative/decisionmaking associations such as NSBA and AASA to teacher associations such as the National Council of Teachers of English and the National Art Education Association. Most of these associations, in addition to their national policy statements of support/endorsement, have also issued one or more publications aimed at showing their members how best to participate in the implementation of career education. Again, it seems safe to say that no other movement aimed at basic educational change has produced so many—or so varied—national education associations with clear evidence of support and acceptance of the effort.

In short, based on evidence accumulated primarily at the K-12 level of education, we can say that career education, during its first decade of existence—the decade of the 1970s—did produce clear and impressive evidence of its ability to meet each of its three major goals.

At the postsecondary level, no similar clear evidence of effectiveness exists. There are, for example, no career education demonstration efforts at the postsecondary level that have, to date, successfully passed through the rigorous requirements for statistically significant results to gain approval by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel. There are no major national community groups that have passed policy statements indicating themselves as "partners" in career education efforts at the postsecondary level. Only 5 of the many professional educational associations operating at the postsecondary level—AACJC, AACTE, AASCU, AEA of the USE, and CPG have formally endorsed career education.

This is not to say that nothing significant happened during the decade of the 1970s at the post secondary level. The record clearly shows: (a) a wide number of demonstration efforts in career education at the community college level—with a smaller number in both liberal arts colleges and in State university settings; (b) "career education" as a topic on the programs of many national professional education associations operating at the postsecondary level: and (c) several national conferences on career education have been conducted by both AACJC and by AASCU. Considering the relative absence of Federal funds available for use in stimulating a career education emphasis, it seems to me that postsecondary education has done far better with respect to career education than anyone could reasonably expect.

The question, of course, is where do we go from here with respect to career education at the postsecondary level in general—and in community colleges in particular. It is that question I want to address now in two ways: (1) in terms of the need for career education in community colleges; and (2) in terms of challenges for change associated with implementing career education in community college settings.

The Growing Need for Career Education in Community Settings

The need for career education on the part of persons attending community colleges has always been great. That need has continued to grow and expand during the decade of the 1970s. The decade of the 1980s will see still further expansion of need on several fronts.

First, with respect to youth – ages 18-24, there are three subpopulations whose career education needs appear especially great. One subpopulation consists of those severely economically disadvantaged youth—both high school graduates and noncompleters—who are, today, a central focus of much of the Federal Government's concern for work/education relationships. There is no way that *equity* of career opportunity can be made available to such youth if we depend only on the facilities and resources of the K-12 school system—including both public schools and private, alternative schools. The provision of *equity* of opportunity can be assured only if community colleges are willing to assist in this effort.

A second subpopulation consists of those youth who enroll in occupational education curriculums in community colleges. Such youth, no matter how certain they may think they are of their career decisions, will, inevitably, be faced with the need for the general employability skills of career education in addition to the specific, entry level vocational skills provided them in occupational education. The third subpopulation, obviously, consists of youth who enroll in the general education/college transfer portion of the community college. A majority of such youth are career undecided—and should be. Their need for the 10 employability skills of career education is based, in part, on the kinds of decisions they must make immediately after leaving the community college and, in part, on later career decisions they will surely face in their adult lives. Each of these three subpopulations have

obvious need for a comprehensive career education effort. Too many are still not receiving the benefits of such an effort.

Second, community colleges, during the decade of the 1980s, will inevitably find themselves faced with major challenges growing out of the fact that those members of the "baby boom" generation will be in the 25-34 age cohort during this decade. The sheer number of such persons will inevitably lead to problems in the occupational society and the need to utilize the general employability/adaptability/promotability skills of career education. Many such persons can be expected to enroll in community colleges in great numbers during this decade. Among the benefits accruing to those who do so should be an opportunity to acquire the general employability skills of career education.

Third, of course, the community colleges of our nation can expect themselves to be faced with problems of meeting the increasing needs for mid-career change — including those changes associated with women seeking to re-enter the labor market. Such persons are faced with the necessity for going through, once more, the complete process of career development — beginning with career awareness through career exploration, decisionmaking, preparation, and placement. Failure to include the 10 general employability skills of career education to such persons would be to short change them badly.

Fourth, community colleges, during the decade of the 1980s, can also expect a great increase in older Americans as students. Some such persons, of course, will be seeking to acquire only skills and knowledge that will help them enjoy life more. Many others, however, because of inflation and limited incomes, will be faced with the necessity for preparing themselves for re-entry into the world of paid employment. Certainly, the 10 skills of career education must be among the learning opportunities such persons find when they return to the community college campus.

Fifth, community colleges, like all other parts of the education system, will inevitably experience great challenges in meeting the career education needs of a wide variety of minority persons, or persons with limited English speaking/reading/writing abilities, and of persons with a variety of kinds of handicaps. Increasingly, such persons can be expected to seek access to postsecondary education and, for many, this means at least beginning such efforts in community college settings.

Special problems related to delivery of career education to each such element of the general population can be expected to be complicated by such factors as: (a) the probability that many of these will be part-time, rather than full-time, students; (b) the special need, on the part of many of these students, to give special emphasis to the career education skills associated with productive use of leisure time, skills in career decisionmaking, skills in overcoming bias and stereotyping, and skills in humanizing the workplace for oneself; and (c) the perception that many such persons hold that they must acquire such skills as quickly as possible. In each of these ways, the delivery of effective career education at the community college level can expect to differ, somewhat, from the delivery system used at the K-12 level of education. Let me now turn to consideration of some of the challenges growing out of this observation.

Challenges for Change Associated with Implementing Career Education in Community College Settings

I see no challenge with respect to validating the need for career education in community college settings. True, some may demand data backing up the generalizations I have already made here, but that should not be difficult to produce. I suspect that many community colleges already have it available. The challenges I want to address here are more basic than that. They are four in number.

First, there is an obvious challenge to collect solid evidence of the effectiveness of career education in community college settings. Such evidence is needed with respect to each of the sub-populations I have identified—and the models needed for each sub-population are certain to differ in several respects. The kinds of demonstration projects needed to produce this kind of evidence are going to be costly—even though their application to other community college settings will cost considerably less. Where are the funds to complete such demonstrations to come from? If the "Federal Government" is the answer given to this question, then there are obvious additional challenges to community colleges with respect to convincing the Congress of the desirability, at the minimum, of providing full funding for Section 11 of P.L. 95-207. No such effort has yet been made. Without clear evidence of ability to deliver career education skills, the cry for *need* is likely to go unheeded in many quarters.

Second, if true "career education" is to take place, there will be a great need for community colleges to engage in a far greater "partnership" effort with other segments of the community than many have illustrated, to date. This should, in a theoretical/philosophical sense, be the easiest part of a total career education effort for a community college to implement. The problems I see facing community colleges here are two: (a) since the community college, by its very nature, already interacts with the broader community in many ways, it may prove difficult, at least in some ways, to make such community "partnerships" stand out as viable for career education as a special kind of effort; and (b) the kinds of community "partnerships" needed to implement career education in community colleges may be more in the form of "coalitions" than in the form of "collaboration" as used in K-12 settings.

Third, partly because of the "hurry up" nature of needs expressed by community college students and partly because of relatively well-developed student personnel services on the campus of many community colleges, there will be an inevitable temptation to meet the career education needs of community college students primarily through the provision of a separate set of courses and/or experiential opportunities over and beyond those now being offered. To some extent, the provision of such special offerings may eventually become one of the distinguishing marks of effective career education models in community colleges as opposed to K-12 settings. If, however, this becomes the *only* basic route taken to implementation of career education, the goal of education reform—and so an essential part of the total career education "mission"—will be lost.

Fourth—and closely related to the third—will be the need to involve the teaching faculty in the implementation of career education. Difficulties here are sure to be great partly because of: (a) the historical separation of "vocational" and "academic" faculty members into separate "camps"; (b) the tendency of many faculty members in occupational education to identify much more closely with providing students with specific vocational skills than with the general employability skills of career education; (c) the current trend which finds many members of the so-called "academic" faculty in community colleges to be persons with high psychological and/or philosophical resistances to participating in preparing students for work; and (d) the presence of many kinds of specialists in community colleges—including counselors, financial aids specialists, career specialists, work experience specialists, and placement specialists—who, without proper perspective, may tend to regard career education as "their" domain. There is absolutely no doubt but that a very massive inservice education effort will be essential if career education is to be successfully implemented in community college settings.

Concluding Remarks

The nature and general viability of career education has, at the K-12 level, been well-documented during the decade of the 1970s. The need for career education in community college settings has grown very fast during the decade of the 1970s and will grow even faster during the decade of the 1980s. There have been positive and encouraging beginnings made in community college implementation efforts during the decade of the 1970s. These need to be expanded and supplemented with much more hard data during the decade of the 1980s. The kinds of demonstrations and the wide variety of kinds of models required to successfully implement career education in community college settings will cost sizeable amounts of money. The time to move forward on all these fronts is now.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1981—328-851