DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 256 SP 033 926

AUTHOR Reilly, David; And Others
TITLE Social, Political, and Economic Variables Associated with Successful and Unsuccessful Educational Change Efforts: Kenya, Japan, Malaysia, the Soviet Union and the United States.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 108p.
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Cultural Influences; Developing Nations; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Group Unity; Nationalism; *Political Influences; Resistance to Change; *Sociocultural Patterns; *Socioeconomic Influences; *Traditionalism
IDENTIFIERS Japan; Kenya; Malaysia; *Reform Efforts; United States; USSR

ABSTRACT

This paper, using five examples (Kenya, Japan, Malaysia, the Soviet Union, and the United States), explores some patterns of interactions among social, political, and economic activity (SPEA) and seven influences affecting the character of national systems of education. The educational change and improvement efforts in the five countries are described. Discussions about Kenya, Japan, and Malaysia illustrate the interplay of SPEA that have resulted in their educational systems successfully coping with the need to adapt to a rapidly changing world. A discussion of the United States and USSR illustrates how the interaction of SPEA can lead to unsuccessful educational improvement outcomes. A review of the five countries indicates that a sense of national unity, the general economic situation, and basic beliefs and traditions influence the success of efforts at educational reform and improvement. These factors interact with SPEA variables to initiate, drive, and sustain efforts toward educational reform. (SM)

SOCIAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL EDUCATIONAL CHANGE EFFORTS: KENYA, JAPAN, MALAYSIA, THE SOVIET UNION AND THE UNITED STATES

by

David Reilly, Jeanie Falcon,
Steven Kee, and Thomas Penland

School of Education
University of North Carolina @ Greensboro
Greensboro, NC 27412

Spring, 1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Overview

Educational reform and change are constants of educational life. It has been so in practically all countries since the advent of formal educational systems. However, the rate of reform has increased since the end of the Second World War, in both developed and developing countries. Following that war, education was seen as a catalyst for economic expansion and as a reducer of social inequalities (Coombs, 1985). The consequences of this educational expansion were immense. Student enrollment and educational expenditures increased dramatically. Expectations for the achievement of education's goals were high. However, the results of these efforts fell far short of their goals and the expectations of most countries (Watson, 1984). In fact, this gap between societal expectations and actual achievements was not restricted to education. Watson (1984) suggests that that there was an enormous gulf between the expectations of the 1950s and 1960s in the fields of education, health, and socio-economic development and subsequent outcomes. It has been in education, however, that this gulf has been perhaps most widely condemned.

In 1968, at an international conference composed of educators and economists, it was concluded that education was experiencing a crisis world wide; that the gaps between societys' expectations and needs and

education's capacities to deliver the desired level of excellence were becoming greater (Coombs, 1985). The reasons for these disparities included four; the dramatic increase in popular aspirations for education, the acute scarcity of resources, the inherent inertia of educational systems and, the inertia of societies themselves (Coombs, 1985).

It is the perceived disparity between the expectations of a society, particularly its economic expectations, and education's capabilities to meet these expectations that give rise to the demand for educational reform. As a result, educational reform efforts have been evident since 1945 practically every decade in every country.

During the past five decades education has has been looked to as the means by which societies would educate their children, provide access to equal opportunities for their poor, improve their social condition, and enhance their economic standing. These expectations of educational outcomes have generally not been realized (Watson, 1984; Coombs, 1985). The reasons for these failures are to be found in a myriad, complex set of interactions among the social, economic, and political conditions of the times on the one hand, and a lack of knowledge of effective and successful educational change mechanisms on the other. This paper, using five examples, (Keneya, Japan, Malasia, the Soviet Union, and the United States) explores some of the patterns of interactions among these three factors which may explain why education has not consistently achieved those results and outcomes which were expected of it. The goal of the paper is to identify a pattern of social-political-economic variables associated with successful educational change efforts and the pattern of variables associated with non-successful attempts.

Background

Since the end of the Second World War significant changes in the social, geo-political, and economic conditions of most, if not all, countries of the world have occurred. During the same period, educational systems of countries have been expected, if not required, to adapt to these changes in each of these dimensions of life. In some countries, the educational system has been required by law to lead the implementation and achievement of the goals established in these dimensions. For example, the educational system of the United States was required to lead the desegration of American society. However, education's efforts in achieving this goal have not been as successful as had been desired. Yet, there are examples where the educational system has been successful in achieving social and/or political goals of the country. For example, Malaysia successfully utilized its educational system to integrate three diverse cultures (Bedlington, 1978). Thus, it is important to examine these different societies and the features which led to success in some while others experienced failure.

Cramer and Browne (1965) argue that there are seven influences affecting the character of national systems of education. They are:

1- sense of national unity.

2- general economic situation.

3- basic beliefs and traditions, including religious and cultural heritage.

4- status of progressive educational thought.

5- language problems.

6- political background: e.g. communism, fascism, democracy.

7- attitude toward international cooperation and understanding.

They go on to say:

> comparative education must be much more than a descriptive catalogue of systems of education as they exist at present. It must try to discover why systems have developed along different lines, why some are progressive and others are inclined to lag behind, why some are dominated by restrictive political ideologies while others encourage freedom and variety within their framework, (p. 5).

This paper contrasts these seven influences with selected features of social-political-economic activity (SPEA) which have been identified in the literature as associated in an interdependent fashion with educational change processes. As Dalin (1978) has indicated, effective educational change must include:

1) Involving political, economic and social interests.
2) Perceiving schools as an integrated part of a network.
3) Understanding schools as organizations involving conflicts over values.
4) Understanding that managing change is a complex interplay between human relations and organizational structures.
5) Understanding leadership patterns and role relationships.
6) Assuring that the security of individuals and their incentive structures are included in the change process.
7) Promoting conditions for development of new skills at all levels of the system i.e., planning, development, monitoring and evaluation of innovation, as well as content.

8) Assuring that the dimensions of change are seen as problems of institutional linkages, conflicts and survival.

Dalin goes on to state :

> Reforms tend to concentrate on goals, but their operationalised schemes seldom show a clear understanding of the change process. Most reformers are content oriented rather than process oriented. Their assumption is that superior content will cause necessary change. (p 9).

Thus, the study of educational change must include an examination of the SPEA conditions surrounding the system involved in the change process, the process utilized to accomplish the change, and the interaction of all of the variables concerned. The next four chapters present descriptions of the educational change (reform) and improvement efforts of five countries. Some of these were successful and some were not. The concluding chapter presents the conclusions gleaned by these change efforts and relates these attempts to principals of effective planned educational change

CHAPTER 2
JAPAN

There are few who doubt the importance of Japan as a player on the world scene as the twenty-first century draws near. In the decades following the Pacific War (as the Japanese refer to World War II) Japan has experienced something akin to a miracle in its restoration as a world power. Her economic miracle has made believers out of all of us. From Mazda to Minolta and from Toyota to Toshiba, her products are found in virtually every corner of the world. At least one American futurist, Herman Kahn of the Hudson Institute, predicted that the twenty-first century will be "Japan's Century." (Beauchamp & Rubinger, 1989).

What many people do not realize is that Japan's achievements did not happen in a vacuum after the war, but instead had their roots in the Meiji Restoration (1868-1912) and, in the case of her educational reforms, in the earlier Tokugawa Period (1603-1868). Most will acknowledge that education played a pivotal role in the modernization of Japan. In fact, one could argue that you must understand Japan's educational past in order to understand her present and perhaps even her future.

Three dominant themes were interwoven in Japan in the years following the war. The Occupation Period (1945-1952) was marked strongly by political concerns. These political realities were imposed by the occupation forces and changed the face of Japanese education dramatically. The second period of change was marked by social concerns. The student unrest that dominated the sixties led to extensive reforms in

higher education especially. The third period of reform was born in the seventies and was closely tied to economic concerns and demographics.

The remainder of this section will be an attempt to examine each of these three periods and see if there are any cause and effect relationships that can be found. The miracle known as Japan can best be understood in terms of the social, economic, and political forces that have shaped her present and will continue to shape her future and her educational system is a reflection of those influences.

After the war, Japan lay in ruins. Two million Japanese were dead and millions more were wounded. The educational system of the country lay in ruins as well. Four thousand schools had been destroyed and one-third of the institutions of higher education had been annihilated. Educationally, the country had been operating under the Imperial Rescript on Education, passed during the Meiji Dynasty in 1890. The Rescript on Education called for a strong commitment to nationalism and militarism. Shinto beliefs, Confucian virtues, and Western statism were wedded in a unique marriage of East and West. Young people were taught to subordinate their desires to the good of the state. Blind obedience and unquestioned loyalty were called for at every level of society. The Minister of Education, in a speech in 1941, called for "the eradication of thoughts based on individualism and liberalism, and firm establishment of a national moral standard with emphasis to the state." (Beauchamp & Rubinger, 1989, p. 88).

Long before the war was over the Allies began to plan for the occupation of Japan. The Pentagon began as early as 1942 to call together experts on the nation of Japan. Ex-missionaries, businessmen, and scholars were called upon to give their advice as how to best govern Japan

after the inevitable victory. Even the Japanese saw the end coming and, on Sept. 15, 1945, wrote a new "Educational Policy Towards Construction of a New Japan."

THE OCCUPATION August, 1945- April, 1952

When the Allies arrived, under the leadership of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, they already had a good idea of the kinds of changes they thought needed to be made in Japan's educational system. The goals of the occupation were simple and straightforward; demilitarization, democratization, and decentralization. And the schools would be used to build this new democratic society. The changes suggested were radical and far-reaching. The Americans intended to change the very fabric of Japanese life. As Kobayashi puts it, "Thus the Occupation became one of the most enormous experiments in 'social engineering' ever conducted in any nation."(Thomas, 1968, p. 93). This social engineering took place under the leadership of the Civil Information and Education Section (CI&E) of the Supreme Command for the Allied Powers (SCAP). The ironic thing about these changes toward democracy was that they often were not done very democratically. The CI&E often made arbitrary and completely unilateral decisions about textbooks, magazines, films, etc., and fired thousands of teachers who had military sympathies during the war. Four directives were issued by the CI&E during the fall and winter of 1945. They concerned the shift in the country from a militaristic to a democratic society, the purging of militaristic teachers, the abolishing of the state Shinto religion, and the suspension of courses in nationalism, e.g. moral education, history, geography, etc. On Jan. 1, 1946, the Emperor was forced to deny his divinity and for all practical purposes the

government of Japan reverted back to the Charter Oath of 1868 which was written during the early Meiji Period. All of these changes constituted the negative side of things. Now, the big question was: What would the Americans put in their place?

It is interesting to note at this point what the Americans did not do. They did not attempt to destroy Japan's cultural heritage and impose a kind of twentieth-century American culture. Instead, they chose to use the Japanese culture to get across democratic ideals. They wanted to transform the culture from filial piety, perfection of moral powers, group cohesion and harmony, loyalty, and obedience to the Emperor and nation into those ideals consistent with American standards. So, in keeping with that idea, in 1946, the First United States Educational Mission to Japan was formed. Twenty-seven noted educational scholars from around the United States arrived in Japan to assess the situation and make recommendations. And so they did. They recommended:

1- to decentralize the power of the Ministry of Education.
2- abolish tracking and institute the American 6-3-3-4 system.
3- substitute social studies for moral education.
4- a greater emphasis on physical and vocational education.
5- more adult education and the use of guidance counselors.
6- teacher education be moved in the four-year institutions.
7- substitution of Roman script for Chinese characters.

The last six recommendations met with little resistance from the Japanese but the first was strongly rejected. For the Americans, decentralization was the key issue. After all, it had worked in the United States but they forgot that the United States was much more spread out

geographically. Japan is a small country with a history of centralized control. Nevertheless, the Americans pushed for decentralization and insisted on locally elected school boards which were introduced in 1948. Other recommendations were made by the CI&E. They advocated scrapping the idea of using only one text to teach a subject. They pushed for more individualization in lesson plans and also for changing the normal schools into four-year institutions. They wanted more educational opportunities for women and an increase in guidance programs at all levels.

In March of 1945, two very important pieces of legislation were passed. The Fundamental Law of Education replaced the 1890 Imperial Rescript. The new law called for: (1) the full development of personality, (2) respect for academic freedom, (3) equality of educational opportunity for all without any kind of discrimination, (4) co-education at all levels, and (5) education for citizenship.

The second piece of legislation was the School Education Law. This law provided for the administrative framework necessary to bring about these desired changes. It established the 6-3-3-4 system of grades and raised the school-learning age to 15.

A new constitution went into effect in Japan on May 3, 1947. This document spoke specifically about education issues although those issues are not addressed in the U.S. constitution.

> All people shall have the right to receive an equal education correspondent to their ability, as provided by law. All people shall be obliged to have all boys and girls under their protection receive ordinary education as provided by law. Such compulsory education shall be free. (Passin, 1965, p. 287).

The men who helped shape this document had no illusions about the importance of education in fulfilling these lofty goals. They recognized that education held the key to making the kind of social, political, and economic changes they wanted to see it this new Japan.

> Having established the Constitution of Japan we have shown our resolution to contribute to the peace of the world and welfare of humanity by building a democratic and cultural state. The realization of this ideal shall depend fundamentally on the power of education. (Passin, 1965, p. 293-4).

The Americans responsible for these laws realized, perhaps prophetically, that the hope for a better world did depend fundamentally on the power of education and that changes in the education system could bring about changes in the social order. This belief in the changing power of education has not been found in most other developed nations. Jencks (1972), in discussing reform in the United States says, "None of the evidence we have reviewed suggests that school reform can be expected to bring about significant social changes outside of the schools." (Jencks, 1972, p. 255). Cummings (1980) maintains that recent Japanese experience totally contradicts these conclusions. At any rate, by 1949, the major accomplishments of the Occupation were complete.

In April of 1952 sovereignty was returned to the nation of Japan and the occupation was formally over. The Japanese immediately made some changes in the imposed American style of education. They scrapped the American style school board and returned centralized power to the Ministry of Education. The Ministry would make all decisions concerning

textbooks, curriculum, and administration. This was not simply a return to a status quo ante bellum but rather a return to a system more in keeping with traditional Japanese culture and tradition. They argued that centralized control is not necessarily anti-democratic. Indeed, local control does not automatically meant more equality or fairness. They pointed out that in the United States in the 1950's local control had often meant racial discrimination, religious bigotry, textbook censorship, and other decidedly undemocratic activities.

JAPAN FROM 1952 to 1983

Japan, after 1952, like many other modern countries, saw tremendous growth in its educational system. Between 1960 and 1975, the number of post-secondary institutions rose from 525 to over 1,000. The number of students tripled from 710,000 to over 2.1 million. The post-war baby boomers hit the university's front door in 1965. Along with this tremendous growth came pressures for higher education to meet the needs of this new post-war society.

In general, policies for higher education are based on two factors; social demands (pull-factors), and personal and familial pressures (push-factors). The pull-factor was the major force behind the great demand for technological and scientific courses during the 1960's when Japan's economic prosperity was at its height. (Narita, 1978, p. 45).

These "pull-factors" were already being felt in 1952. In that year Nikkeiren, the Japanese Federation of Employees, issued a statement calling for a system better able to support economic reconstruction. They pointed at the need for the "functional differentiation" of higher education structure, and increased specialization in courses and graduation of more

science and engineering specialists.(Pempel, 1978, p. 163).

In 1957 the Economic Planning Agency issued a long-range plan establishing guidelines for economic development and role of education in achieving it. In that same year, the Ministry of Education allocated 8,000 new university places annually for science and technology students. Within six years there were 100,000 science and technology graduates annually.

In keeping with these social and economic demands, a new category of higher education was established in 1962. In that year, nineteen five-year technical schools were established to turn out middle-level technicians needed for Japan's growing technological industries. By May, 1983, there were sixty-two of these schools with an enrollment of 47,000 that was 97.2% male.

Along with these tremendous strides in growth and specialization came a growth in student unrest as well. Student unrest had begun in 1960 when opposition to the revision of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty had surfaced. This struggle culminated in 1968 with the Tokyo University incident. Students took over campus buildings for months until the unrest was squelched by the "Bill for Emergency Measures of University Administration" which was passed in August of 1969.

The problem faced by Japanese youth in the 60's and 70's was that the schools were teaching two conflicting views of life. On the one hand, the schools were advocating discipline, responsibility, concern for the needs of others, the work ethic, and the requirements of good citizenship. On the other hand, they pushed for an egalitarian approach to work, individualism (American-style), and a certain degree of criticism for authority. This led to dissatisfaction and disillusionment in the youth of

Japan. This can be seen in a poll done by Gallup International in 1973. In the poll Japanese youth were compared with the youth from eleven other countries. The results are shown below:

Figure 1-A

A COMPARISON OF THE PROPORTION OF DISSATISFIED JAPANESE YOUTH WITH THE PROPORTIONS INOTHER ADVANCED SOCIETIES

Dissatisfaction	Japanese Youth	Country with next highest level
With nation's provision for the rights/welfare of the people	88.5	54.4 England
With society	73.5	35.7 U.S.
With school	45.2	29.0 France
With employment	40.0	24.8 France
With family life	30.6	10.9 France
With friends	15.8	8.0 France

(Honbu, 1973)

It is easy to see from this data that the tempestuous events of the 60's, including the Tokyo University take-over in 1968, resulted in a generation that was dissatisfied and disillusioned with their country.

The disruptive behavior by the youth of Japan made those in power begin to question the role of higher education in their country. Conservative politicians began to review university policy and, for the first time since the war, to make suggestions for educational reform.

Between 1967 and 1970, over five hundred reform reports were issued by various organizations. (Beauchamp, 1978, p. 321).

In the years after the war two classes began to emerge in Japan. There were those controlling the central government. They were more traditional and economically conservative. On the other hand, there were the intellectuals, white, and blue-collar workers who were more modern in their approach and tended to be economically progressive. Both sides recognized that the control of education would be necessary for advancing their cause. That is why educational issues are a continuing focus for class conflict in Japan. Neither side has been able to claim control of the educational system. The conservatives generally control the finances and curriculum and the progressives, through the Japanese Teachers' Union, control what actually goes on in the classroom. In the middle of all sits the university. The forces of politics were working on a national level in post-war Japan, but they were working at the institutional level as well.

The struggle for university autonomy has been going on in Japan since the Imperial University was founded in the last century. Inevitable conflicts arose between the scholars who tried to advance truth and liberty and the state, which was concerned with national development and solidarity. In 1915 the government officially agreed to the principle of university autonomy. There were some threats to that autonomy during the occupation but, by and large, it remained intact.

There is a trend currently going on in Japan for control of the university by the central government. On July, 1969, Tokyo Education University announced the formation of a new school to be called Tsukuba University. The 'Tsukuba Concept" was initiated and a new university was founded that would be "opened to society". Its structure would be

radically different from other institutions. It would consist of multi-disciplinary schools for teaching and "complexes" for research. It marked, for the first time since the war, the central governments ability to initiate change in higher education.

JAPAN TODAY

Some have suggested that Japan is now embarked on the third major educational reform movement in her history. The first occurred in the Meiji Period (around 1872), the second during the occupation after World War II, and the third which is currently underway. There are some serious problems facing Japanese higher education today. Since 1984 the focus of discussion and debate on education in Japan has been the government's plans for reform. Several problems call out for attention: the inegalitarian effects of entrance exam pressures and juku (cram) school attendance; the sacrifice by young children of their emotional and physical well-being; the increase in school violence, bullying, and drop-outs; the need to "internationalize" the curriculum and institutions; to better integrate students who have returned from abroad; and the need for greater flexibility in the system as a whole. (Beauchamp & Rubinger, 1989, p. 258).

While the reform movement of the early 1970's was at its height, Japan was hit by the oil embargo of 1973. As a result, Japan's economy sputtered to a halt and the money needed for education became more scarce. In addition to these economic woes, Japan's demographics began to change drastically. The school-age population has been decreasing since 1979 at the kindergarten level. This "graying" phenomena in Japan confronts education with a number of problems.

The basic problems facing Japanese policymakers are the maintenence of high standards in education that will continue to foster economic development; and the simultaneous reform of education to provide greater flexibility and defuse public discontent while, at the same time, taking care that revisions take a form that is harmonious with Japanese traditions and values.(Beauchamp & Rubinger, 1989, p. 265). If Japan follows the patterns of her past then the next few years should see sweeping reforms followed by a period of reflection and modification to bring the reforms into line with the realities of Japanese life. Japan faces the same dilemma of all modern nations. How can the competing interests of politics, society, and economics be balanced in a nation's school system. In the past, Japan always had a model to emulate. During the Meiji Period and during the Occupation she looked to Europe and America. Today, however, there are no foreign models which stand out as worthy of emulation. America and Europe are themselves going through periods of education reform.

There are some political realities that have to be considered as one examines the probable outcome of reform in Japan. On March 27, 1984, Prime Minister Nakasone proposed the establishment of an ad hoc committee on educational reform. This committee would report directly to him instead of to the Central Council for Education. Before going out existence in 1987 the committee published four reports. The First Report of Educational Reform addressed the problem of attaching too much importance to an individual's educational background. This leads to excessive competition through the examination system. The Second Report described the "state of desolation" in Japanese education. Recommendations dealt with the need to restore public confidence in the

system, the need to cope with the changing times, and the need to emphasize internationalism (kokusaika), and the reality of entering the information age. The Third Report spoke of continuing efforts in life-long learning, elementary and secondary school reforms, and reforms in the administration of higher education. The Council's Fourth Report dealt with future educational reforms and, interestingly, with the need for an emphasis on patriotism that will "teach the proper sentiment and attitude so that people can understand and respect the meaning of the national flag and the national anthem. (Beauchamp & Rubinger, 1989, p. 268).

All of these recommendations are indeed worthy and honorable but the political reality is that Prime Minister Nakasone is no longer in power. What, if any, of these reforms will come to pass? No one knows. The ones most likely to arouse controversy will be the mandatory use at school events of two sensitive symbols of Japan's military past; the national anthem (Kimigayo) and the Rising Sun flag.

CONCLUSION

In many ways, Japan represents an anomaly in educational reform. One could argue that Japan has been going through one long process of educational reform ever since World War II. However, it is true that she has gone through at least three major periods of reform in the last one hundred years. The first, during the Meiji Period, was brought about due to contacts with the West. These contacts made it possible for her to change the direction of her educational system. She looked to the West and copied what she thought were the best elements of that system. These modifications and emulations brought her head-long into the twentieth century. The changes were brought about because of social changes

initiated by her contacts with the outside world.

The second period of reform was a result of the Allied Occupation after World War II. Those reforms were politically and militarily imposed on her by a conquering people who sought to change her to match their own set of beliefs. She bent to their wishes and accepted all she could without giving up her essential character.

Now Japan is in the throes of a third major reform movement. This one is more directly tied to economics and the economic reality of surviving as a nation as she hurtles toward the twenty-first century. Japan, in these three eras of change, demonstrates a microcosm of educational reform that all may observe. Japan has adapted and has changed over the years to a remarkable degree. She recognized long ago that education was directly tied to her future as a nation. But with this look to the future came a yearning for the past.

The work "ikigai" appears frequently in Japanese educational writings. Its basic meaning is a kind of philosophic "life goal." It is the very thing some say is sadly missing in Japanese education today. It is the same kind of call that we hear by some American educational reformers as well.

Contemporary schools are not providing "ikigai" for children, it is said, and education is geared to examinations, which are ironically regarded to offer a reason not for living but for dying. By analogy, the call for restoration of "ikigai" in schools corresponds to the call by the American organization Moral Majority for rejuvenation of moral standards and principles, prayer in the schools, order in the hallways, and respect for the flag.(White, 1987, p. 168).

This represents a call by the Ministry of Education and the Liberal

Democratic Party to "re-Japanize" the Japanese educational system. This return to a kind of pre-war nationalism is seen by some at the coming trend in Japan. (White, 1987).

Others have suggested another basic weakness in the Japanese system of education that will have to be dealt with in the future. In December, 1988, Phillips University in Enid, Oklahoma, signed an agreement with a Japanese entrepreneur to operate the largest undergraduate liberal arts and sciences branch program in Japan of any American institution. More than 1,500 students now study in beautiful $100 million facilities in Uji and Osaka. Why would the Japanese want to pay Phillips University $600,000 for their good name, for accredited degrees, and for managing the academic program? The Japanese partners involved in this agreement cite a fundamental weakness in Japanese educational philosophy as a problem for which they seek an American solution. Tanezo Yamasaki noted in his speech at the 1989 opening of Phillips University-Japan that there is a notable parochialism and lack of global cultural awareness in the traditional Japanese curriculum that fails to prepare Japanese students for world political leadership. (Peck, 1991).

What is interesting in this scenario is the apparent ambivalence with which the Japanese view the American educational system. They seem to display a kind of love-hate relationship when it comes to copying American culture and ideas. As Yamasaki explained in the same speech mentioned earlier, "we (Japanese) will take your American virtues and objectives, but because of the superior values and philosophical purposes of our history, avoid their corruption." (Peck, 1991, p. 50).

Some would suggest that the Japanese are embarking on the next

phase of their plan to dominate the world. They already dominate economically and now the emphasis is shifting to political domination as well. In order to accomplish that goal, they realize they need a broader political and culture perspective that will enable them to assume a political leadership that will match their industrial and technological might.

This desire for the international perspective on education has logical consequences in educational planning. Hiroshi Kida, the director of Japan's Society for the Promotion of Science and former director of the National Institute for Educational Research has summarized the issue of internationalization:

> It is important to educate a new generation of children to be individual persons, rather than to cooperate with a group. The group model for work was excellent for catching up , but from now on, Japan's leadership in international interdependency is more important, and for this we need individuals who can work with other than homogeneous units. We need to create individuals who can bridge the gap. (White, 1987, p. 173-4).

These issues of "life goal" and "internationalization" would seem to involve basic changes in philosophy and practice by the Japanese people. But in reality it is more of a trade-off than a change. Americans look at Japan and want a way to improve their children's test scores and instill a greater sense of responsibility and discipline. Japanese look at America and want a more expansive, liberal, individualized form of instruction so their children can be more creative.

Change will play an important part in the future of the educational systems in both of these countries but in one regard the Japanese may

have the advantage. Japan's greatest strength may be in her belief in "man's changeability".

The concept of "man's changeability" in Japan appears very strong compared with similar ideas in the West and China. This may be understood from the fact that modern characterology, developed and introduced into the world of education in France and Germany, has been cold-shouldered throughout by Japan's education circles. For the basic notion of characterology with "unchangeable inherent character" as its premise is incompatible with the idea of "man's changeability". (Aso & Amano, 1972, p. 4).

This flexibility may be the one ingredient that is indispensable as nation's face the complexity of life in the coming years. This ability to initiate and implement change may be the factor that separates the winners from the losers in the twenty-first century.

CHAPTER3
KENYA

Overview

The purpose of this overview is to introduce several ideas (change agents, or causes) in regard to the evolution and or developmental processes of a "system" of education. This overview will specifically address the ever changing country of Kenya. Several "change agents" that will be identified are: the country's social atmosphere, the economic background and political system. These "change agents" will also be considered in an historical context in order to provide a chronological framework of cause and effect that will portray an accurate reflection of the impacts that these "agents" have had on the developing/evolving system of education in Kenya.

Historically, we may look at several significant events which have served to facilitate change in the Kenyan system; this should be noted as all encompassing-educationally, politically, socially and economically. Western education was introduced to Kenya in the mid 1800's by missionaries. Prior to this, African education was based on indigenous education, "...education was based on the environment, and its aim was to conserve the cultural heritage of the family, clan and tribe; to adapt children to their physical environment and teach them how to use it; to explain to them that their own future and that of their community depended on the perpetuation and understanding of their inherited tribal institutions, laws, language and values." (Sifuna, 1989, p. 736). The

emergence of the missionary had great cultural and social impact on the educational system of the native people. Some obvious implications include; the "western" ways of teaching, the "western" subject matter and the introduction of the christian religion (it is important to note the implication of this in regard to native religion eg. gods, tribal witch doctors etc.). The greatest repercussion was that of the bond of church and state. An educated man became synonymous with a "christian" man. After a long period of this missionary education the British government became responsible in 1890 for what has come to be known as Kenya (Sifuna, 1989).

The construction of a railway in 1901 linking Lake Victoria to the coast also provided an element of "change" (Sifuna, 1989). Due to the need for man power in constructing the railway, Kenya saw some of her first immigrant communities. These people were comprised mainly of Indians and Asians, along with Europeans who had discovered the new "British" territory. This event (change) raised a "racial question". "With strong encouragement from the European settlers who gained ascendancy to the newly established Legislative Council in 1907, the colonial government accepted the principle of separate development for the three races--Africans, Asians and Europeans" (Sifuna, 1989, p. 737). The implications in regard to social, governmental and educational development appear obvious. In regard to the native Africans their "separate" development, educationally was to focus on technical education.

By the end of World War I, the general feeling is that, many Africans began to feel suspicion toward the motives of the colonial school. Africans responded to this with political pressure. They saw "real" education as an avenue of escape from poverty and subsistence living,

"...it would give them the secret to the white mans success" (Sifuna, 1989, p. 737). An Education Commission was formed to address these concerns. Native Councils were formed, greater coordination between government and missions were expected. In 1925 a permanent Advisory Committee on Education was formed, it urged that, "...education be adapted to the mentality, aptitudes, occupations and traditions of the various peoples" (Sifuna, 1989, p. 738). All these committees and proclamations sounded and looked appropriate, however, Africans were still dissatisfied with their academic education. They saw the colonial focuses on "technical" education as means of keeping the Africans inferior and out of the political and social realms.

These feelings and situations began to shape new feelings and thoughts in the African mind (political, social and cultural). The natives demanded greater academic teachings, religious education that was pertinent to THEIR culture and belief systems, as opposed to the white mans dictums. As time and world events went by, e.g., WW II, the native Africans maintained their voice. As their experiences of the world grew, so did their thirst for appropriate education for their sons and daughters.

Independence for Kenya from British rule was gained in December of 1964. This is probably the most significant historical event in the evolution of the Kenyan educational system. The previously racially structured system was to be phased out. Along with this was the influx of vast postindependence reform proposals addressing the needs of the "Kenyan" people. This event is extremely illustrative of the cause and effect situations our research efforts support. As the African peoples gained legitimacy in political and economic realms, more educational needs began to be addressed. An additional significant event occurred.

Because of the swift change and immediate and varied needs of the Kenyans, there was no one great resolution. Various areas of Kenya developed and implemented various types of educational programs. It appears that the educational systems, in whole or part, evolved in regard to the social needs of the african peoples. Where increased literacy was needed, these programs were advocated, i.e., religious schools (harambee); higher education began to evolve as the secondary school produced more graduates--the need for this type of education existed, therefore, it evolved. Hence, the implications in regard to the social needs, or hierarchy of educational needs for the populations became translated into the evolution of the various educational settings.

This is but a brief overview of some historical events (politcal, cultural, social and economic) which may provide a framework to view some of the causes for educational change in Kenya.

There are several factors that appear to contribute to educational change/development. These may be viewed in cause and effect relationships. The factors which have been identified as effecting change are: History (cultural, traditional, religion, nationalism), Social (ethnic groups, language diversity, assimilation), Economic (history, development, current status, percent of GNP/education), Organization/Administration (central, decentralized, combination), and Political (democratic, socialist, etc.).

In taking these factors into consideration, one may look at the types of areas in education that are effected, influenced or held constant by these "change agents." Areas that are identified are: Education as deficit or improvement based, the existence of a support system for change (funding, ministries...), developmental status (I think we may consider

need based, result based, gap based, value based in this area), control of education (direction/focus, pace, intensity), Mission (economic, citizenship, intellectual, combination), and finally, outcomes.

In order to formulate accurate predictions and illustrate outcomes, one must look at these change agents in coordination with their areas of impact, action or non-action, and consistency. In addition, four themes can be identified which relate to success of educational change. These themes are as follows;

1. the idea of infusing a sense of nationalism;
2. the idea of producing a capable, competent "people" based on their needs (social hierarchy of needs) e.g., literacy, vocational, technical;
3. the need for education in order to address and insure national economic success-forward movement; and
4. the idea of a common language (mono-cultural) to insure the least restrictive social, political and cultural environment.

Deficit or Improvement Based Education

With reference to Kenya, the country's educational system may be defined as improvement based. This seems to be consistent with the defined "change agents." Perhaps the most illustrative example of this factor may be seen in the historical and social impacts within the country. Pre-independence saw a time of colonial rule addressing the main needs of the colonists, hence creating a deficit situation for the native population. Eshiwani (1985) illustrates this demographically. In 1962, one year before independence, only 8,033 pupils attending secondary school out of 25,902,

were Africans. During post-independence these issues began to be addressed on a collective, improvement based level, with the native Kenyans in mind. Improvement based motivation may be seen in the infusing of technical and agricultural content into the curriculum to address the needs of the native population. There has also been continuous change and evaluation throughout the 80's to define and address the changing needs of the Kenyans.

Support System for Change/Developmental Status

With regard to a support system for change, several change agents stand out. The history of pre-independence is still a fresh wound on the face of Kenya. Therefore we may assume an almost inherent historical and social support for change. This support has carried over to active support economically and organizationally. The National Committee on Educational Objectives and Policies (NCEOP) was formed to create guidelines and national goals. Economically, these goals and recommendations are helped to be met through and ever increasing percentage of governmental expenditures given to education.

Figure 4-A

Education's Share of Governmental Expenditures

Year	Total	Education	Share %
1963-64	61,759	7,387	11.9%
1966-67	71,274	7,924	11.1%
1970-71	131,708	28,404	21.5%
1974-75	258,499	63,803	24.7%
1979-80	587,409	134,035	22.8%

*Education expenditure in relation to total expenditure
(thousands of Kenyan pounds)
Source: Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, 1985.

Education accounts for the largest amount of government expenditure. According to Sifuna (1988), today's percentage of expenditure is estimated at 33%. It should also be considered that the number of learning institutions has also increased. The main question to be addressed is- is the percentage of expenditure proportional to the increases and sophistication of and within the educational system? Politically, Kenya's unicameral, democratic system cannot help but support the efforts and national goals of education. Kenya's major political challenge is to reinvigorate its economy. Some other issues facing the Republic are a rapidly growing population, increasing unemployment and strained educational facilities. "...the aim of the government is to stamp out illiteracy and thereby create a citizenry who could more effectively aid in national development...the government

assumed a direct relationship between education and economic growth" (Sifuna, 1988, p744).

Control of Education

The control of Kenya's educational system is found, primarily, in the Ministry of Education. The minister, assisted by assistant ministers, of education is responsible for all policy matters concerning the ministry. The ministry's hierarchy is as follows; minister, assistant ministers, permanent secretary (top advisor to minister on policy matters), the permanent secretary is supported by a team of senior officers in charge of different departments. As you proceed down the chain of command, the organization remains relatively decentralized. It is also encouraged for parents and community members to become highly involved in the educational process. This is not just in parent associations but in the maintenance and up-keep of facilities; and the housing of instructors. The Kenyan's hold true to their thoughts of "harambee" which means "pulling together". The pace and intensity of the system of education is consistent with the support system for change. Consistency may be seen between these areas which are touched by our "change agents".

Mission

Kenya's mission in regard to education appears to be a combination of intent. There are references to; intellectual development (literacy), citizenry, as well as the individual in relation to the economy. The mission of the Kenyan educational system is illustrated best in the NCEOP's Educational Goals for the 80's. In coordination with these goals,

some issues that have been incorporated and addressed for the future mission of the Kenyan system of education are as follows:

1. Expanding educational facilities, despite a low economic growth rate.

2. Ensuring that school leavers are employed. It is projected that by 1984 half a million school leavers from different levels of education will be seeking employment.

3. Complete revision of curriculum for primary and secondary schools.

4. Reducing the number of "untrained teachers" in schools and overcoming the problems of teacher shortage and teacher wastage (Eshiwani, 1985, P. 2804).

Other issues that are discussed in current literature (e.g., Eshiwani, 1985; Fine, 1974; Olela, 1985; Sifuna,1988) that will inevitably be included in Kenya's mission include; overall expansion of the educational system, increased special education programs (physically challenged), continued literacy campaign, productive work campaign (technical and vocational), correspondence education, and intra-African cooperation (given that funding for education will be cut across the board-this a sort of power in numbers idea)

An over all view of this information would indicate a very consistent approach across the board for the continued progress of the Kenyan Educational System. The road for Kenya will be a long one, in spite of its advancements, due to many of the ills inherited from the colonial system. These ills are still being felt in the disproportion of educated

folk in Kenya. All the machinery appears to be in place to provide a forward momentum in the educational changes wanted and needed by Kenya (people and government). Future budget cuts, increasing population and decreasing economy are three significant barriers for this population to overcome. The only way in which these barriers may even begin to be challenged is through the cooperation and consistency of educational goals at all levels. These levels should include, but not be limited to, government, educators, communities and national organizations.

In looking at these "common themes" that consistently appear, the idea of "infusing a sense of nationalism" is directly addressed in Kenya's educational goals; while other themes are significantly, but indirectly addressed. Evidence of this may be seen, particularly, in the post independence period. In attaining its independence, the powers at hand saw the need for a sense of unity. The people of Kenya were to be "Kenyans", not Massai, Lua Lua or Kikuyu (tribal ethnicities). In 1980, the National Committee on Educational Objectives and Policies (NCEOP, 1985) took an active role in addressing the educational goals of Kenya for the 80's:

1. Education should promote national unity by removing social and regional inequalities and increasing adaptability.

2. Education should promote the full development of the talents and personality of individuals within the context of mutual social responsibility. It should also promote cooperative, social, ethical, and cultural values conducive to national unity and positive attitudes to work and incentives.

3. Education should promote national development and an equitable distribution of incomes. It should assist youth to grow into self-disciplined, self-respecting and mature people.

4. Education should also be integrated with rural development. This should be done by the allocation of resources, cooperative education, and coordinating the activities of institutions with the development of their localities.

These goals and recommendations went on to address the need for education to relate to employment, specifically in the rural areas of Kenya. "It also promoted the view that education should systematically teach youth the values of society." (Eshiwani, 1989, p. 2804).
The statement of these goals addresses more than just the theme of "infusing a sense of nationalism." As stated previously, they indirectly speak to other themes.

In reference to point number 2, the idea of producing a capable, competent people based on their needs, the National Goals statement addresses this. The goals recognize the various stages of development in the country of Kenya and the need to integrate various types of education for those various "social needs".

Theme number 3, the need for education in order to address and insure national economic success, is also illuded to in these goals. The NCEOP realized the need positive attitudes to work and incentives in order to instill a responsive and dependable work force in order to maintain sense of domestic economic stability. The question of national economic

stability needs to be looked at in a more in depth fashion. Sifuna (1989) helps to support this argument. He notes that with the increase of national economic statements and publications, (e.g., Reports on High-Level Manpower Requirements and Resources in Kenya, the Development Plan 1964-1970, and African Socialism and its Application to Planning in Kenya), a direct relationship was formed between education and economic growth. "It was generally believed that if education could produce the high-level manpower so desperately needed by a developing country, the pace of economic development could be accelerated." (p. 739).

Theme number 4, the idea of a common language to insure the least restrictive social, political and cultural environments, is also directly addressed in the NCEOP goals. The idea of a common language is not specifically addressed, the need for equity is considered. Equity is addressed in regard to social class, economic situation and regional disparities. Although not specifically addressed in these goals, further research provides support for the need of common language in assisting in the termination of these inequalities. Sifuna (1989) recognizes that there existed, and to a certain degree currently exists, a feeling of loss by not stressing the mother tongue of Kiswahili. However, he goes to note that students with mastery of English have a relative advantage, educationally, than those who do not. English has been deemed the main medium of instruction, utilizing Kiswahili in early primary areas and moving toward English in the latter primary and secondary. It should also be noted at this point, the vast amount of participation in international education programs, that Kenya has been involved in. Specific involvement is noted with the American systems, e.g., the Education Development Center and Ford Foundation monies. This may have had a great impact as to the

infusion of English as a method of instruction. In a sense, a snow ball effect.

In reference to this particular theme, we may observe what appears to a difference in our coordinating countries. Researchers and current times seem to suggest a move from English as the media of instruction, back to local and tribal language. This seems to be particularly embraced in the primary school area. I would like to go one step further and view this as a similarity as opposed to difference, in support of our common themes. I base this argument on the fact that English as a common language is not meeting the needs of the people of Kenya in a national sense. What it appears to be doing is dividing the various populations, perpetuating the privileged who can master English media. Therefore, to break down these barriers is an outcry for change, that change being, the move to a national language--not an imposed one.

CHAPTER4
MALAYSIA

Malaysia is a constitutional monarchy with a popularly elected government located in Southeast Asia. It occupies two distinct geographical areas: Penisular Malaysia, comprising the Malay Penisula and East Malaysia, consisting of the north and western regions of the island of Borneo. Malaya became self-governing in 1955 and gained independence from the British in 1957.

Malaysia is a very pluralistic society. There a three major ethnic groups -- Malays, Chinese, and Indians. There are also many aborignial tribal groups. The population ofMalaysia in 1980 was estimated at 14.3 million with a yearly increase of 2.8 percent. In 1980, almost 40% of the population was 14 years of age or younger.

Malaysia leads the world in it's three major export items. Those are tin, natural rubber, and palm oil. The country has begun to diversify it's economy. Two examples are involvement in the technological industry with computer chips being produced in Malaysia. Also entering the automobile industry with the "Proton Saga" which is currently the number one seller in England. Malaysia has some oil reserves off the east coast of the penisula, but these are minimal; they import oil from other nations.

Today Malaysia is a leader in the ASEAN (Association of South East Asian Nations) group of nations. Its relatively small population, plentous natural resources, and good commuication and infrastructure has allowed

it to fall just behind Singapore as a leader in ASEAN.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF COUNTRY AND EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Pre-war (WWII) Malaysia was a British colony. Western influence had come as early as the 1500's with the Portuguese, followed by the Dutch in the 1600's and the British establishing trading centers in the late 1700's. Education in pre-war and pre-independence period developed along racial and ethnic lines. "Compared to both the American administration in the Philippines and the Dutch regime in the Indies, British colonialism in Malaya prior to World War II lack a clear long-run polictical objective" (Snodgrass, 1980, p. 237). The British were interested in status-quo. "They governed pragmatically, focusing their attention on immediate problems, allowing things to happen and intervening only when a threat to British interests were perceived" (Snodgrass, 1980, p. 237).

Because of the lack of a clear objective, education developed somewhat haphazardly in Malaya. No unified system was established and the British limited English education. They were concerned about the disruptive potential of a large amount of English-speaking Asians. Educational opportunity was severely limited by ethnic group and socio-economic status. The Chinese were best able to benefit from the structure of opportunities offered during this period than the other ethnic groups.

After the conclusion of the War the British seem to concede to the polictical aim of the eventual democratic self-government of Malaya. With this realization the people realized that it was now up to them to live

peaceably with one another. Representatives of the Malay, Chinese and Indian communities took an increasing part in educational policy-making during this period. They were torn by wanting to represent their constituents and there needs and aims and yet showing the British that they could effect workable compromises among themselves. "In this increasinglypolictical atmosphere, education became a major subject of controversy" (Snodgras, 1980, p. 47). Discussions began with renewed vigor for a unified educational system. Initially, there was some sentiment for English as the basis of a unified system, but that was not acceptable.

> The English educated Malays could capture power only by coming to terms with theChinese. Having a majority of the electorate,as well as a greater participation in the British system of government, they had a superior bargaining power and they realized that emphasis on English education would favor the urban non-Malays. They could not, however, press for a completely Malay system of education without alienating the essential minimum of Chinese support. As a result, a mixed system with gradual pressure toward Malay as a national language was introduced (Snodgrass, 1980, p. 247).

The development of the "mixed system" can be best traced by means of a series of landmark committee reports, beginning with the Barnes Report in 1951. The Barnes report actually encouraged educational unification based on Malay-English bilingualism. Although the government at first adopted the Barnes report it was never fully implemented, partly because of a mild recession in the rubber and tin markets just after 1951.

After the 1955 elections an Alliance of ministers were appointed to review unification. The Minister of Education; Abdul Razak vin Dato Hussein was appointed. In 1956 the Razak report was issued and has probably been the most influential of all education committee reports.

> The Razak report cited two major desiderata: a place in primary school every child and a unified educational system which would promote national unityand consciousness (Snodgras, 1980, p. 247).

The Razak report second objective has continued to thisday with the development of education in Malaysia. The development of the "mixed system" continued. Another momentous step was taken in 1960 when, the Rahman Talib committee recommended; "public support for secondary education be restricted to schools teaching in either Malay (the national language) or English. This severely crimped the growth of Chinese-medium education at the secondary level" (Snodgras, 1980, p. 247).

The last critical change in the final implementation of the "mixed system" was not considered by a committee but simply announced. Following severe racial riots in Kuala Lumpur resulting in multiple deaths in early July, 1969, the Minister of Education simply announced, "that English medium schools would be converted to the Malay medium one grade at a time, beginning with Standard One in 1970" (Snodgras, 1980, p. 258). This then gave the unified system with its basis in the Malay language. The implementation has been completed and carried even further to the conversion of the university system as well.

The Malaysian government began in in 1965 issuing a five year plan, called simply the "Malaysian Plan". This was not only a look to the future but a review of the past.

Historically, education has been a major part of the five-year plan. The Malaysian plans have played a very influential part of the development of educational aims in Malaysia. The second Malaysian plan suggests that through the educational process it would enable the rural Malays to participate in a modern, inovative competitive and technological society. Of course, the plan restated the governments wishes to ensure future new generations of "Malaysians" emerging instead of disparate groupings of Malays, Chinese, Indians, and tribal groups. This plan led to expansion of of educational facilities in the sciences, mathematics, and technology-oriented disciplines. This Second Malaysian Plan really gave Malaysia its second educational objective. The first objective simply stated, being national unity. The second objective also being twin objectives of the New Economic Plan,

> (a) the eradication of poverty by raisingincome levels and increasing employment opportunities of all Malaysians irrespective
> of race
>
> (b) the acceleration of the process of restructuring Malaysian society to correct imbalances so as to reduce and eventually eliminate the identification of race with economic function" (Postlethwaike,1988, p. 3170).

In 1979 the latest and third objective of Malaysian education was stated in the Cabinet Committee Report on Education. The report included the above stated objectives but took part of the first objective of national unity and emphasized it more clearly. The report recommended, "revitalizing the curriculum for the development of stronger spiritual, moral, and ethical qualities of citizenship among school

children" (Postlethwaike,1988, p. 3170).

It also recommended for the first time streamlining the management of the educational system. Up to that point bureaucratic growth had continued unquestioned.

PROBLEMS FACING EDUCATION

The problems facing Malaysian education and for the most part the nation as well continues to be focused around the "Malaysian" identity and ethnic and cultural recognition. At least one author, Bedlington, states, "The governments rhetoric concerning the eventual emergence of a single "Malaysian" culture through the process of "integration" is, I believe, patently invalid. The persistence of ethnic diversity and its attributes cannot be confidently disregarded if Malaysia is to retain an acceptable level of stability as an thenically tolerant state. The government must continue with an approach that stresses cultural accomodation rather than unilateral decisions beneficial to one community alone and discriminating against others, however inadvertently" (Bedlington, 1978, p. 175).

Malaysians seem to have been fortunate to have good economic growth during their emergence as an independent state. It will be important that as the traditions of democracy grow that cultural diversity is encouraged not prohibited. Gradually the objective of national unity should be achieved and a reevaluation should occur possible leading to a celebration of cutural diversity as a nation could become an objective. Malaysia could become a global example of the development of a healthy free nation using the tool of education as its major manipulative tool.

CHAPTER 5
UNSUCCESSFUL EDUCATIONAL CHANGES
THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION

Overview

The discussions of the three countries above have illustrated interplay of SPEAS that have resulted in their educational systems successfully coping with the need to change their educational systems to adapt to a rapidly changing world. This section of the paper uses two examples to illustrate how the interaction of SPEAS can lead to unsuccessful efforts to improve educational outcomes.

THE SOVIET UNION

Introduction

The opportunity to be in the Soviet Union during the past academic year offered an unparalleled occasion to observe one of the greatest social change movements of all time. It is simplistic now to talk of the economic conditions that forced the political and social changes in the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc countries that have occurred during the past few years, and the speed with which they happened. The challenge currently is to understand the forces that have led to these dramatic changes and assist in the development of the social-political-economic and educational institutions that will assure that the changes become

permanent fixtures of Soviet life. There are also lessons for other countries to be gained from the Soviet experience.

The changes that have occurred and that are still occurring, (the collapse of the Berlin Wall, the loss of Communist Party power in the Eastern bloc countries, the changes in the Politburo, the decrease of Soviet military power, a new, and different foreign policy, the rise of nationalism), each signal, singularly and collectively, one of the the most significant social reversals of a seemingly entrenched political power base seen in several lifetimes. These changes have occurred in such sweeping fashion, and with such speed, that the implications of their occurrence are only now beginning to be developed and understood. Changes in American foreign and domestic policies, and in other countries around the world, as a result of these significant changes in Soviet life, have not yet been formulated (Mandelbaum, 1990). Similarly, although not as well recognized or discussed, these changes in the political, economic, and social dimensions of Soviet life should force significant alterations of both the Soviet and American educational systems.

These changes (in the economic, social, and political arenas of Soviet life) are noteworthy in several ways. They represent changes of such a dramatic fashion that they were undreamed of just a few short years ago. However, one of the notable aspects of these changes, highlighted by its absence, is the role education, both public and higher education, played in causing these changes. However, both President Gorbachev and Gennadi Yadogin, Chairman of the USSR State Committee on Public Education, as well as others, recognize that the success of perestroika is dependent upon the accomplishment of reform of the Soviet educational system. (Yagodin, 1989)

This section will describe the structure of education in the Soviet Union, examine its role during the current upheavals, and describe the changes in education the Soviet Union with educational change procedures and the SPEAs accompanying these change efforts.

Soviet Educational System

The Soviet educational system, like that of most countries, is perceived as a servant of the state. In the Soviet Union, its role was to serve the interests of the state, i.e., the Communist party interests. This is changing significantly in some of the Soviet republics and, in fact, recommendations for significant change are being recommended by the Soviet State Committee on Public Education. (Yagodin, 1989) Soviet public education comprises 11 years, between the ages of six to 16, of free, compulsory education. These schools teach twenty-two subjects. Yagodin reported that over two and a half million teachers (2.7 million) are employed in the schools, although in a different part of the same report he indicates the Soviet Union employs over five million teachers. The USSR State Committee on Public Education estimated that this number will have to increase by 50% during the next decade. (Yagodin, 1989)

Higher education institutions, of which there are 895 in the Soviet Union, currently enroll approximately 3 million college and university students, of which 654, 000 are new students each year (Legras, 1989a). Three general avenues are offered to advanced education. First, there is the university, which offers a brief general education of about two years. Slightly over one semester of this general education component is composed of required courses in Communist theory, history and ideology. This is followed by three years of concentrated study in an area of

specialization. Second, there is the technical university that requires five years of concentrated work, primarily in vocational and technical subjects. Finally, there is the specialized institute. For example, there are specialized institutes for the study of medicine, art, engineering, economics, psychology, education. Students can also "major" in most of these subjects at the university. Each of these institutes requires five years of study.

Graduate study differs significantly from that in the United States. There are two levels of graduate study in the Soviet Union. The first is a three or four year program of study leading to the degree of Candidate of Science and may be undertaken at either a university or at some institutes. The Soviet State Committee on Public Education, located in Moscow, must approve these programs. These programs require two or three years of class work in the field of specialization, and one year or more of research and writing the dissertation for the degree.

The second level of graduate study is for the degree of Doctor of Science. These programs are offered only at universities approved by the Soviet State Committee on Public Education in Moscow. To obtain this degree the student attends no classes but concentrates solely on preparing a dissertation in the general field of specialization. No formal guidance is provided the student. The student defends the dissertation before an 18 member Scientific Council when the dissertation is completed.

The Soviet State Committee on Public Education in Moscow appoints the members of this council. The members of the Council generally do not all come from the same university. For example, while I was in Tbilisi, members of the Scientific Councils administering the doctoral examinations in education and psychology came from Tbilisi, Leningrad,

Moscow, Baku, and several other institutions in Georgia and other republics. Thus, the student generally has had no contact with many Council members until the day of the examination. Further, not all universities are allowed to offer the doctoral degree in all areas. For example, Tbilisi State University is the only university in the Trans-Causaus republics (Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia) to offer the doctoral degree in education, psychology, and several other disciplines. This works a severe hardship on students who are distanced from the university.

The student still is not awarded the degree even if the examination results in a favorable outcome as judged by the Scientific Council. This holds for both Candidate and Doctoral degree candidates. The dissertation must be approved by the Soviet State Committee on Public Education in Moscow in order for the student to be awarded the degree. This requires that the student have his or her dissertation translated into Russian, even if the topic is Georgian literature and written in the Georgian language, and sent, with voluminous documentation, to Moscow. Some months later the student will receive a post card stating whether the dissertation has been approved. Although there is some hope that this requirement of sending every thing to Moscow for final approval will be modified this year for the Candidate degree, there is not much expectation that control of the doctoral degree will be granted to the republic or university.

There is a third level of academic recognition, but it is not earned at the university. This is the rank of Academician. It is earned by generating an impressive record of research and being recognized by the republic's or the Soviet Academy of Sciences in the person's discipline. This accord is earned only by research and the title of Academician is much desired and entitles the bearer to all sorts of perks.

Several important consequences result from this form of higher education. First, students and graduates of Soviet universities tend to be extremely knowledgeable in their area of specialization, but generally not broadly educated, with one exception, as we conceive of a liberal arts education. The exception is that all students, and particularly faculty members, seemed especially knowledgeable in the history and philosophy of education, both Soviet and American. Specialities tended to produce a narrow focus, and in the social and behavioral sciences and the humanities, could be quite outdated. For example, in psychology, faculty and students alike at Tbilisi State University were quite competent in set theory but lacked knowledge of recent psychological theories and developments. Although public school students appeared at least as knowledgeable as their American counterparts in most subjects, Soviet university students appeared only more knowledgeable in a small area of specialization than comparable American students.

Second, the primary emphasis in the area of specialization at the undergraduate level, and at the graduate level, is on library research and theory development. Very little of an applied nature is taught in most of the social and behavioral sciences. For example, in the field of psychology, which in America, has a significant applied character, had essentially no applied or practice aspects to its study in the Soviet Union. This lack of experience in the applied nature of many social and behavioral disciplines has greatly handicapped the testing and evaluation of many theories and the subsequent modification of a theory on the basis of research. Additionally, during the past 70 years, the time the Soviet Union has been under the domination of the Communist Party, any theory development had to be consistent with Communist Party doctrine.

Further, research of a comparative or experimental nature in the social and behavioral sciences is generally not conducted.

As a result, development of a Theory of Individual Differences, upon which rests the practice of psychology, education, and particularly, special education in America, is virtually non-existent in the Soviet Union. Further, it is a belief in individual differences, built upon a value structure of primacy of the individual, which has fueled the most significant advances in human and civil rights in America. Such concerns have only recently emerged publicly in some republics of the Soviet Union and are not embedded in practice. It is this philosophical and theoretical base of respect for the individual in America that has most marked the differences between the educational systems of the two societies in past decades.

One obvious consequence of Soviet theory development having to be consistent with Communist party doctrine is the stultifying effect this requirement has had on theory development in the social and behavioral sciences, as well as the humanities and other disciplines. As a result, many disciplines have significant gaps in their curricula.

Another characteristic of the Soviet educational system is the almost exclusive reliance on a lecture method of instruction. This is most obvious at the university level where students are not prepared, either by experience or inclination, to engage in a discussion or seminar type course. They are quite uncomfortable with such courses and I had considerable difficulty in attempting to teach my courses in such a format.

A related aspect of teaching in the Soviet Union is that there are virtually no handouts provided to students as paper and reproduction

facilities are essentially non-existent. All material comes from the instructor in the form of his/her verbal lectures. Test books are available but rigid in theory (and not particularly paid attention to). Library resources, except in Moscow, and perhaps Leningrad, tend to be outdated, and many sources are lacking. In general, resources for academic matters are very scarce. The psychology department at Tbilisi University had the equivalent of $50 for equipment and other resources for the 1989-90 academic year.

Soviet education, in all republics, is controlled from Moscow in all important aspects. Until very recently, the curriculum of a university could not be modified unless Moscow granted approval. Each university has a rector (president) but he could not make any significant decisions unless he received permission from the Chairman of the Department of the Communist Party that is a part of each university. In 1988 however, 150 rectors were elected through a process aimed at broadening local authority over education. (Legras, 1988) Yagodin indicated in 1989 that this number was 228. (Legras, 1989a) The Ministry of Education of each Republic tells the university how many students in each field they may accept for each year. There are other similar characteristics of Soviet education but perhaps these mentioned will serve to illustrate the points I wish to make.

Before I make these points I need to mention that there are signs that some of these controls are being relaxed. For example, one day when I was scheduled to lecture at Tbilisi State University no students showed up for class. I was told that the students were demonstrating to have the Department of the Communist Party expelled from the University. I was detained at the University for several hours, until the students left the

campus, marching down the street, because it might have been dangerous for me to leave during the time they were demonstrating. The students were successful. The department was removed from the University, along with the requirement that each student take eight courses in Communist party doctrine. This requirement alone took up almost one year of each student's course of study. However, university administrators, since they have had no experience in such matters, find planning for replacement courses to be a perplexing matter.

There are two points I wish to make with respect to Soviet education, and in contrasting it with the American system. The first is concerned with the forces that have generated the recent changes in the Soviet Union and some of its allies, and the relation these forces have to educational change and developments. The second is related to the role that education plays in each of these two different political systems.

Forces Creating Educational Change

Clearly the most dominant force driving recent political and social change in the Soviet Union was the absolute failure of its economic system. This is clear from the comments of Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Yagodin. (Legras, 1989b; Yagodin, 1989) It is a matter of conjecture whether the current changes sweeping the Soviet Union would have occurred without this failure of the economic system. I think not. The history of the Soviet Union and its pattern of decision making during the past 70 years does not indicate that the type of decisions made recently were ever made except under severe duress, as for example, during the Second World War, or for longer term self serving purposes. Thus, the current changes, while certainly welcome and in what I believe most

Americans would consider to be an appropriate direction, were not made out of the goodness of the hearts of the Kremlin leaders. These decisions were cold and calculated and the lesser evil of perceived alternatives. As perceived by many Soviet leaders, perestroika was a necessary evil to save the Soviet Union from disintegration and collapse. It was not instituted to make the world a safer place, although that may, in fact, be its ultimate outcome. Currently, however, it is becoming evident that perestroika is not achieving its desired objectives. The economic situation in the Soviet Union, if anything, is worse now than before it was initiated. (Dujmovic, 1989)

Glasnost, on the other hand, is succeeding. There are increasing signs of open and free discussion. My wife and I were told repeatedly that one or two years ago we could not have had the discussions we were having with Soviet citizens, or been invited into their homes without a member of the government present. In many cases we were the first Americans that had been invited into the homes in the cities and villages. The discussions were frank and open. These discussions were one source of information that led to the conclusion that perestroika was failing. The overwhelming consensus was that things were worse now economically than they were a few years ago. There was even a longing in some of the comments for the old days, when life was more predictable, more stable.

It is also glasnost that provides the climate for the waves of dissent that have swept the Soviet Union. It is not conceivable that without glasnost students could demonstrate against the Department of the Communist party at the university and win. Works of literature, paintings, and plays are now being produced and performed that a few

years ago would have led quickly to an uncomfortable session with the KGB, which although still quite evident, goes about its work more quietly. There are also signs that dissent will only be allowed up to a certain level; for example, the continued show of military strength in the Baltic states and the use of troops in the Central Asian republics. The most dramatic show of force we were told about, and saw on video tape, was the use of troops, tanks and poison gas in Tbilisi on April 9, 1989, to quell a peaceful demonstration for independence. The number killed, primarily women and girls, by the tanks, troops and gas was over 20, and many more were injured and wounded. One of our translators, 16 years old, spent almost three weeks in a hospital recovering from the effects of being gassed.

It has been the economic condition of the Soviet Union that forced perestroika. Its goal, I believe, was and is to buy the time necessary for the Soviet Union to develop and implement survival mechanisms. It should be remembered that a traditional strategy of the Soviet military has been to trade land for time to allow the enemy to exhaust itself by over extension, and to allow the Soviets to mobilize their own resources. One perspective of perestroika is that it could be a similar strategy, trading land and people for economic mobilization.

Glasnost, on the hand, was perceived as an essential, but not particularly desired, social mechanism required to provide the Soviet people with the personal incentives necessary for perestroika to succeed. The real failure of perestroika, besides the divided opinion of Soviet leaders about whether the economic system needs only serious alterations, or whether a new system has to be developed and installed, is the lack of recognition, emphasis and support for restructuring the social

and educational conditions and processes of the Soviet State. Although it was the failure of the economic system that led to the need for perestroika, it is the failure of perestroika to recognize that it was the nature of the social and educational systems that led to the economic collapse.

Reform of Soviet Education

If there was serious intent to restructure or reconstruct the Soviet economic system, it would be logical to assume that the educational system would be among the first social institutions to be modified in structure and functions to provide the new training required to successfully implement perestroika. Obviously, to be successful, perestroika requires a new form of thinking, a new set of attitudes and skills on the part of management and workers. The universities, technical schools, institutes and the public schools each must be released from Moscow's control, and new open and more flexible systems of education designed and instituted. It must be recognized that there are some signs that very small incremental steps are being taken along this line, e.g., the expulsion of the Party from Tbilisi University. More specifically, the blueprint for reform of Soviet education, as outlined by Yagodin (Yagodin, 1989), envisions broad and sweeping improvements of all dimensions of the educational system.

Yagodin, in his blueprint proposal, speaks of the intent to carry out serious, revolutionary changes in the structure and content of secondary education (in the Soviet Union, secondary education means grades 1-11). The specific proposals he indicates include the curricula, the training and continuing education of teachers, and the need for a humanitarian

component in teacher training is commented upon several times. Improved instructional methods, the significant role of aesthetic education and emotional refinement in the shaping of personality are prominent in his proposal. Of particular import are his comments relating to the desire to expand the rights of educational institutions and local Soviets in the republics with respect to the improvement of the teaching of national culture, the history of the people and the national language.

Yagodin's proposal also addresses the reorganization of management of public education. Yagodin's proposal includes four major reforms at the national level;

1) a system of joint state and public administration of public education,

2) A congress elected by the people that would be the supreme public body of the administration of public education and a Council on Public Education elected by the congress. The Council would be comprised exclusively of representatives of pedagogical circles,

3) A radical redistribution of the functions and powers of the central, regional, and local bodies of administration. The guiding principle in this redistribution is to be that an educational institution should decide all questions it can decide unaided. This change is intended to extend the rights and responsibilities of educational institutions and lead to the destruction of a uniform management structure and the formation of a flexible one, and

4) The State Committee would concentrate its activities on creating a strategy of development for public education, setting priorities and carrying out major social-pedagogical experiments.

Yagodin freely admits that not much has been accomplished in

achieving these reforms.

Reforms at the republic and local level are also envisioned. At the republic level regional educational requirements with due regard for national requirements, local social and economic conditions and the national culture and historical differences are to be developed. Each republic will be responsible for determining the number of schools, and their types. The administrative bodies will supply the educational system with financial, material and technical resources and personnel, coordinate the work of educational institutions, and organize the retraining of personnel and the improvement of their qualifications.

At the level of the individual institution the principle of interaction between society and state will be implemented through the activity of its council, composed of representatives of teachers, students and the public. These councils will be empowered with extensive rights to organize the activity of schools and colleges. They will elect the heads of the institutions, receive reports from the heads, assess the qualifications of teachers, coordinate the institution's funds and supervise management. The council is to work out the social order for the institution and supervise its achievement. The council is to organize a collective search for solutions to various problems and assist management in implementing the solutions. The institutional head will be personally responsible for for the results. This responsibility will require that the head have a veto power for decisions made by the council.

The management of the educational system is to be based on new principles: helping instead of restricting, guiding instead of prohibiting, directing instead of commanding. The need for the creation of economic, legal, and organizational mechanisms that ensure the priority of

development and improvement of these goals is recognized. Three separate education ministries were consolidated in 1988 into a single State Committee for Higher Education to facilitate the reform process. Yagodin, the then higher education minister, was named to head it.

Assessment of Soviet Educational Reform

The reform of the Soviet educational system is a vital component of achieving other major reforms of Soviet life, but it has not received a high priority for the resources necessary to bring about the changes desired. It appears to have received a high priority only in terms of rhetoric. Of course, the short term needs to provide housing, etc., may have eclipsed the longer term investment of resources necessary to achieve educational reform. The achievements of the four major components of Gorbachev's reform agenda, economic reconstruction, political revitalization, and the modernization of foreign and military policy (Isaacson, 1989) are in the long-term dependent upon reform of the educational system. Gorbachev himself, at a Communist Party meeting in the summer of 1988, emphasized that the success of perestroika would depend on "high standards of education, scientific research, general culture, and proficiency on the job." (Legras, 1988) The blueprint for reform of the educational system as outlined by Yagodin is an ambitious and far-reaching program. However, it would take an all-out effort to institute these reforms of education, and to be successful, would take years to implement and evaluate, as Yagodin understands. (Yagodin, 1989) Educational reform is recognized as critical to the success of perestroika. However, faced with the economic crises, the rising sense of nationalism, and growing social discontent, the pace of educational reform is

exceedingly slow. Yagodin has told the Soviet Committee on Science, Education and Culture that, "if our public consciousness does not fully realize the top priority of education, our loss compared with the West will grow further." He also declared in a monthly journal article that the Soviet Union's current (economic) difficulties can be traced to a severe deficit in education and culture. (Legras, 1989b)

Evidence is mixed concerning the implementation of reform measures. On the one hand, some steps have been made in allowing institutions, faculty members and students more independence and flexibility. Student participation in university decision making has increased and they now serve on many university committees. As might be expected, many faculty members do not approve students being given equal voice on local education councils, and they question whether the best student representatives are being elected. One of the questions I was asked most frequently by students was about the role of students in the governance of American universities. I was also was present and asked to participate in and address the inaugural session of the Students' Discussion Club at the Kutaisi Pedagogical Institute. This club was formed to raise and discuss issues of import to the students. The motto of the Club is, "Truth is to be Found in Discussion." The most debated and frequent topics raised were political ones. Other such groups such as Association of Teachers of Higher Education Establishments, formed in 1989, to address faculty overload have been formed. The workload for each faculty member is 600 hours of lectures per academic year, plus the completion of at least one research report

However, in spite of these modest but significant reforms, evidence of significant support for educational reform is difficult to find. Yagodin

has indicated that his ministry needed close to 20-per cent more than the $68 billion in government funds that it is scheduled to receive in 1990. This contrasts with a budget of $50.5 billion in 1987 and $55.5 billion in 1988. Higher education received $6.7 billion and & $7.5 billion for these years, respectively (Legras, 1989b). The exchange rate for these figures was based on $1.60 to the ruble. This exchange rate has since changed with the devaluation of the ruble.

Key educators have called the education budget a disaster. Education's share of the 1990 budget increased only half a per cent from the preceding year. Significant increases in funds for health, housing and the production of consumer goods were provided. The budget for these areas rose about 10.7 per cent from 1989 to 1990.

Educators say that a key problem in reform is a pattern of inertia that can be traced to the era of the Communist Party leader Leonid Brezhnev-the so-called "period of stagnation" from the mid-1960's to the early 1980's, when bureaucrats always waited for their superiors to tell them what to do and took little initiative. We saw much evidence of this attitude still operating in the Soviet Union. Many decisions were delayed and many questions were still referred to Moscow for a decision.

One member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences has said that the Gorbachev reforms "have not been supported economically or politically." The scientist, who asked to remain anonymous, added that Soviet universities "do not know what to do with the freedoms they have already received" (Legras, 1988). Other comments of a similar nature have come from such persons as a member of the Politburo and secretary of the party's Central Committee. According to this official the nation's economic progress depended on serious change in the educational system

and that the pace and extent of recent educational reforms were unsatisfactory. (Legras, 1988)

The Soviet Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, which is responsible for teacher education, has come under significant criticism in the past two years. In Spring, 1989, the Communist Party newspaper Pravada accused the academy of "stagnation, inertia, and being out of touch with reality and the needs of the teaching body." This theme is consistent with that of Yagodin who has stated that the problem of the pace and extent of the change lies with the universities who have been advised to do what they think is best, without asking the State Committee's permission. Fleix Peregudov, Vice Chairman of the State Committee on Public Education, indicated that "higher education establishments have been given many rights. It is time they were used instead of waiting for instructions from above." (Legras, 1988)

The conclusions seem clear. The success of perestroika is perceived as dependent to a significant extent upon education and the success of educational reform. The reform measures of education are not perceived to be proceeding quickly enough or successfully enough. The political leaders blame the educators and the educators blame the political leaders and the lack of an adequate budget. Sounds suspiciously like America.

The reforms envisioned in the Soviet Union amount to one of the most wide scale reform agendas ever attempted. The complete reversal of a political dogma enforced for 70 years, with all the psychological and social upheaval that entails, a completely new economic structure, a social reconstruction of unparalleled scale, a totally new program of foreign and military policies, is each dependent upon significant reform of the educational system, which is not achieving its goals. It is a classic

example of what a lack of knowledge and application of social and educational change processes to reform efforts produce, increased stagnation. If success of Gorbachev's reform agenda is dependent upon educational reform, then the conclusion has to be that his reform efforts will fail. To the extent that educational reform has a mutually dependent relationship with political, economic and social reform issues, efforts and successes, the Soviet reform leaders have neglected the educational dimension that must drive achievement of these other areas of reform. Further exacerbating this reform drive is the unrealistic time limit Gorbachev has imposed on achieving significant gains. It is important for the leaders of reform to understand the mutually dependent context and relationships that exist among these various dimensions of life. To date, without an experience base in reform in these areas, Soviet leaders have not evidenced the behavior that would lead an observer to conclude that the direction, pace, intensity, processes or goals of the reform efforts are under control.

Reform in the Soviet Union has to be considered, at the current time, a failure. The causes of this failure are to be found in the monumental extent of the changes attempted, the lack of knowledge about change processes, the lack of a synchronized system for coordinating changes in the political, economic, social and educational systems, and the unrealistic time allowed for the results of reform to manifest themselves.

Implications for American Educational Reform Efforts

In many respects the efforts of the Soviet Union to reform and

restructure their modes of living to improve their quality of life bear a striking resemblance to educational reform efforts in the U.S. The single biggest difference between Soviet education and that of the U.S. has been the centralized form of control in the Soviet Union and the more decentralized form of control in the US. However, during the past several years, each of these forms of governance has been approaching a more common position. In the Soviet Union there has been the rhetoric, if not the substance, of moving to a more decentralized form of governance of educational decision making. In the United States, as Krist's (1988) review (among others) indicates so clearly, the United States is moving towards a more highly centralized form of control of educational decision making at the state level. In effect, the single most significant difference that formerly distinguished the educational decision making philosophies and mechanisms of the American and Soviet systems is disappearing. An imperfect analogy for this process is the regression towards the mean phenomenon.

The implications of this phenomenon are staggering. The characteristic of the Soviet Union that most repelled Americans was the centralized planning and the related lack of recognition of the worth of the individual, cornerstones of the idealized American way of life. Here it is the Soviet Union that is forging ahead in decentralization and recognition of the education of each individual's personality and worth. Yagodin, in his blueprint for restructuring the Soviet educational system spoke to this point directly in his address to the 1988 All-Union Congress of Public Education Workers. He stated,

"The building of a new system of education is a long and complicated process. In carrying out this extensive and diverse work, it

is absolutely essential to single out the principal goal. Undoubtedly, it is the development of the individual which is the centre and the main purpose of the entire educational activity of a teacher and a pedagogical collective.

"Schools exist for the child and the teaching profession exists for the child, and not vice versa." (Yagodin, 1989, p. 12)

This orientation represents one of the most fundamental shifts in philosophy that can be imagined in the Soviet Union and the most radical departure from Marxist theory that can be imagined. Even if the implementation of educational practices based on the development of the individual is delayed, the very fact that such a philosophical orientation is being advocated from the highest circle of Soviet leaders is an event that surpasses even the crumbling of the Berlin Wall in importance. It may also represent the reason the reform of the Soviet educational system is being delayed. If such a philosophy as the recognition of the worth of the individual and his/her education as an individual takes root in the minds, beliefs, and behaviors of the ordinary Soviet citizen, and is practiced by teachers, the philosophy of Marx, Lenin, Stalin and other former Soviet leaders is doomed. So also are the perks and privileges of the current ruling Communist Party members. We must keep in mind that Gorbachev has serious opposition from many hard line Party members. They would love to see his policies and reforms fail, particularly those that would allow and encourage people to think and act according to their own conscience and beliefs.

In contrast to these Soviet moves towards a philosophy of individualism, in America, as a result of the current reform effort we have seen a move to centralization of control of curriculum, personnel

preparation, accountability and resource allocation at the state level. (Reilly, & Girst, 1988) One of the most noticeable effects of the latest wave of reform has been the reinforcement of uniform and standardized curricula and evaluation procedures. This focus on producing similar outcomes on the part of learners at minimal levels of acceptability. Nothing could devalue more the philosophy of individual differences, respect for individual needs, and the role of education as the primary means for providing individual students equal opportunities than what has been imposed upon the educational system during this latest reform effort.

It is interesting that the primary force driving the educational reform movement in both the Soviet Union and the United States is the same. This force is the lack of the economic system in both countries to achieve the results desired. In the Soviet Union the failures of the economic system have caused the most fundamental shifts in philosophy in practically all dimensions of life, with a hallmark change being a move to bolster the role of the individual. In the United States, the failures of the economic system to produce the short term profits desired have been attributed almost solely to failures of the educational system. I don't believe this is a valid conclusion, but the outcomes of the reforms have been a centralized approach to planning, policy development, teaching practices and accountability, each of which detract seriously from the role and worth of the individual. We would be well advised to learn from the Soviet experience. They have tried centralized planning and may lose their country as a result.

An Alternative Role for Education

Education has been increasingly perceived as failing to meet the needs of the societies it serves (Coombs, 1985). This disparity, characterized as a failure of the educational system has, in fact, been described as an educational crisis of world wide proportions. Particularly since the end of WWII, when expansion of educational systems became a tool for fueling the economic expansion of the victorious countries and the economic development of conquered and developing nations, the gap between societal expectations and educational outcomes has become greater (Coombs, 1985). This increasing disparity has led to the prevailing view that it is the failure of the educational systems that has contributed significantly to the problems of the economic systems. In turn, these problems have spurred the attempts to reform the educational systems in both the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as in most other countries.

Apparently, it has not occurred to political, business and many educational leaders that there is not an isomorphic relationship between the educational system and economic development. They are different types of systems with entirely incongruous goals, techniques and procedures. There is also a more important difference. Education is not just a tool for filling the worker quotas of a nation. It has a responsibility that far exceeds this simplistic perspective. That responsibility includes the development of the personal-social competence of students that is far more critical for improving the social (and probably the economic) health of a nation then if dominant evaluation of education's success is determined by economic gains.

Education is perceived as serving the national interests in practically all countries, but particularly those with a centralized form of

planning and control. To most political leaders, and perhaps ordinary citizens, this means having the educational system responsive to the dictates of the political leaders, however they happened to achieve these positions. It is time to begin thinking about a new role for education where the profession has shared responsibility and authority with the public for the goals and methods of instruction, and accountability criteria. Education, as a profession, must develop some autonomy to resist untoward intrusions and excesses of reform efforts and to share the authority as well as the responsibility for maintaining the cultural heritage of a society. It must also develop the capacity to provide an objective analysis of social and political events and trends without the fear of having its resources cut. I am mindful in making these statements of wondering what the course of events in the Soviet Union would have been during the past 70 years if there had been a free and objective system of education. Of course, there had not been such a legacy from the Czar, but one must wonder where the voice of education was when the rights of Soviet citizens, even under provisions of the Soviet Constitution were being trampled. Somehow, I think it would be a good idea if America's educational system were to develop such a legacy while we still have the chance.

Elmore and Mclaughlin (1988) have identifed eight major waves of educational reform in the United States between the 1700s and the latest round which was initiated formally with the publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983. There have been countless minor attempts to reform various aspects of educational activity during the same time period.

Educational reform in the Soviet Union has been present during the same period, beginning first with those efforts of Peter the Great in 1724 (Gerhart, 1974). The most recent, publicized effort at educational reform began shortly after Mr. Gorbachev came to power. However, efforts at curriculum reforms have been under-way since the mid-1960s (Popkewitz, 1982). The most recent reform efforts (since 1985) have focused on consolidation of ministries, decentralization of authority, increased standards, faculty evaluations and others (Legras, 1989a; Yagodin, 1989).

Thus, the latest educational reform efforts in each country began at approximately the same time. In both these countries, the United States and the Soviet Union, these latest efforts at educational reform share similarities; each also posseses unique features. An analysis and comparsion of these common and disimilar characteristics should prove enlightening to policy makers and educational theorists alike. The following discussion revolves around the similarities and differences inherent in the latest reform attempts in each country, and outlines unique features of these efforts. Specifically, these similarities, differences and unique features will be examined in light of the reform goals, philosophies, procedures, outcome criteria and personnel preparation practices of each country.

Information Gathering Procedures

The procedures utilized for the following discussion were similar, but differed in degree, depending on which country was being analyzed. For the data concerning the United States, the primary source of information was the reform literature which provides a wealth of material concerning the procedures, goals and current outcomes of

educational reform. Visits to schools and conversations with teachers and administrators, as well as discussions in doctoral seminars played a significant, but lesser role in gathering this information. For the Soviet Union, the literature played a lesser role since the excant literature is much less, and in some cases, unavilable. Visits to schools, conversations with faculty members and students at three pedogogical institutes and one state university, and discussions with members of a graduate class taught at a Soviet (Georgian) university were the primary sources of information for the observations related to Soviet reform efforts. It should be noted that the Soviet literature reviewed was primarily (1) American writers' impressions of Soviet education, of which there is little available written in the 1980's, and (2) Soviet government publications. The conversations and visits to public and higher education institutions took place during the Spring of 1990, but were restricted to one Republic (Georgia). The educational reform efforts being attempted from Moscow and appearing in Georgia, do not seem to be dissimilar to those occuring in most Soviet republics.

Comparison of Reform efforts

Goals

The goals of the current educational reform efforts in both the U. S. and the Soviet Union are similar. The common spur to these attempts in each nation was a faltering economy and a perceived need to improve the skills of the working force. David Kearns (Kearns, 1988), CEO of Xerox stated, " Public education has put this country at a terrible competitive disadvantage" (p. 566). Others have reflected this concern more strongly.

Cuban (1988) stated the feelings of corporate executives of America who have been key figures in the educational reform movement, "if this nation wants a strong economy that can compete in the world marketplace, it needs schools that can give young people the attitudes, skills, and flexibility to fit into a changing job market" (p. 571). McCall (McCall, 1988) has stated, "Educational reform is starting in the marketplace and moving onto school property" (p. 8).

In the Soviet Union the perceived relationship between educational improvement and a revitalized economy are equally strong. Gennady Yagodin, chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Public Education, has tied educational improvement to economic success in the future (Legras, 1989b).

These motivations for, and goals of, educational reform are consistent with the 1985 report of Coombs. This report sketches clearly the relationship between economic development and educational quality that existed in the minds of many economic, political and educational leaders since 1945 (Coombs, 1985). This perceived relationship has, if anything, been strengthened in the latest round of educational reform motivations and recommendations.

Philosphical Bases of Reform

United States

The philosphical basis of reform in the United States is difficult to determine, other then the aforementioned drive to improve the economic life of the nation. In fact, it is difficult to identify a common philosophical orientation to much of what has happened in American education in recent years. The history and debate of varying philosphical orientations to American education extends back at least till the beginning of the 20th century. Chubberly (1934) perceived schooling as an appropriate extension of democratic ideals and the basis of early reform efforts. Kaestle (1983) understood the school reforms of the 18th and 19th century as the development of a Protestant, capitalist majority against various minority groups. Katz (1968, 1975) saw the development of secondary education as a means of exerting control over the working class. Tyack (1974) suggests that the "administrative progressive" reforms of the 19th and early 20th centuries were efforts to solidfy control of public education by urban elites. Ravitch (1983) deals with more recent reform efforts and perceives current endeavors as clumsy attempts by political interests to shape schools, and thereby society, according to their own perception. She suggests that these attempts have failed at the central task of improving student learning. Bruner, (1983) agrees that the latest round of reform is "enormously political." Of course, the debates over "child-centered" curriculums have gone on for years. The closest orientation to a guiding philosophical belief for recent reform efforts appears to be the quest for increased profits.

Soviet Union

In contrast to the United States, the Soviet Union appears to have two conflicting philosophical orientations guiding its reform attempts.

Yagodin (1989), in a report to the All-Union Congress of Public Education Workers, provides insights into these conflicting orientations. First, he speaks of the proposal to carry out serious, revolutionary changes in the schools under the guiding principles of Lenin's unified, labour-oriented polytechnical schools. He also speaks of the need to take advantage of opportunities to influence the development of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook in young people. At the same time, Yagodin speaks of the need to democratize on a broad scale a system of joint state and public administration of public education. He recognizes that democratizing the management of education will require a radical redistribution of the functions and powers of the central, regional and local bodies of administration. Thus, the goal appears to be a more democratic structure of education, but within a Marxist-Lenin philosophical framework and a socialist society. How this process will develop over time under these conflicting orientations is difficult to forecast, but it is unlikely that both can exist as co-equal guides for the improvement of Soviet education.

Reform Procedures.

The procedures utilized to achieve the goals of reform in each country are quite dissimilar. In the Soviet Union the procedures utilized are appear to be a function of a highly centralized form of control telling sub-units, the ministrity of education in each republic, state universities, techinical universities and institutes, that they were now free, and expected, to form their own decisions (Yagodin, 1989). The areas for independent decision making include primarily the curricula within each unit. Some matters are still controled by and from Moscow, for example, the decision regarding approval for a student to be awarded the degree of

Doctor of Science.

One major flaw in this process is that there was not a pre-planning time period. Most theorists of educational change (Dalin, 1978; Fullan, 1982) indicate strongly that those who are to be affected by the change must be involved in the planning of the change effort if it is to be effective. Further, it is quite clear from the literature that successful educational change, particularly if it involves structural or significant re-allocation of resources, decision making authority, etc., must be preceded by a period of planning and education for those who are about to lose and gain resources, to prepare and teach those who will now have to make decisions, etc. This planning and education period did not occur in the Soviet Union. Although Yagodin (1989) recognizes the need for time to achieve the goals of reform, such time is not being built into the reform process. As a result, many educators in the Soviet republics are not prepared to assume, design, implement or evaluate changes which Moscow is telling them that they now have the authority to make (Legras, 1989b). It is unlikely, therefore, that the changes desired at the central, republic and local levels will be achieved because adherence to successful change strategies and procedures were not utilized.

In the United States, a different set of procedures were followed, but similar outcomes can be predicted. In contrast to the Soviet Union, the United States has, or is presumed to have, a decentralized form of educational control. The latest round of educational reform (1983 to the present) gives lie to this belief. Over 40 reports at the national level, and over 250 blue ribbon committees and task forces at the state level (Corrigan, 1986) indicate that control of education is being excerised at the state and national levels. Further, over 700 statues at the state level,

affecting education, were enacted by state legislatures between 1984 and 1987. These were more than had been enacted in the previous 20 years (Timan, & Kirp, 1989). In addition, as Kirst's 1988 review so vividly demonstrates, local boards of education have been increasingly losing control of policy making authority, curricula decisions and resources to state policy makers, special interest groups at the local, state and nations levels, court decisions, and federal mandates since the early 1960s (Kirst, 1988).

The conclusion seems inescapeable. The United States is racing towards a centralized control of education at the state level, with some signs of national control being exerted in this movement. The procedures utilized in this movement combine scare tactics, e.g., "a rising tide of medoricity," (Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), with heavy involvement by leaders of business and industry and an imposition of their management practices and a standardization of curricula, personnel preparation practices, expected results, and resource allocation formulas (Reilly, & Girst, 1988). Variability, risk taking, experimentation and local analysis of needs and programatic decisions is rapidly eroding as a result of these practices.

It seems clear that the Soviet Union and the United States share similar goals in their educational reform efforts. It also seems clear that the philosophical bases and procedures utilized to achieve these goals are quite different. These different procedures appear to be producing at least one similar result, a failure of the reform effort. This issue will be addressed below.

It also appears that the goals and produres of reform efforts are having differential effects on the structure and function of public schools

and personnel preparation policies and practices. This issue will also be discussed below.

Focus of Reform Efforts

The focus of the reform efforts in the United States appears to be the public schools primarily. Most of the initial national reports mentioned earlier focused on the public schools and K-12 teachers. It was not until the first flurry of outcries about the quality of teaching was completed that attention was focused on the teacher preparation programs. And, it was not until nearly five years after the initial nation report, A Nation at Risk, (Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) that attention was given to the leaders of schools, their administrators. Although there had been sporadic reports and articles concerning the need to improve the preparation of educational administrators, it was not until 1987 that the first serious attention was given to this issue. Since 1987, there has been a concerted effort to improve the preparation of this group, focusing on both the knowledge base of educational administrators, and the delivery models utilized to prepare them.

In sum, the focus of reform efforts in the United States has ricocheted from one issue to another, from teachers, to curricula, to standards, to preparation of teachers and administrators. The glaring ommission of an approach which coordinated efforts to address each of these areas stands out in sharp relief. As a result of this almost random approach to reform, successful achievement of its goals seems remote.

In contrast to the United States, the reform focus of the Soviet Union appears diffuse at this point. Although educational improvement is seen as essential to the success of "perestroika" there appears to be

little coordination of reform efforts, and the education budget is far short of needs to radically improve the educational structure (Legras, 1989b). The initial focus of the reform effort appears to be the public schools. Universities are also being provided the latitude to engage in increased local decision making, but this window of opportunity appears to be independent of the effort to improve public schools. The efforts of the reform movement appear focused on the improvement of education from the perspective of state (national) management for increasing individual competence (Yagodin, 1989)

The Blueprint for reform of Soviet education, as described by Yagodin, Chairman of the Soviet State Committee on Public Education, is extensive. Three separate education ministries were consolidated in 1988 into a single State Committee for Higher Education, and Yagodin, then the higher education minister was named to head it.

Yagodin, in his 1988 address to the All-Union Congress of Public Education Workers, submitted his proposal to restructure education. In his blueprint proposal, he speaks of the intent to carry out serious, revolutionary changes in the structure and content of secondary education (in the Soviet Union, secondary education means grades 1-11). The specific proposals he indicates include the curricula, the training and continuing education of teachers, and the need for a humanitarian component in teacher training is commented upon several times. Improved instructional methods, the significant role of aesthetic education and emotional refinement in the shaping of personality are prominent in his proposal. Of particular import are his comments relating to the desire to expand the rights of educational institutions and local Soviets in the republics with respect to the improvement of the teaching of national

culture, the history of the people and the national language.

Yagodin's proposal also addresses the reorganization of management of public education. Yagodin's proposal includes four major reforms at the national level;

1) a system of joint state and public administration of public education,

2) a congress elected by the people which would be the supreme public body of the administration of public education and a Council on Public Education elected by the congress. The Council would be comprised exclusively of representives of pedagogical circles,

3) a radical redistribution of the functions and powers of the central, regional, and local bodies of administration. The guiding principle in this redistribution is to be that an educational institution should decide all questions it can decide unaided. This change is intended to extend the rights and responsibilities of educational institutions and lead to the destruction of a uniform management structure and the formation of a flexible one, and

4) the State Committee would concentrate its activities on creating a strategy of development for public education, setting priorities and carrying out major social-pedagogical experiments.

Yagodin freely admits that not much has been accomplished in achieving these reforms.

Reforms at the republic and local level are also envisioned. At the republic level regional educational requirements with due regard for national requirements, local social and economic conditions and the national culture and historical differences are to be developed. Each republic will be responsible for determining the number of schools, and

their types. The administrative bodies will supply the educational system with financial, material and technical resources and personnel, coordinate the work of educational institutions, and organize the retraining of personnel and the improvement of their qualifications.

At the level of the individual institution the principle of interaction between society and state will be implemented through the activity of its council, composed of representives of teachers, students and the public. These councils will be empowered with extensive rights to organize the activity of schools and colleges. They will elect the heads of the institutions, receive reports from the heads, assess the qualifications of teachers, coordinate the institution's funds and supervise management. The council is to work out the social order for the institution and supervise its achievement. The council is to organize a collective search for solutions to various problems and assist management in implementing the solutions. The institutional head will be personally responsible for for the results. This responsibility will require that the head have a veto power for decisions made by the council.

The management of the educational system is to be based on new principles: helping instead of restricting, guiding instead of prohibiting, directing instead of commanding. The need for the creation of economic, legal, and organizational mechanisms which ensure the priority of development and improvement of these goals is recognized (Yagodin, 1989).

Thus, the reform efforts in the Soviet Union appear to be also suffering from a lack of coordination and the understanding that improvement of public schools must be closely coordinated with changes in teacher preparation. Leaders of educational reform in the Soviet Union,

as well as within the United States, do not seem to realize the amount of time necessary to design, plan, coordinate, implement and evaluate change efforts. Particularly, when the magnitude of the changes being contemplated represent such radical departures from previous ways of doing business, the time period allowed for the changes to demonstrate results must be of a correlated magnitude.

Outcome Criteria

The reform efforts of both the United States and the Soviet Union suffer from a lack of clearly specified outcome criteria to assess the success of programmatic changes. The lack of clearly specified outcome criteria is linked to a major flaw of reform attempts, the lack of clearly articulated, focused and prioritized goals. Without goals that are clear, accepted and focused, there can be no meaningful system of assessment to determine if the changes implemented are achieving their objectives. The lack of clearly focused reform goals has been a hallmark of most previous reform movements (Dalin, 1978).

There is one outcome factor common to both the United States and the Soviet Union. This is not allowing sufficient time for educational changes to be implemented for a sufficient duration to demonstrate results. Educational change takes time, most often much longer than reform leaders believe or are willing to allow (Dalin, 1978; Fullan, 1982). The more profound the change, generally the longer the time required to produce results. This is the case in both the Soviet Union and the United States. Each is attempting reform of substantial elements of the structure of education. However, neither has allowed sufficient time for these changes to be planned and implemented for a sufficient length of

time to demonstrate results.

In the United States, the most frequent method of assessing reform change effectiveness is through the widespread use of group achievement tests. These are not tests which have been developed according to the goals of the reform effort. The lack of clear reform goals prevents their development. They are the same tests which have been used to gauge student progress over the past 20 or more years. Thus, these tests, inappropriate as they might be for assessing reform efforts, are analyzed yearly to see if they indicate improvement on the part of students. There have been only seven years since the publication of A Nation at Risk, the start of the latest reform effort in the United States. Allowing two years for this report and its companions to have initiated reform policy changes, there have been only five years for implementation of reform practices. That provides a very short time for retraining of teachers and the eventual demonstration by students of the results of any modified practices on the part of their teachers. Even if the reform movement had been without serious flaws, which it is not, it is to soon by ten years to be able to assess its success. Yet, in the United States, we are already hearing that the reform effort is not producing sufficient results quickly enough.

The Soviet Union faces a double problem with respect to assessing reform outcomes. The first problem is the lack of a clearly articulated set of reform goals. The second is that there does not exist a systematic method for assessing the results of reform based program modifications. There does not exist a Theory of Individual Differences within the Soviet Union upon which any national or republic based assessment of student performance can be based. The lack of such a theory is embedded in Soviet philosophical approaches to education. The lack of such assessment

procedures greatly handicaps assessment of progress or change success. Without a national or republic based assessment program, judgment of change effectiveness must be more subjective, and thus, open to varying opinions. The opportunity for different political interpretations is greatly enhanced.

Reform of Personnel Preparation

Both the United States and the Soviet Union have recognized the need for reform of teacher preparation programs. This is a necessary component of any educational reform attempt that demands improvements in student learning. However, both countries suffer from the same problems with respect to changes in personnel preparation. Neither has attempted to coordinate changes in public education with those that must occur in personnel preparation. This is, perhaps, the single greatest flaw of teacher preparation reform efforts.

In the United states, reform of teacher preparation goes on practically independent of efforts to reform public education. Recent recognition and emergence of the need to reform educational administrator training programs is occurring without reference to reform efforts of either public or teacher education. This lack of communication and coordination among these three areas of reform is a severe detriment to achieving effective, long term improvement of educational policies and practices.

Within teacher education reform efforts, there is a lack of consensus about which areas of preparation need change and improvement, which areas of preparation should be deleted, and which should be strengthened. Over all professional attempts to improve personnel

preparation there looms the twin specters of political oversight and reduced funding for improvement efforts. It seems sure that we will not increase the length of teacher preparation programs because of reasons that are both ludicrous and obscure.

In the Soviet Union, it is clearly recognized that reform of university programs, including teacher preparation, must occur (Yagodin, 1989). However, as in the United states, there is a lack of coordination among efforts to improve public and teacher education. This lack is further complicated by two additional factors. First, the Soviet Union provides two routes to becoming a teacher; through a university based program or through a pedagogical institute. The need to coordinate changes within each of these two types of institutions, each with its history, traditions and constituencies, increases dramatically the difficulties of coordination. The second factor is the lack of pre-service training programs for educational administrators. Principals are posted to a position on the basis of their teaching effectiveness, party affiliation, and perhaps other factors. After being assigned as a principal they may receive six weeks of part-time training. In view of the research demonstrating the pivotal role played by principals in implementing and assuring educational change programs, this lack of training at either a pre-or in-service level is a glaring flaw.

Assessment of Reform Efforts

Soviet Union

The reform of the Soviet educational system is a vital component of achieving other major reforms of Soviet life, but it has not received a high priority for the resources necessary to bring about the changes

desired. It appears to have received a high priority only in terms of rhetoric. Of course, the short term need to provide housing, etc., may have eclipsed the longer term investment of resources necessary to achieve educational reform. The successful achievement of the four major components of Gorbachev's reform agenda, economic reconstruction, political revitalization, and the modernization of foreign and military policy (Isaacson, 1989) are in the long-term dependent upon reform of the educational system. Gorbachev himself, at a Communist Party meeting in the summer of 1988, emphasized that the success of perestroika would depend on "high standards of education, scientific research, general culture, and proficiency on the job" (Legras, 1988). The blueprint for reform of the educational system as laid out by Yagodin is an ambitious and far-reaching program. However, it would take an all-out effort to institute these reforms of education, and to be successful, would take years to implement and evaluate. One estimate by Abel Aganbegyan, Mr. Gorbachev's economic mentor, and one of the brains behind perestroka , is that it will take 20-30 years to transform the Soviet Union (Franklin, 1988).

Educational reform is recognized as critical to the success of perestroika but faced with the economic crises, the rising sense of nationalism, and growing social discontent, the pace of educational reform is exceedingly slow. Yagodin has told the Soviet Committee on Science, Education and Culture that," if our public consciousness does not fully realize the top priority of education, our loss compared with the West will grow further" (Legras, 1989a). He also declared in a monthly journal article that the Soviet Union's current (economic) difficulties can be traced to a severe deficit in education and culture (Legras, 1989a).

Evidence for implementing the educational reforms is mixed. On the one hand, some steps have been made in allowing institutions, faculty members and students more independence and flexibility. Student participation in university decision making has increased and they now serve on many university committees. As might be expected, many faculty members are not totally in favor of students being given equal voice on local education councils, and they question whether the best student representives are being elected. Groups such as Association of Teachers of Higher Education Establishments, formed in 1989, to address faculty overload have been formed. The workload for each faculty member is 600 hours of lectures per academic year, plus the completion of at least one research report However, in spite of these modest but significant reforms, evidence of significant support for educational reform is difficult to find. Yagodin has indicated that his ministry needed close to 20-per cent more than the $68 billion in government funds that it is scheduled to receive in 1990. This contrasts with a budget of $50.5 billion in 1987 and $55.5 billion in 1988. Higher education received $6.7 billion and & $7.5 billion for these years, respectively (Legras, 1989b). The exchange rate for these figures was based on $1.60 to the ruble. This exchange rate has since changed with the devaluation of the ruble.

Key educators have called the education budget a disaster. Education's share of the 1990 budget increased only .5 per cent from the preceding year. Significant increases in funds for health, housing and the production of consumer goods were provided. The budget for these areas rose about 10.7 per cent for 1990.

Educators say that a major problem in reform is a pattern of inertia

that can be traced to the era of the Communist Party leader Leonid Brezhnev-the so-called "period of stagnation" from the mid-1960's to the early 1980's, when bureaucrats always waited for their superiors to tell them what to do and took little initiative. There is much evidence of this attitude and behaviors still operating in the Soviet Union. Many decisions are delayed and many questions are still referred to Moscow for a decision (Legras, 1989a).

One member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences has said that the Gorbachev reforms "have not been supported economically or politically." The scientist, who asked to remain anonymous, added that Soviet universities "do not know what to do with the freedoms they have already received." Other comments of a similar nature have come from such persons as a member of the Politburo and secretary of the party's Central Committee. According to this official, the nation's economic progress depended on serious change in the educational system and that the pace and extent of recent educational reforms were unsatisfactory (Legras, 1989a).

The Soviet Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, which is responsible for teacher education, has come under significant criticism in the past two years. In Spring, 1989, the Communist Party newspaper Pravada accused the academy of "stagnation, inertia, and being out of touch with reality and the needs of the teaching body." This theme is consistent with that of Yagodin who has stated that the problem of the pace and extent of the change lies with the universities who have been advised to do what they think is best, without asking the State Committee's permission. Fleix Peregudov, Vice Chairman of the State Committee, indicated that "higher education establishments have been given many rights. It is time

they were used instead of waiting for instructions from above" (Legras, 1989a)

The conclusions seem clear. The success of perestroika is perceived as dependent to a significant extent upon education and educational reform. The reform measures of education are not perceived to be proceeding quickly enough or successfully enough. The political leaders blame the educators, the educators blame the political leaders and the lack of an adequate budget. Sounds suspiciously like America.

The reforms envisioned in the Soviet Union amount to one of the most wide scale reform agendas ever attempted. The complete reversal of a political dogma enforced for 70 years, with all of the psychological and social upheaval that such repeals entail, a completely new economic structure, a social reconstruction of unparalleled scale, a totally new program of foreign and military policies, is each dependent upon significant reform of the educational system, which is not achieving its goals. It is a classic example of what a lack of knowledge and application of social and educational change processes to reform efforts produce, increased stagnation. If success of Gorbachev's reform agenda is dependent upon educational reform, then the conclusion has to be that his reform efforts will fail. To the extent that educational reform has a mutually dependent relationship with political, economic and social reform issues, efforts and successes, the Soviet reform leaders have neglected the educational dimension that must drive successful achievement of these other areas of reform. Further exacerbating this reform drive is the unrealistic time frame Gorbachev has imposed on achieving significant gains. It is important for the leaders of reform to understand the mutually dependent context and relationships which exist

among these various dimensions of life. To date, without an experience base in reform in these areas, Soviet leaders have not evidenced the behavior which would lead an observer to conclude that the direction, pace, intensity, processes or goals of the reform efforts are under control.

Reform in the Soviet Union has to be considered, at the current time, a failure. The causes of this failure are to be found in the monumental extent of the changes attempted, the lack of knowledge about change processes, the lack of a synchronized system for coordinating changes among and within the political, economic, social and educational systems, and the unrealistic time frame allowed for the results of reform to manifest themselves.

United States

Educational reform in the United States is not faring much better. Although the final results are not in, the trend seems clear. Educational reform in the United States is not achieving the results desired. Kelly (1985) has indicated the current reports for reform provide little consensus about what is needed to improve the schools and that there is little consistency among the proposals for change. Peterson (1983) detailed the reasons that several of the national reports were flawed in their recommendations for reform and concluded that these commission reports had limited value. Passow (1984) concluded that many, if not most, of the recommendations accompanying the reform reports are simplistic, conservative, and unrealistic. Further, Dodd (1984) concluded that the current reform recommendations were patchwork and unlikely to bring about fundamental educational reform.

Miles (1967) and Dalin (1978) have both described educational

reform efforts as lacking consistent, specific and clearly articulated goals which they perceive as a necessary condition for achieving successful educational change. Kantor (1987) has argued for treating the (reform) issues which will make a difference in the classroom. He asks the question, "to what extent have school reform proposals actually moved beyond political expedience and platitudes to take into consideration the actual conditions under which teachers work?" (p 179). Mitchell and Gallagher (1987) echo this concern when they argue that the current reform efforts are centered around the issue of who will control the schools. These authors suggest that the early reforms of the 1900s were an effort to adopt business and industrial values and practices indiscriminately which were applied with little consideration of the educational values, purposes or consequences for children. Callahan (1962) demonstrated that this application of business values was not to provide the best product but to keep down the cost of education. Today's current educational reform attempts are another example of a similar effort with the interests of children as inconsequential today as they were in the early 1900s.

A number of authors have concluded that current educational reform attempts have not learned from these previous reform efforts, that they are seriously flawed and will not achieve their goals. Leiberman (1977), almost a decade and a half ago, made the observation that the more about schools that is discovered, the clearer it becomes that improvements must be initiated, nurtured and supported at the local level. However, he found that the the reform efforts of the 1970s centered around, "mandating specifics, linear procedures that tie money and support to precise objectives and their outcomes" (p. 265). This process of reform in

the 1970s set in motion the form of reform that is currently being utilized.

Albrecht (1984) concluded that A Nation At Risk contained within the seeds of immense mischief. Dodd (1984) concluded that none of the avalanche of proposals to fix the public schools confronted the basic issue that schools were expected to accomplish so many tasks at once that they could do no single job very well for very long and that the current efforts to patch the present system were not likely to bring about fundamental reform. A number of authors have questioned the validity of the national reports' perception of educational quality in America (Graham, 1984; Hacker, 1984; Peterson, 1983). Peterson, in particular, has provided an insightful critique of these reform reports. He concluded that the current reform efforts offer little more than rhetoric instead of substantive answers to education's problems. Cornbleth (Cornbleth, 1986) concluded that the reform reports omitted consideration of serious and critical issues of reform including, "the purposes of public schooling . . . the processes of teaching and learning, and the possibility of organizational or structural changes to improve schooling" (p. 6). Many educational reforms that did target changing the basic organizational and administrative structures and practices of education have met with little success (Cuban, 1988). The common conclusion from these reports is that past educational reform efforts have had little effect on teaching and learning in the classroom (Elmore and McLaughlin, 1988) and that current efforts will not enjoy any more success.

Conclusions

Educational reform has been a fixture of both the Soviet Union and the United States for the past two hundred years. The last five years has seen another surge of a continuing wave of attempts to reduce the disparity between societal expectations and educational outcomes. This latest surge in both countries was fueled by failures in the economic arena. Education was looked to as the prime social mechanism to resolve the economic problems. Despite the differences in political, social and economic conditions of both countries, there is one remarkable similarity between the processes used in each country to effect reform of education. This similarity is most notable for its lack of observing fundamental principles and processes for achieving successful educational change. At the current time, under the procedures presently being followed, it can only be concluded that educational reform in each country will achieve a similar result, failure.

CHAPTER6
SUMMARYANDCONCLUSIONS

There seems little doubt that education has developed in different ways in the countries reviewed. The results and outcomes of these vastly different developmental approaches also differ substantially. However, there appear to be several dimensions which are key indicators of whether the approach chosen will bring about the results desired. These are partially related to the seven proposed by Cramer and Browne (1965). The seven they proposed are:

1- sense of national unity,
2- general economic situation,
3- basic beliefs and traditions, including religious and cultural heritage,
4- status of progressive educational thought,
5- language problems,
6- political background: e.g. communism, fascism, democracy, and
7- attitude toward international cooperation and understanding.

In the review of the successful and unsuccessful change efforts presented only three of these appeared to be related to whether a particular country's efforts at educational reform and improvement were successful. These three are: (1) sense of national unity, (2) general economic situation, and (3) basic beliefs and traditions, including religious and cultural heritage. However, none of these by themselves

seems to be sufficient to predict whether an educational change effort will be successful. In some situations, it appears any one of them can act as a catalyst for educational reform, but by itself is not sufficient to sustain or achieve the goals desired. What does seem clear is that, acting in concert with other dimensions of social-political-economic activity, these factors interact in a complex manner to initiate, drive, and sustain efforts to bring about the educational reform goals desired. These factors are discussed next, followed by a discussion of the ways they appear to interact with each other and with other dimensions of social-political-economic life.

General Economic Situation

A poor economic condition is probably the single best indicator of a coming educational reform. Although other situations in the social sphere may trigger attempts to reform various aspects of the educational enterprise, e.g., the social reform wave of the United States in the 1960s, poor economic conditions seems to be the plight most likely to lead to broad spectrum educational reform efforts. This condition does not, however, appear to be sufficient to sustain the effort, or to lead to successful achievement of the goals desired.

In Japan, it was a recognition of the economic condition likely to occur following the post Second World War period that led to the reform of the educational conditions laid down by the occupation forces. Without the specter of economic collapse in this period, it is mere speculation whether the educational reform efforts at that time would have been accepted or implemented with the cooperation of the populace.

The educational reform efforts in both the Soviet Union and the

United States in the past decade were also triggered by falling economic conditions. In the Soviet Union, the economic condition led to a collapse of the entire social-political-economic spectrum. The goals of educational reform as described by Yagodin in 1989 were to late to reverse, or even to an have an effect on, the failures of the larger social-political-economic spheres.

There is also little doubt that the economic condition of the United States was the driving force of the educational reform movement of the 1980s. The final results of this movement have not yet been recorded but it appears the goals of this effort are not to be realized. The failures of this effort are to be seen in the web of interactions this effort had with the factors to be discussed below, and the lack of reform strategists to understand and implement fundamental principles of educational change.

Sense of National Unity

In each of the three successful educational change countries, a sense of national unity and purpose seemed to prevail and permeate the efforts to improve the educational condition so as to achieve higher social, political, or economic goals. This is perhaps best seen in Japan. There, a national sense of pride and commitment to achieving a belief that Japan was destined to play a leadership role within the world community dominated its efforts to succeed. At the same time, in order to achieve this vision, individuals were willing to subordinate their individual wishes to the larger national goal.

This sense of national commitment was not seen in either the Soviet Union or the United States. In neither country was there evidenced a willingness to subordinate individual, corporate, or ethnic goals to a

larger national vision and belief in education's capability to achieve such a vision. This failure appeared related in the United States to three independent factors, but which combined had a cumulative effect to deny the achievement of the reform goals. These factors were: (1) the lack of clarity about the goals of the reform effort, and/or (2) a lack of confidence in education, and/or (3) a lack of appropriately designed and implemented education change strategies. Each of these possible explanations will be discussed in more detail in a later section. In the Soviet Union, it appeared that the latter two explanations, interacting with more complex social and political factors were the primary causes of the failure of educational reform.

Basic Beliefs and Traditions

One of the most stable and necessary conditions for the achievement of educational change/reform goals is a history and tradition of education as a mechanism for maintaining and enhancing the cultural beliefs of a society. This is most easily achieved in a mono-cultural society. For example, in Japan and Kenya, the goals of educational reform were achieved. Each has primarily a mono-cultural society. On the other hand, in both the Soviet Union and the United States, each with a poly-cultural society, the goals of educational reform were not achieved. This factor is brought into even sharper focus when a republic of the Soviet Union is contrasted with a state in the United States. Many of the republics of the Soviet Union are predominantly mono-cultural. For example, the Republic of Georgia is composed of over 73% Georgians. The Republic is also predominantly mono-religious, with the Georgian Orthodox Church vastly out numbering the total of other religions. The Georgian Republic has a

history of civilization and education dating back to the time of Christ. Its current efforts to reform its educational system are based on this history and tradition which provide it a sense of national unity and purpose, along with a sense of mission and stability.

On the other hand, in the United States, any given state is composed of many different ethnic, religious, cultural, and local beliefs and traditions. There is not a common tradition concerning the purposes and goals of education. Thus, there is not the stabilizing beliefs and cultural history that tends to provide a unifying force around which the reform efforts can focus.

In addition to the independent effects each of these three factors has on educational change efforts, their interactive effects must also be accounted for if an understanding of their cumulative effects are to be understood. For example, a sense of national unity is certainly related to the history, beliefs, and traditions of a country. In a society which has a mono-cultural base, the sense of national unity will be easier to ignite and maintain than a society which is poly-cultural in nature. It appears that the chances of a successful, nationally focused educational change effort is reduced by the complexity of the cultural backgrounds of its constituents. Likewise, the interaction of the economic condition of a country and the degree of national unity is to a significant extent dependent upon which segment(s) of the society are affected by an economic down-turn. In concert, the values, beliefs, and traditions of the groups affected and non-affected by the down-turn will substantially influence the urgency and commitment to achieving the goals of a particular educational change movement. We submit that it is understanding the interactive nature of these variables which is most

important in understanding and predicting the fate of any large scale educational reform effort.

We did not find that the remaining four of Cramer and Browne's seven factors substantially influenced the success of an educational change attempt. These four factors, status of progressive educational thought, language problems, political background: e.g. communism, fascism, democracy, and attitude toward international cooperation and understanding added little to predicting whether a given educational reform or change would be successful. For example, a more fundamental aspect of the status of progressive educational thought appeared to be more a function of a realistic appraisal of a country's needs and developing programs to meet this need than how progressive in philosophy or technology the country was considered. We would suggest that "realistic appraisal and program development" be substituted for "status of progressive educational thought," Likewise, language problems appeared to be a major problem in past educational reforms in the Soviet Union. However, in Malaysia, although with far fewer languages to contend with than in the Soviet Union, a successful effort was achieved which incorporated three different languages. It is probably a valid statement that the question of languages must be addressed in any national educational reform or change effort. However, if addressed in a timely and realistic fashion, it does not have to pose a serious threat to the success of the change attempt.

Educational Change Variables

Dalin (1978) suggested it is possible to study and understand the processes of educational change independent of the content associated

with any particular change effort. We agree with this premise and in this section address the principles of educational change associated with successful and unsuccessful change efforts as evidenced in the five countries of our review.

Principles of Change

1. There must be clarity and acceptance of the reform goals. This appeared to be a particularly significant principle. The goal of the reform has to be clear, unambiguous, and accepted by the public and the practitioners of education. Without both goal clarity and acceptance there is likely to be little commitment to working towards the reform goals.

2. Sufficient time must be allowed for the changes to be instituted and for results to be demonstrated. Without adequate time, the chances of successful results to be achieved are significantly lessened. This may involve a period of years. This is a particularly difficult principle to implement when there is (1) pressure to achieve goals quickly and/or (2) when there is change-over in the political and decision-making leadership.

3. Successful educational change is more likely when the community (national, state, republic) concerned with the change is mono-cultural, and to some extent mono-language. The more diverse the community in terms of ethnic mix, language, political affiliations, etc., the more difficult it is to achieve consensus on the goals, methods, and time limits for the change.

4. Successful educational change is more likely when the nature of

the change is considered by the public to meet their needs, particularly their economic ones. The closer the nature of the change conforms to the expectations of the society's desires, the more probable the acceptance of the change. This does not mean that the change will achieve the desires, but only that the change initiation will be more readily accepted.

5. The events that tend to trigger educational change efforts are not those that will sustain them. For example, unstable social conditions and economic difficulties are likely to trigger educational change efforts. However, stable social and economic conditions are more likely to allow educational changes to be institutionalized. Thus, the management of the change process is critical and must be synchronized with the changing social and economic conditions.

6. Stable political oversight of the change effort is a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for success. The political leadership, at what ever level the change is attempted, must remain stable. A turn-over in the political leadership generally signals interference with whatever educational plan is current. Thus, stable political leadership over time is a necessary condition for allowing the time necessary for the change plan to be implemented and evaluated.

7. Adequate resources are a necessary prerequisite for instituting the change plan. Without assurance of the resources to implement teacher and administrator training, developing the instructional materials, proving the technology necessary, etc., it is best not to implement the change because it is almost bound to fall short of expectations.

8. There should be a plan for the change. Although the plan does not have to spell out each detail of the change, it should certainly provide sufficient information to let the public and educators know the goals of the change, the costs, who will benefit and how, how much the educators will have to change, what the time frame is for the change, and how the results will be evaluated.

9. The political ideology of a country does not seem to be related to the success of an educational change effort. Of much more importance are the general social, economic and political conditions.

The above principals of change can be difficult to implement. For example, the stability of the political leadership and the state of the economy are not not under the control of educators. It seems to be a valid conclusion that educational change and reform efforts are more likely under severe conditions of political, social, or economic stress. It is these very conditions, however, that make sustained and successful educational change most difficult to achieve. Educators must make more concerted efforts to form allegiances with the political and societal leadership to provide themselves increased autonomy for instituting educational changes. As long as initiation of educational change is controlled more by forces external to the education profession, the more unlikely it is that educational change efforts will be successful.

REFERENCES

Albrecht, J. (1984). A nation at risk: another view. Phi Delta Kappan. 65(10), 684-685.

Aso, M., & Amano, I. (1972). Education and Japan's Modernization. Japan: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Bailyn, B. (1961). Education in the Forming of American Society. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Beauchamp, E. R. (Ed.). (1978). Learning to Be Japanese: Selected Readings on Japanese Society and Education. Hamden, Conn.: Linnet Books.

Beauchamp, E. R., & Rubinger, R. (1989). Education in Japan: A Source Book. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Bedlington, S. (1978). Malaysia and Singapore: The building of new states. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Bruner, J. (1983). Thoughts on school reform. In Bossone, R. and Polishook, I. (Eds.). School reform and related issues. New York: The Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York.

Bunge, F. (Ed.). (1985). Malaysia: A country study. Washington: National Department of Education (Studies).

Callahan, R. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coombs, P. (1985). The world crisis in education. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cornbleth, C. (1986). Ritual and rationality in teacher education reform. Educational Researcher. April, 5-14.

Corrigan, D. (1986). Agenda for educational reform. Prepared for the College of Education Fall Faculty Meeting, Texas A & M University.

Cramer, J. F., & Browne, G. S. (1965). Contemporary Education: A Comparative Study of National Systems. New York: Harcourt Brace and World, Inc.

Cuban, L. (1988). You're on the right track, David. Phi Delta Kappan. 69(8), 571-572.

Cubberly, E. (1934). Public education in the United states. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Dalin, P. (1978). Limits of educational change. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Dodd, A. (1984). A new design for public education. Phi Delta Kappan. 65 (10) 690-693.

Dujmovic, N. (1989). Finally-Soviets admit socialist life is harder. The Christian Science Monitor, (Monday, June 19), 19.

Elmore, R., & Mclaughlin, M. (1988). Steady work: policy, practice, and the reform of American education. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Eshiwani, G. (1981). Educational research and evaluation in Kenya. Paper presented to Educational Research Seminar, University of Botswana.

Eshiwani, G. (1985). Kenya: a system of education. In Husen, T. & Postlethwaite, T. (Eds.). International Encyclopedia of education: Research and Studies. New York: Pergamon Press.

Fine, J. (1974). The financial crisis in Kenya education: some perspectives on policy. Kenya Education Review. 1(3): 47-52.

Franklin, D. (1988). The Soviet economy. The Economist, (April 9), 3-10.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Graham, P. (1984). Schools: cacophony about practice, silence about purpose. Daedalus. 113(4), 29-57.

Hacker, A. (1984). The schools flunk out. The New York Review of Books. 31(6), 35-40.

Honbu, S. S. t. (1973). Seikai Seinen Ishiki Chosa Hokokusho (International Youth Survey). Tokyo: Okurasho Insatsukyoku.

Isaacson, W. (1989). A long mighty struggle. Time, (April 10), 49-59.

Gerhart, G. (1974). The Russian's world: life and language . New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Jencks, C. (1972). Inequality. New York: Basis Books.

Kaestle, C. (1983). Pillars of the republic: common schools in American society, 1780-1860. New York: Hill and Wang.

Kantor, K. (1987). Teaching writing since Darmouth: broadening the context. English Education. 19(3), 171-180.

Katz, M. (1968). The irony of early school reform: educational innovation in mid-nineteenth century Massachusetts. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Katz, M. (1975). Twentieth century school reform: notes toward a history. Class, bureaucracy, and schools. New York: Praeger.

Kearns, D. (1988). An educational recovery plan for America. Phi Delta Kappan. 69(8), 565-570.

Kelly, G. (1985). Setting the boundaries of debate about education. Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books.

Kirst, M. (1988). Who should control our schools: reassessing current policies. Stanford, CA: Center for Educational Research at Stanford, School of Education, Stanford University.

Legras, P. (1988). Shakeup in Soviet Union seen accelerating pace of educational reforms. The Chronicle of Higher Education, (October 12), A1, A40.

Legras, P. (1989a). Plan to reform Soviet higher education said to produce uneven results in year. The Chronicle of Higher Education, (March 29), A35-A37.

Legras, P. (1989b). Soviet Union gives to little emphasis to education under "perestroika" academics there maintain. The Chronicle of Higher Education, (November 1), A41-44.

Lieberman, A. (1977). Political economic stress and the social reality of schools. Teachers College Record, 79(2), 259-266.

Malaysia, A Country Study, DS592, M345 1985

Mandelbaum, M. (1990). The trouble with independence. Time, (January 29), 33.

McCall, J. (1988). The provident principal. Chapel Hill, NC: Institute of Government, University of North Carolina.

Miles, M. (1967). Some properties of schools as social systems. Washington, D.C.: Co-operative Project for Educational Development, National Training Laboratories. National Educational Association.,

Mitchell, B., & Gallagher, K. (1987). The latest reform binge: quality in school governance and administration Planning and Changing, 18(3), 131-141.

Narita, K. (1978). Systems of Higher Education: Japan. New York: International Council for Educational Development.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: the imperative for educational reform. Washington: U. S. Department of Education.

Olela, H. (1985). Republic of Kenya. In Knowles, A. (Ed.). International Encyclopedia of Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Passin, H. (1965). Society and Education in Japan. New York: Columbia University.

Passow, H. (1984). Tackling the reform reports of the 1980s. Phi Delta Kappan. 65(10). 674-683.

Peck, R. D. (1991). Joint Ventures: Japanese-American Educational Partnerships. Change (March/April), 47-50.

Pempel, T. J. (1978). Patterns of Japanese Policymaking: Experiences from Higher Education. Boulder: Westview Press.

Peterson, P. (1983). Did the education commissions say anything? The Brookings Review, 2(2), 3-11.

Popkewitz, T. (1982): The social/moral basis of occupational life: teacher education in the Soviet Union. Journal of Teacher Education, XXXIII(3), 38-44.

Postlethwaike, T. (Ed.). 1988). The encyclopedia of comparative education and national systems of education. Elmsford, N.Y. Pergamon Press.

Ravitch, D. (1983). The troubled crusade: American education 1945-1980. New York: Basic Books.

Reilly, D., & Girst, T. (1988). The current status of educational improvement: curricula, standards and quality control. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Sifuna, d. (1988). Kenya. In Kurian, G. (Ed.). World Education Encyclopedia. New York: Facts on File Publishers.

Snodgrass, D. (1980). Inequality and Economic Development in Malaysia. New York: Oxford University Press.

Timan, T., & Kirp, D. (1989). Education reform in the 1980's: lessons from the states. Phi Delta Kappan. 70(7), 504-511.

Thomas, R. M. (Ed.). (1968). Strategies for Curriculum Change: Cases from 13 Nations. Scranton:International Textbook Co.

Tyack, D. (1984). One best system. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yagodin, G. (1989). Towards higher standards in education through its humanization and democratization. Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Publishing House.

Watson, K. (1984). External and internal obstacles to educational development. In Watson, K. (Ed.) Dependence and interdependence in education: international perspectives. London. Croom Helm

White, M. (1987). The Japanese Educational Challenge: A Commitment to Children. New York: Free Press.