

***Bibliothèque
et Archives
nationales***

Québec



Le présent fichier est une publication en ligne reçue en dépôt légal, convertie en format PDF et archivée par Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec. L'information contenue dans le fichier peut donc être périmée et certains liens externes peuvent être inactifs.

Version visionnée sur le site Internet d'origine le 12 août 2013

Section du dépôt légal

mcgill Journal of education

SCHOOLING

EDUCATION AND

Editorial	121	M.G.
<i>Into the Mainstream Life or Did I Grow Up Absurd?</i>	123	E. F. Beane
<i>Schooling and the Privatization of Experience</i>	129	Charles A. Tesconi, Jr.
<i>"Allo McGill, vous parlez français?"</i>	140	Jean-Philippe Aubert
<i>Sputnik in American Education</i>	143	Jeffrey Herold
<i>School Spaces</i>	165	Derek Drummond
<i>Education and Schooling: What's the Difference?</i>	173	W. Kenneth Richmond
<i>Missionaries as Educators</i>	187	George Johnston
<i>Collective Education in the Kibbutz</i>	193	Yvonne Katz
<i>Schooling for Peace and International Understanding</i>	201	Douglas Ray
<i>Critical Thinking as an Objective for Public Schools</i>	206	John W. Friesen
<i>The Teaching of Social Foundations</i>	214	Donald S. Seckinger
<i>From Formal Class to Community</i>	224	Gabrielle Pascal
<i>The Unit Box Approach</i>	228	Mitchell E. Batoff
Reviews	242	Bruneau, Hearsey, Calam, et al.
Index — Vols. VII & VIII	254	

**McGill Journal of Education
Editorial Board**

Editor	Margaret Gillett
Managing Editor	Ronald H. Tali
Member	Réal G. Boulianne
Member	Justine Harris
Member	Peter C. Landry
Member	Martin J. O'Hara
Review Editor	Nancy Carlman
Member (ex-officio)	C. Wayne Hall
Circulation	Martha Tetreault



The McGill Journal of Education is published twice a year, in the Spring and Fall. Subscription rates, post paid: 3 years - \$5.00; 2 years - \$4.00; 1 year - \$3.00. Single copies - \$2.00.

Subscriptions, payable to the McGill Journal of Education, should be sent to 3700 McTavish Street, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 1Y2. Phone: 514-392-8843.

The M.J.E. is indexed by the Canadian Education Index and Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). It is listed in Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory, abstracted by Sociology of Education Abstracts, and is available on microfilm from University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan. International Standard Serial No.: CN ISSN 0024-9033.

©Faculty of Education, McGill University.

Editorial

Education and Schooling

This issue of the *Journal* tackles a basic question faced by teachers, parents and students: "Is schooling educative?" While this is a perennial question, it has been highlighted in recent years by the writings and ragings of Ivan Illich, Everet Reimer, Colin Greer, Christopher Jencks and members of the de-schooling school of thought. With the publication in 1966 of James S. Coleman et al., *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, which is better known as "The Coleman Report" and which was the result of a comprehensive study of American youth commissioned by the United States Government, the answer seemed clear: Not schools but families make the significant difference in children's future income, success, social mobility. The great myth of the school as agent of true democracy and effective social escalator was exposed. Meanwhile, a legion of other critics, such as Paul Goodman and Jonathan Kozol, had criticized the schools as being anti-humane, anti-intellectual, anti-social. In the awful institutional vacuum all this condemnation created, alternative forms of education were sought in varied, imaginative and often improbable places.

However, some of the delight, freshness and fervor of the alternative movement has faded. Some of its assumptions have been subjected to scrutiny and found wanting; some of Coleman's findings have been seriously challenged (see, for example, Herbert J. Walberg and Sune Pinzur Rasher, "Public School Effectiveness and Equality: New Evidence and its Implications," *Phi Delta Kappan*, September 1974, pp. 3-9).

The contributors to this *Journal* are not ranged for or against the ideologues of de-schooling. They look at formal education from a number of perspectives and, while the following extracts suggest they are critical of past efforts, they tend to justify faith in the idea that schools *can* be worthwhile!

... school shelters an individual in the most negative of fashions by not giving young persons adequate preparation for life, often muddling their minds up in the process by giving them a mistaken idea of the priorities of life by means of which they can manoeuvre more effectively into and through this Brave New World of ours.

— E. F. Beane

... education, even in more or less formalized systems of schooling, need not be what it usually has been. We were created to be more than narrowly didactic, machine-like creatures in our classrooms. ...

— Donald S. Seckinger

The way Americans had thought about education in the past was no longer good enough. Pieties about the value of schooling to democracy without the necessary financial support would no longer do. ...

— Jeffrey Herold

Our first order of business should be aimed at recapturing the dream of creating an institution — public, universal and compulsory — whose major task is to bind and cement. We will probably come up with something quite different from what we have.

— Charles A. Tesconi

If readers of the *Journal* are not convinced that schools and education can be compatible, we challenge them to devise better forms of learning.

M. G.

E. F. Beane

Into the Mainstream Life or Did I Grow Up Absurd?

School is a Sheltered Environment. Of course it is not without its brutal and abusive aspects, and there is more than enough literature on that score written in the last decade to attest to that. The point, however, I wish to make is that school shelters an individual in the most negative of fashions by not giving young persons adequate preparation for life, often muddling their minds up in the process by giving them a mistaken idea of the priorities of life by means of which they can manoeuvre more effectively into and through this Brave New World of ours. This realization comes upon a body quite cataclysmically and, I feel, far too often catastrophically, when the young person makes his departure out the quasi-womb precincts of the school environment into what is called "The World" and what I, in this account, shall refer to as "Mainstream Life."

To flesh things out a bit, let me provide you with a few details about my background (to place myself into a historical context). I, the maker of all the bold claims of the previous paragraph, am part of the Post War Baby Boom. As was the case with post war babies, the whole lot of us or a considerable majority of us, once hitting age five, for Protestants, and six for Catholics (I was, as you've guessed by now, injected into Quebec's gloriously bi-religious and bilingual school system), were sent into public schools (elementary and secondary) after which those hangers-on of us either graduated, dropped out, or continued on, depending upon that subtle constellation of monetary resources, motivation, and just plain old intestinal fortitude. For my own part, I took a B.A. degree, and went on to take the one year teaching course at McGill, a line of study, to put it euphemistically, which I didn't complete. Floundering for a short while and using a summer to reorient

myself by working as a pot washer at a summer camp, I finally landed a job in a Meat Plant-cum-Emporium through a nepotistic connection — in short, the young man's father worked there and got him in. It is at this point in my life where I embarked upon one of the most important chapters of my education.



Now, by virtue of my position outside formal school I can actually bear down upon the crucial learning experiences or what I've termed educational chapters in my life:

The first, being the initial three years of primary school (excluding kindergarten) wherein I acquired the crucial skills of Reading, Riting and Rithmetic.

The second, came in my sixth grade when I was initiated into the whole business of doing projects and term papers.

The third, in my second year of university when I acquired the ability — which, with a varying degree of proficiency, allows me to relate seemingly remote bodies of knowledge — the old reconciliation of "the two cultures" trip.

The fourth, this one that I'm about to make all manner of grand advertisements concerning.

The importance of this last stage, I cannot stress strongly enough. Maybe, it derives its unique character from the fact that, on getting into this phase, I was twenty-three and about to set out upon my own and thus to become financially responsible for my actions. Nevertheless, I feel the act of facing some, just some, of the demands of the Mainstream Life, such as earning a living, keeping my appearance and my dwelling place in order, and seeking compensation for the stresses incurred at work, carried for me the greatest intensity and reality as a learning experience.

George Leonard, in what is to me one of the most positive and sanely visionary of books ever written about education, *Education and Ecstasy*, enunciates the terms of learning.

1. To learn is to change.
2. Learning involves interaction between the learner and his environment, and its effectiveness relates to the frequency, variety, and intensity of the interaction.

Interestingly enough, it was while doing the 9:00 - 5:00 shift that I came closer to experiencing the reality of these

two descriptions of learning than I ever had while attending school. Regardless of what level in formal school I found myself in, no matter what sort of subject matter I was dealing with, from the most appealing — such as biology, psychology, or literature — to the least appealing — mathematics — I never got as clear cut a notion of a progression, an evolution, a change, as Leonard puts it, as I did when I found myself working full time. At no time either did I ever develop a perspective about what learning was, that is, an awareness that the myriad schooling activities with which I was engaged, constituted a process called learning though, God knows, I could give you definitions along with the best of them.

Something had been missing all along in the schooling experience that prevented me from making these perceptions which, interestingly enough, were present in the working situation. That something, I now conclude, was a combination of a definite awareness of a Payoff (as bluntly as I can put it, there was money riding on whatever you did) and, that long delayed or perhaps, avoided, marriage of cause to effect, the connection between information acquired and the Observable Repercussion it had upon the environment. I think, in the end, for the purposes of making learning a Meaningful, Rich, and Real Experience, this second point is of paramount importance. Given the relative simplicity of the tasks that cropped up in the course of doing my job, I could finally see how the faculties of the mind could be used to do something that would have a concrete effect. For instance, one often had to reflect a few moments and formulate a strategy concerning how to place the incoming stock in such a way as to satisfy two conditions: The principle of stock rotation and the utilization of minimum space. Often, in the process of moving this incoming stock from the receiving dock into the store, one would be faced with various obstacles in one's path — unused pallets (raft-like structures, usually made of wood, used to place stock upon), tree hooks often with a full load of meat hanging from them, flat trucks, all of which had to be moved out of the way, usually, with the attendant consideration of putting them in places where they would not unduly impede the work of others.

In relation to these problems there was the great demand made upon one's ability of concentration. One had to learn how to handle a knife, for instance, while putting up with the premeditatedly distracting behavior of fellow workers, bent upon your learning not how to handle a knife. And one had to satisfy the perpetual obligation to have left no loose ends around job-wise, so that your boss might give you hell for fiddling

with a knife when you should have been doing something more appropriate to what you were being paid for, such as packing pork chops or minced meat, or sweeping the floor, or any hundred other minute chores, all so indispensable and God awfully important as they put it, for the proper and smooth workings of the entire operation. Though many of these endeavors had an undeniable humdrum and trivial quality about them, the necessity to integrate these disparate activities into a smooth repertoire of behavior proved to be a Challenge, one to which I could see the Rhyme and Reason and one which gave me the opportunity to see thought undergoing an almost immediate translation into action.

This, I guess, could be considered the self-reinforcing side of learning behavior, the one so highly emphasized by Bruner and his colleagues when they contend that learning is intrinsically reinforcing. However, I cannot, in this context, minimize the importance of the "Payoff" function because that, if not the original Reality Principle behind the whole operation, was certainly a complementary agent to the Intrinsically Reinforcing side of the learning process. The importance of the payoff, to be understood fully, cannot be left at the stage of being considered merely as the carrot held dangling before the mule, but must be construed as engaging the young individual in another potentially rich and involving set of activities, that is, the circulation of monetary currency throughout society.

Thus, not only do you get a real Reward for work — not an Abstraction such as a gold star, or a percentage, or a better grade, or whatever the criterion of evaluation may be in a school situation, but is a reward that makes you feel all the more complete as a person, because you are now, an Economic Free Agent. In operational terms this means you are responsible to yourself for catering for your basic needs — food, shelter, clothing — as well as for your luxuries, the paraphernalia involved with hobbies, entertainment, and your long term projects be they the acquisition of a car, a super-deluxe stereo system, or the building of a financial empire in the best Carnegie, Rockefeller, Horatio Alger tradition.

I don't wish to turn this into a panegyric to the Almighty B**ck, but you've got to admit that these kinds of activities, with their marked purposive bent (maybe even warp), mean more to the average youngster in this our Brave New World than either pedagogical praise or reprimand. Consequently, it does the schooling system no honor to have kids — be they five, ten, or twenty-two — ignorant of a few basic facts, name-

ly that:

1. You need some kind of money to get by in this world.
2. That you need some sort of skill or ability to acquire this money, and by money I mean enough to make life liveable, because no body is going to throw open the doors of business or industry and welcome you therein with outstretched arms, just on account of your being you.
3. That in many respects, still, like it or not, as the song goes, "Oh baby, it's a wild world, it's hard to get by just upon a smile."

There are numerous people out there ready to take as much advantage of your young idealism, naiveté and talent as there are bacteria in a pile of dung, and they will try to do it however they can, whenever they can. This, this very point, is the catastrophe, and I'd say brutalizing part of the worldly, or mainstream life experience, the very thing which school does not prepare you for in the least either by inclining you to acquire a definite skill to help you get by, or by telling you in as frank and non-anxiety producing a fashion as can be, that you're going to be dealing with a pack of cannibals, some perfumed and others Damned Rotten Smelly!

Too Cynical? Paranoid even? I don't think so. To me, this recommendation is adaptive strategy of the most fundamental kind. And if you think I'm just throwing words around, why not take a deep breath of air in the inner city area of Montreal during the work hours of any ordinary week day?

Go down to the city harbor, look and smell the water there.

Look at the haze that covers the sky even on those brilliantly sunny Montreal mornings.

Gaze upward at the great skyscrapers that are encroaching upon everyone's view of the sky, and cutting off sunshine for the human ants that scurry their way along the bottom of the concrete-glass canyon.

Examine statistical reports of the increased occurrence of mental illness.

Consider the fact that young, intelligent, idealistic people have to band together in terrorist groups such as the S. L. A. to make the world understand the outrageous social injustice that still plagues, never mind the world, just this continent.

Maybe much of this harangue has no application to school as we know it in so far as there is only so much that can be conveyed in school learning situations, regardless of the good intentions behind them or the imaginativeness of their design. If that's the case, I would press for some alternative or middle ground between what we call schooling today and mainstream

life. Without that, I believe that we shall only be producing youngsters who will be hopelessly maladapted to the conditions in the world as they are.

Maybe I am the last person in the world to have the right to direct what I feel to have been some pretty alarming denunciations of our schooling system, let alone be audacious enough to recommend a middle ground set of experiences interposed between school and mainstream life. All I can say, in the end, is that to be so sickeningly out of contact with the demands of mainstream life as I was, really boils down to being out of touch with a major side of oneself. If this confession of sorts leads you to conclude that there was no one to blame for the condition but myself and that to foist a personal failing upon the shoulders of the school system is really unfair, you are right. The only question I can ask is this: How many more cases are there like myself, who grow up, as Paul Goodman put it, in an absurd fashion or, as I would say, in a vacuous environment? How many of us are there in an environment which, if we are ever fortunate enough, feel our impact upon the world even if it is in the most trivial respects of lifting a heavy load in a proper fashion, or wielding a boning knife with a modicum of expertise — we are able to earn, as they traditionally say, our daily bread, but more profoundly our place in the sun, in positions as effectively functioning adult human beings? If I am just one more sorry case included amongst the outer fringes of either aspect of a bell curve that depicts the relationship between scholarship and vocational realization, consider this account so much sour grapes.

But, if I, and others like me, are beginning to encroach upon the middle range of that curve, ensconcing our vile little bodies within the dome of the bell, start sweating folks because the times they are a changin' — what's more in a way that few ever believed they would.

Charles A. Tesconi, Jr.

Schooling and the Privatization of Experience

schools under attack

What Hutchins describes as the "great campaign against the public schools" has seemingly left few spoils from which one might mount new and different attacks. For as he put it:

The schools have been assailed from every conceivable direction, with every conceivable motive. The coalition against them is such to suggest that the one thing on which our people have reached unanimity is the evils of our system of public education. . . . Soft-hearted revolutionaries and hard-headed businessmen join in arguing that the public schools should be abolished. . . . Nobody has a kind word for the public school, the institution that only the other day was looked upon as the foundation of our freedom, the guaranty of our future, the cause of our prosperity and power, the bastion of our security, and the source of our enlightenment.¹

It even appears that the "great campaign" has reached the stage of overkill for which evidence is found in a number of developments beyond those suggested by Hutchins. The more strident critics, for example, particularly the de-schoolers and "free"-schoolers, are increasingly finding that they are talking only to themselves. In this regard they are experiencing what the so-called "romantic critics" (e.g., Holt, Friedenberg, Goodman, Kozol, and Kohl) of the early and middle 1960's went through. They review each other's books, act as respondents to one another's speeches, and sit together on panels addressing the same kinds of audiences repeatedly. Others are beginning to soften their barbs given their tardy recognition that most of our school problems are extensions of those in society at large. What is so ironic about the "great campaign," however, particularly in its de-schooling and "free"-schooling aspects, is that it serves to perpetuate many of the social ills it presumably seeks to alleviate.

I wish to argue the importance, indeed the crucial necessity of the public school. This will be revealed through an analysis of institutional fragmentation in advanced industrialized society, the privatization of the individual made possible and promoted by this fragmentation, and the potentially pervasive and oppressive social control all this makes likely. I am not at all sure about the precise nature of the role for the public school that can be carved out of the analysis which follows, but I am persuaded the necessity of public schooling comes through. Most important, however, I am convinced that the *idea* of public schooling turns out to be a great idea indeed.²

institutional fragmentation

A number of social analysts have commented on the fact that, in our structurally pluralistic society, the various institutional sectors — family, church, school, military, government, business, communicative media, etc. — are growing increasingly independent of, and thus isolated from, each other.³ A number of developments have been cited as causal forces. Most of them seem to converge in ways which force institutions to narrow their roles and functions. Just as advanced industrialized society demands that individuals develop specialized skills for prescribed roles, so it does with institutions. And just as individuals trained in specialized skills for restricted roles tend to become isolated from and independent of individuals exercising different skills in different roles, so it is with institutional sectors. They appropriate, or have imposed upon them, exclusive roles and functions. They thus become increasingly one-dimensional and cut-off from other institutional sectors. At the same time, and primarily because of inter-institutional independence, individuals are forced to psychologically compartmentalize their relationships to institutions. They must spread out their institutional commitments, in bits and pieces, over an increasingly broad and segmented terrain. Thus it is that various institutional sectors are growing more and more distant from and independent of individuals as they grow isolated from each other.

In pre-industrial or even pre-World War II society, the various institutional sectors were functionally and culturally related, if not interdependent and mutually supportive. This was particularly true at the community level and especially for those institutions which served as primary and secondary acculturating agencies. Moreover, individuals in earlier days belonged to only a relatively few enduring institutions and only a few stable groupings. Those institutions and groups not

only promoted and sustained lasting interpersonal relationships and individual identity, they satisfied a wide variety of social and individual needs which now require the services of a multitude of independent, specialized, isolated institutions and groups. Charles Frankel illustrates this for us by using the local church as an example.

Even fifty years ago, the local church in many places was still the focus of community. Men met at the church to get the news, to enjoy themselves, to deal with common disasters, to receive or dispense charity, to be confirmed and married and to bury their dead. When they came together to pray, it was as a community which had been meeting regularly to deal with common problems. Now, however, the local church is one more specialized association with a special business. Men get their news elsewhere, they get their entertainment elsewhere, and when they realize they have a common problem they usually form a special association — a Youth Board, for example, or a Civic Association — to deal with the problem. As a result, church membership has become more formal and occasional, and prayer more abstract.⁴

Today, membership in most institutions and groups has become formal and temporary, while participation has become much more functional (task oriented) and abstract. Formerly, individuals saw their membership and participation in institutions and groups as organic extensions of membership in community and society. Institutional and group membership was viewed as socially binding. And individual participation was concrete, valued, and visibly rewarding. Institutional interdependence and wide ranging need satisfaction performed by institutions helped to fashion and sustain a world wherein a pervasive sense of shared destiny and purpose served to bind random events together in making meaningful lives. The individual considered himself fully integrated into a social (if not universal) order which embraced his physical and spiritual existence.

It is probably true that to live in a world populated by the kinds of institutions and group relations described above required relatively little "internal" independence, little reliance upon what we might call ego or critical reasoning. This is a claim, however, that can only be made by an outside observer. There is in it, nevertheless, an important message for those who clamor about today's supposedly conforming American while looking longingly to the simpler past.

Today, however, even though the various institutional sectors may still be somewhat *functionally* related, they are typically less so. Family, church, and school, for example, do perform child-rearing functions, but increasingly they perform

these independently of, and often in isolation from, each other. Also, they often offer a variety of different, sometimes contending, values, customs, mores, morals, and world views. For these reasons, they are becoming less and less culturally interdependent. Thus, increasingly they are failing to promote and achieve the former coherent patterns of meaning and purpose which were enduringly imprinted as cultural and personal identity sources upon those who passed through them. Today, as the institutional sectors grow more disassociated from each other, they require the individual to fragment meaning, identity, and loyalty. He must change meanings and continuously orchestrate a variety of different, sometimes contending, identities and loyalties while moving from one institutional sector or group to another. The person, then, cannot connect properly, enduringly, or rewardingly with institutions or groups. By necessity, then, he commits himself only partially to each and creates meanings relative to each which become like fugitive pieces of an impossible jig-saw puzzle.⁵

Such a fragmentation also occurs *within* institutional sectors. Going to one Roman Catholic church, for example, is no longer like going to another. Furthermore, all of us are finding that our institutional relationships are increasingly grounded in groupings which, more often than not, are functional, task oriented associations, quick to dissolve upon completion of the task.

Increasingly, persons bring little to such groupings other than their physical presence. Consider, that some of the powerful groups or institutions to which most individuals now belong are the mass organizations like unions, trade organizations, political parties, or professional associations. Power, decision-making responsibilities, and other important participatory functions are highly bureaucratized and vested in the hands of a few dominating leaders or in staff roles filled by specially trained personnel. Accordingly, the meaning of individual membership is obscure in its social significance, and participation is generally abstract and formal.⁶ No surprise, then, that most of us participate in such organizations merely through the exercise of writing a check for our annual dues. Even this is not necessary for many of us, since payroll deduction procedures often take care of it.

In any case, the point is that the individual's commitment to institutions and groups, and the meanings he derives from them, are necessarily of a partial and superficial nature.⁷ Relationships with institutions and groups are necessarily seen as too impersonal to nurture. All this depletes community feel-

ings and common interests. Social ties become tenuous and impermanent. Thus, in what Bennis and Slater call "a temporary society," in a society of transients, in a society where the individual suffers the inconstancy of everything, in a society where institutions have influence upon him only as he passes through them, and only partial influence at that, the individual is forced to give a bit of himself here, a bit there. He must fragment himself as the world he encounters is itself fragmented.

the pursuit of privacy

A social and cultural ambience such as this leaves unfulfilled needs. These, in turn, constitute voids, what Luckmann calls "interstices" — gaps in the lives of individuals which are unstructured for lack of external roots traditionally found through institutional and group affiliation. The individual consequently lacks a comfortable and stable sense of self and of direction. Unable to locate and affirm himself, he looks inward and withdraws more and more into a private world. "Personal identity becomes, essentially, a private phenomenon." It is sought in subjectivistic ways divorced from institutional and group contexts. "This is, perhaps, the most revolutionary trait of modern society."

Without enduring and identity-giving ties to community, kinship networks, and beliefs and values (in short, all those self-affirming attachments which are generated and sustained by inter-institutional and group dependence), individuals absent themselves from the public world. They become increasingly hermetic and self-indulgent as they seek and exercise private consciousness. Accordingly, it is no surprise that a defining characteristic of modern, structurally pluralistic society is that our institutional sectors tend to take on an objective, distant, independent autonomy separated from individuals who are increasingly privatized.⁹

Privatization obviously means, among other things, that individuals are unfettered by institutional and group loyalties. They become "free" to pursue privacy, to do their "own thing." They are "liberated" from the tasks of the world, so to speak, and can and do hold strongly to what are considered non-negotiable, private directions and satisfactions. Consider in this regard the mass of people whom we loosely categorize as middle-class America. Reflect upon how we seek privacy through varied attempts at creating private life styles, through our rush to isolated, inter-personally sterile bedroom suburbs

or high rise sanctuaries where we can tune out the public world. Consider further how we strive for "a private home, a private means of transportation, a private garden, a private laundry, self-service stores, do it yourself skills of every kind."¹⁰ Reflect upon how we Americans feel that "each member [of the family] should have a separate room and even a separate telephone, television, and car, when economically possible."¹¹

The dissolution of the powerful hold over individuals once exerted by institutions does bestow upon them a buoyant sense of freedom. But it is important to recognize that this is essentially *freedom from* something. It cannot be construed as freedom in some objective, independent sense. For *freedom from* denotes dislocation and, thus, relational freedom or autonomy. As pointed out by Luckmann, then, this felt freedom may very well constitute only an illusory sense of autonomy.¹² It is, after all, a product of institutional segmentation put together, so to speak, "from the leftovers of a segmented social structure."¹³

In this light it comes as no surprise that much of today's expression of "rebellion" *from* structurally pluralistic society emerges out of, and reveals an emphasis upon, the subjective dimension of man's being. Consider in this regard not only the already mentioned examples of ways in which privacy is sought, but the so-called counter-culture with its emphasis upon the non-intellectual, subjective ways of knowing and dealing with the world, attempts at creating new modes of marital and familial arrangements, and the like. No surprise, either, that ours is a time witnessing the flourishing of astrology, Tarot cards, the Mystic Arts Book Society, the Children of God, group marriages, and perhaps more telling, all those cosmeticized advertisements promoting products offering ingenious ways of pursuing privacy.

In most cases these attempts at privacy are expressions of a yearning to be away from everything. In this sense, they can be seen as attempts at nihilistic anonymity revealing anarchy at its most chic. However, they are merely placebos for the void. They offer only existential cul-de-sacs ending on points of pale resolution or dewy denouement. They are of the category suggested by Marcuse when he asked: "Why not try God, Zen, existentialism, and beat ways of life, etc. . . . ? Such modes of protest and transcendence are no longer contradictory to the status quo and no longer negative. They are rather the ceremonial part of practical behaviorism, its harmless negation and are quickly digested by the status quo as part of its healthy diet."¹⁴ In short, they are expressions of

protest, rebellion, and transcendence, but they are the sort that do not change that from which one is rebelling; and they seldom lead to transcendence. For as we seek more and more privacy we feel more and more alienated and lonely when we get it.

Andrew Hacker sees all this as signaling *The End of the American Era*. For Slater it means *American Culture at the Breaking Point*. Peter Berger labels it the era of *The Homeless Mind*. And all of them muse over Rilke's observation: "Who has no home now will not build one anymore. Who is alone now will remain alone." Doubtless the situation is fraught with the possibilities suggested by these writers. It sparkles with questions existential. But because it centers around the ways individuals divorce themselves from the public and institutional world, and may involve an illusory sense of freedom, it has dramatic implications relative to social control.

privatization and social control

To the extent that the institutional sectors of society are always sources and agents of social control, it follows from our analysis that the traditional sources of institutional control are distributed over a fragmented gamut. But this is not to suggest some kind of chaotic anarchism in the social order. The traditional overt authority of the institutional sectors has been replaced by a more subtle and thereby perhaps more oppressive source of manipulation and control. Today, our society is held together and individuals are quite effectively but subtly manipulated by a bureaucratic and technological logic. The industrial-productive apparatus grinds pervasively, determining "not only the socially needed occupations, skills, and attitudes, but also individual needs and aspirations"¹⁵ and all that which goes into the gaudy promises of a consumer society. Bureaucracy, technology, and the whole productive machinery combine, then, to make for very effective integration and social control. They are so effective because, among other things, the new controls "appear to be the very embodiment of Reason for the benefit of all social groups and interests — to such an extent that all contradiction seems irrational and all counteraction impossible."¹⁶

It is this effective controlling character of modern advanced industrialized society which permits us to speak of the paradoxical phenomenon experienced by modern man: felt freedom on the one hand and pervasive social control on the other.

Structurally pluralistic society does allow for the pursuit of privacy, but the controlling forces to which we have referred "define what is worthy and desirable." Everyone tends, then, to "independently, but monotonously, . . . pursue the same thing in the same way."¹⁷ However, because individuals do their pursuing in isolation from each other, and because the forces which control also define that which is worthy of pursuit, the manipulative and controlling power of these forces are masked.¹⁸ As Zijderfeld observes, they never crystallize in a form of obvious tyranny and totalitarianism. Indeed, by converging in ways which create not only the voids to which we referred earlier, but also the means seemingly to satisfy the needs endemic to the voids, the "system blunts the individual's recognition that it contains no parts which do not communicate the repressive power of the whole."¹⁹ All this speaks to a state of alienation, but it is a unique form since that from which individuals are alienated is that in which they find the means for pursuing privacy and, hence, more alienation. This is a more progressive stage of alienation than that usually described. For the public world has become entirely objective; the subject which is alienated is swallowed up by its alienated existence.

The relationship between institutional and group segmentation and social control now becomes clear. In a fragmented world, the individual pursues loneliness, is rewarded materially for doing it, feels free in so doing, and is more likely, therefore, to submit to powerful social control and manipulation than he would were a total involvement demanded of him. Rebellion, refusal to go along, occurs only when the individual is not allowed to develop some kind of private sphere and individual autonomy to exercise that sphere. Thus, control and manipulation will be strong only if it demands partial involvement from the individual.²⁰

This helps us to understand the contradictory experience of personal freedom and social control. In short, social control in a structurally pluralistic society is so strong and pervasive precisely because the social order is pluralistic. Because it is pluralistic, it fragments and privatizes experience which, in turn, raises the individual's threshold for accepting more social control.²¹

Into all this enter demands from the "great campaign against the public schools" for de-schooling society as a whole and for creating all kinds of variegated alternatives to public schooling. "Great campaigners" generally, and de-schoolers particularly, are protesting over and rebelling from the forces

of social control which so effectively manipulate and coerce modern man. But their educational and schooling recommendations for combating these forces actually would serve, if they have not already, to intensify those conditions which make for effective and powerful social control in the first place. What de-schooling, for example, holds out, at least in the initial stages, is further fragmentation hence greater privatization and social control. To call for de-schooling in what in a real sense is an already de-schooled society is absurd and recklessly tempts the forces of oppressive social control. We do not need less public schooling, when schooling means rooting individuals in socially formative institutional arrangements, we probably need more to combat privatization. For problems owing to the arrogant use of power, lack of purpose, consumerism, and so on are institutional, not psychological, moral or political. They cannot be dealt with by reaffirming our faith in eternal verities, by pampering the solitary ego, by invoking righteousness, by tuning in to alpha-waves, by working for spiritual transformation, or by calling for more institutional fragmentation. Thus, I agree with Maxine Greene when she says:

I do not think that oppressiveness, and consumerism, and racism, and violence can be overcome through changes in personal consciousness divorced from institutional stances. I do not think it will be enough to reconceive our reality and our "democratic personality," to *see* differently, as so many young "dropouts" apparently see. It will be necessary to come to terms with power conceived as something other than "personal growth" — the power of the state, which at some point must be expected to change hands. I do not believe de-schooling will ensure that happening; I do not believe that "dialectic encounter," no matter how rich, can compensate for the alienation experienced in the corporate society or lead to the taking of power in any significant sense.³²

I refer to the de-schooling syndrome only briefly by way of emphasizing that I am more confident about what the school ought not to do than what it should or can do. If at all possible, the school should not, it seems to me, contribute to forces which increase fragmentation and privatization. This is no easy job, given the school as the dependent variable in the school-society relationship. But it is within this context that I am led to conclude that the public school idea was indeed great. For it was conceived as a means of, among other things, combating and insuring against fragmentation, privatization and unchecked social control. It is this aspect of the public school as a concept which I am convinced must be promoted. In this sense the task for public schooling is not unlike what

Freeman Butts has described as the major function of the schools. He put it this way: "The chief end of American education is the promotion of a new civism appropriate to the principles of a just society in the United States and a just world community. We have forgotten or simply mouthed these goals; now we must advance them in full seriousness as the first order of business for the future."²³

I do not believe, however, that we have forgotten what these goals are, or that we have merely mouthed romantic niceties on their behalf. I think, rather, that we are lacking in those socially and culturally binding ideals which are necessary to a conception of civism and, hence, community. The ideals upon which a conception of civism must be based, thus civism itself, are then unknown, or at best, amorphous. Moreover, the public school as it exists today has itself served those forces which have led to fragmentation and its attendant ills. Thus, when I say the school is important, I am not speaking of the school as it exists; rather, I have in mind the idea or conception of an institution which engenders community and belongingness. We are giving up on this great idea when we fragment the institutional concept implied by it through attempts at de-schooling, creating alternative institutions, and the like. Our first order of business should be aimed at recapturing the dream of creating an institution — public, universal, and compulsory — whose major task is to bind and cement. We will probably come up with something quite different from what we have. I am convinced that we will come up, nevertheless, with one, not many, institutions. And we will come up with something based upon a truth deeply embedded in the public school idea and which today is in need of revitalization: Institutional and group affiliation and commitment is necessary to the well-being of individuals.

footnotes

1. Robert M. Hutchins, "The Schools Must Stay," *The Center Magazine* (January/February, 1973), p. 12.
2. See R. Freeman Butts, "Assaults on a Great Idea," *The Nation* (April 30, 1973), pp. 553-560.
3. See for example: Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality*, Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Book, 1966; Thomas Luckmann, *The Invisible Religion*, New York: Macmillan, 1967; Warren Bennis and Philip Slater, *The Temporary Society*, New York: Harper and Row, 1968; Philip Slater, *The Pursuit of Loneliness*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1970; Anton C. Zijderveld, *The Abstract Society*, Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor

Charles A. Tesconi, Jr.

- Book, 1971; Charles Tesconi and Van Cleve Morris, *The Anti-Man Culture*, Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1972.
4. Charles Frankel, *The Case for Modern Man*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1959, pp. 200-201.
 5. Anton C. Zijderveld, *The Abstract Society*, Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Book, 1971, p. 136.
 6. Frankel, p. 200.
 7. Zijderveld, p. 136.
 8. Thomas Luckmann, *The Invisible Religion*, New York: Macmillan, 1967, p. 97.
 9. *Ibid.*, p. 96.
 10. Philip Slater, *The Pursuit of Loneliness*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1970, p. 7.
 11. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
 12. Luckmann, p. 97.
 13. Zijderveld, p. 138.
 14. Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1964, p. 14.
 15. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
 16. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
 17. Slater, p. 9.
 18. Marcuse, p. 11.
 19. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
 20. Zijderveld, p. 130.
 21. *Ibid.*, p. 130.
 22. Maxine Greene, "And Still It Is News," *After De-Schooling, What?* Alan Gartner, et al., Editors, Evanston: Harper and Row, 1973, p. 136.
 23. Butts, p. 559.

**A New Serial Publication from the
Faculty of Education, McGill University
REPORTS IN EDUCATION**

- No. 1. **Accreditation.** A survey of the literature on the accreditation of schools, including an evaluation of some of the concepts involved. Annotated bibliography. 58 pp.
 - No. 2. **Class Size.** A review of the literature on the relations between size of class and student outcomes. Selected annotated bibliography. 58 pp.
 - No. 3. **Learning Disabilities.** A survey of the literature in principal areas of concern in special education. Selected annotated bibliography. 59 pp.
 - No. 4. **Open Education.** A survey of the literature on the open space, team teaching, and open education. Bibliography and selected annotated bibliography. 109 pp.
- PRICE: \$3.00 each. Set of 4 titles, \$10.00. Payment must accompany orders. Cheque or money order preferred (payable to McGill University).

REPORTS IN EDUCATION
McGill Faculty of Education
3700 McTavish Street, Montreal, Quebec H3A 1Y2

Jean-Philippe Aubert

*“Allo McGill,
vous parlez français?”*

Il y a longtemps que la coexistence des “deux solitudes” pose des problèmes à cette Université: McGill enseigne et vit principalement en anglais, mais elle est située dans une province francophone. Peut-elle — doit-elle — communiquer en français avec la communauté qui l’entoure?

Pour répondre à cette question, qui est plus d’actualité que jamais dans le contexte politique québécois de 1974, l’Université McGill a organisé le *Cours de français au personnel*, dont cet article va tenter de décrire brièvement le fonctionnement du point de vue d’un de ses instructeurs.

L’an passé, l’Université a marqué le dixième anniversaire de ce cours et a rendu un hommage mérité à son directeur, le professeur T. Romer, qui prenait sa retraite. Je ne vais donc pas revenir sur un historique qui a déjà été fait dans diverses publications.

Après avoir eu le privilège et la charge d’enseigner le français depuis plusieurs années à nombre de collègues, administrateurs, bibliothécaires et employés de cette Université, je tiens à dire avant tout la très réelle satisfaction que j’en ai tirée. Cela tient premièrement à l’ambiance d’un tel cours, du fait que ses participants sont volontaires et qu’ils viennent de tous les départements, facultés ou instituts existants à McGill. Ainsi vous pouvez trouver dans une classe des professeurs de médecine, de génie et de musique, en même temps que l’épouse de l’un, la secrétaire de l’autre, plus le technicien d’un laboratoire ou le doyen d’une faculté. La hiérarchie s’oublie et les cloisons inter-départementales tombent devant une ardente vocation commune à tous: l’apprentissage du français! Le côté sympathique de cette atmosphère est particulièrement sensible lors de la session d’été, tenue généralement en mai, qui réunit

une centaine de participants pendant quelque trois semaines et leur donne l'occasion de se rencontrer, de manger ensemble et de "vivre en français" de façon intensive.

Les cours proprement dits sont essentiellement pratiques et visent avant tout à rendre les participants capables de comprendre et de parler le français. Leur nature n'est donc ni littéraire ni académique. Au moment de l'organisation du cours, le premier problème qui se pose est de savoir à quel niveau et dans quelle section placer chacun. Si vous partez de zéro, le cas est simple: vous rejoindrez les débutants. Mais si vous avez étudié la grammaire française dans vos jeunes années pendant six ans et que vous vous sentez incapable de prononcer une phrase, où vous mettre? C'est là que la pédagogie pratique de l'enseignement des langues intervient. Il s'agira d'abord de vous donner confiance, puis de vous mettre en situation d'utiliser l'acquis linguistique que vous possédez déjà et de le développer.

Pratiquement, les diverses sections se répartissent en gros à trois niveaux. Pour les *débutants*, deux semestres de la session régulière suffisent à acquérir toutes les structures fondamentales. Le Centre de langue française de McGill, spécialisé dans la langue seconde, a choisi une méthode pour les débutants qu'il a éprouvée et mise au point depuis 1966 aussi bien avec les étudiants de jour que dans le cadre du *Cours de français au personnel*. Cette méthode, qu'on peut résumer en la qualifiant d'audio-linguale, offre aux étudiants l'occasion de s'exprimer immédiatement en même temps qu'il apprennent les bases de la langue. Exercices structuraux, phonétique, dialogues, emploi intensif du laboratoire de langues en font partie intégrante et forment une préparation nécessaire à la pratique de la conversation en petits groupes.

Le niveau *intermédiaire* rassemble les sections qui ont besoin de réviser les connaissances de grammaire et de vocabulaire tout en parlant français aussi souvent que possible. Cet art de la conversation, bien dirigé, est le meilleur instrument de progrès des sections *avancées*.

A ces trois niveaux, et notamment aux deux derniers, l'instructeur sait bien que les difficultés des "étudiants" ne sont pas d'ordre technique ou intellectuel. Certains professeurs, brillants experts dans leur propre spécialité, semblent parfois ne pas pouvoir se jeter à l'eau et se mettre à parler français. C'est que le problème tient du blocage psychologique et se situe au niveau du comportement. Pour y remédier, un cours a été conçu dès 1968 au Centre de langue française, d'abord à l'intention des étudiants anglophones de McGill. Ses principes

sont ceux qui permettent à un cours dit de conversation d'être un moyen efficace d'amélioration. Plutôt que de tenter un exposé qui serait incomplet, je préfère renvoyer les lecteurs du *Journal of Education* à un article d'André Milbers, un des initiateurs de ce cours: "'Functional French', A Student-Oriented Course," paru dans le bulletin du *Centre for Learning and Development*, mai 1971, volume 2, no 8. Ce texte indique comment créer un climat de détente et de liberté, où l'instructeur s'efface (en apparence) pour jouer le rôle du "conseiller technique" à la disposition du groupe.

C'est ici qu'il convient de poser la question: comment décrire l'instructeur idéal d'un tel type de cours? Cette question est celle de toute la formation du professeur de langue seconde; de nombreux ouvrages y ont déjà été et y seront encore consacrés. Je me contenterai de résumer mon opinion à ce sujet en suggérant que ce métier est un *art* autant qu'une *science*.

Comme l'écrit Denis Girard: "la méthodologie de l'enseignement des langues est tout autre chose qu'une sous-branche de la linguistique appliquée" (dans: *Linguistique appliquée et didactique des langues secondes*, A. Colin, Paris 1972). C'est dire que de solides connaissances théoriques et pratiques de linguistique sont un pré-requis indispensable mais non suffisant, de même évidemment qu'une formation littéraire poussée ne saurait assurer la préparation du professeur de langue. Les "qualités de meneur de jeu," comme dit D. Girard, l'expertise dans l'art de corriger et surtout de faire corriger les fautes, le dynamisme en même temps que le tact, et une bonne dose d'humour, tout cela n'est guère l'affaire de l'enseignement universitaire mais tient au caractère, à la personnalité et surtout à l'expérience.

Le *Cours de français au personnel* est-il une réussite? C'est à chacun des participants d'y répondre, et les résultats sont évidemment très variables. Ils sont fonction du degré de motivation, des dispositions individuelles et, dans une large mesure, du temps qu'on peut consacrer à l'étude et à la pratique du français. Voilà des facteurs décisifs quant au succès de l'entreprise, mais ils ne sont plus de mon ressort.

Jeffrey Herold

Sputnik In American Education: A History And Reappraisal

I

After a decade during which Americans have suffered through the Vietnam war, assassinations of national leaders, racial conflict, the burning of cities, the 1968 Democratic Convention, Kent State, Attica, the drug scene, Watergate, and other outrageous events, it is difficult to remember that there was a time not so long ago when they thought the biggest problem they had to worry about was a Russian satellite orbiting in space. The launching of Sputnik on October 5, 1957, seems very remote and unimportant now. In fact, most Americans today might wish that a space race with the Russians was the most serious problem they faced. At the time, however, Sputnik truly frightened them and subsequently helped bring about changes in American education which are just beginning to be assessed and placed in perspective. A reexamination of the impact of Sputnik on American education is not only interesting in its own right but also provides additional support for the revisionists' claim that educational reform is never undertaken primarily in the interests of youth but rather in the interests of preserving the existing social order, and that the young are viewed by their elders not primarily as ends in themselves but as so many pawns to be played in the game of maintaining that order.

II

The shock that Sputnik caused among the American public actually took some time to set in. In Boston, public reaction was one of massive indifference at first. In Denver, football and the Asiatic flu remained the primary topics of conversation. The only missiles Milwaukeeans were talking about were the

round, white ones Lew Burdette had thrown at the Yankees in winning the second game of the World Series.¹ But as the days went by, with the television networks and newspapers making clear the implications of the Soviet satellite, the public began to appreciate what some of their scientists and high government officials had understood immediately. The Russians had not only one-upped the United States by being first in space, but the rocket power and guidance system it took to orbit the satellite also could be used to hurl thermonuclear warheads at American cities. It appeared that the Soviets had taken a dangerous lead in weaponry. And although Americans joked about Sputnik cocktails (one-third Vodka, two-thirds sour grapes) and "muttnik" (after Sputnik II with a dog aboard was launched), they were not only frightened but angry. Having been led to believe that American science and technology were the envy of the world, they wanted to know why the United States suddenly found itself second best.

A search for the reasons for the American predicament began immediately and became a favorite pastime of the mass media. Although opinions varied, the consensus among informed observers was that the Russians had put a much greater emphasis on rocketry and getting into space first than had the United States. Furthermore, the American space program had been retarded by lack of funds because an economy-minded Eisenhower administration had decided to spend more money on complex defense systems than on the space program. Finally, inadequate or poor integration of the numerous missile and rocket programs had resulted in duplication of effort, loss of time, and inefficient spending.²

These reasons did not satisfy all the critics, however. To many, Sputnik represented not only a triumph of Soviet scientific and technological expertise, but ultimately a triumph of the Soviet educational system. It was the Russian schools, they argued, that had produced the scientists and engineers who made the feat possible. Conversely, many thought, the United States found itself second-best in space exploration because its educational system was second-best. It had not produced the experts that an increasingly scientific and technological age demanded. Suddenly, an institution which had been a source of national pride became the scapegoat for a national failure.

The mass media were quick to pick up these criticisms of American education. The press accused the schools of substituting "life-adjustment" education for rigorous instruction in the teaching of mathematics and the sciences,³ and the publi-

cation of interviews with leading educational critics who charged that educators had neglected the gifted student became commonplace.⁴ Shortly after the launching of Sputnik I, the Columbia Broadcasting System televised a program describing the education of a "typical" Russian teenager, one Ivan by name. While Ivan had his share of extracurricular fun in sports and amateur dramatics, he spent the major part of his time learning a good bit of mathematics, drinking deeply of both Russian and Western literature, learning to speak English, and doing plenty of homework. From Moscow, CBS switched directly to Tennessee where it asked a group of American high school students what they thought of Ivan. The general consensus was that Ivan was probably a "drag." One girl doubted that she would have anything to talk to him about. Furthermore, she thought that the things Ivan was studying were not only a waste of time but downright boring. The rest of the students concurred with her judgment. As far as they were concerned, the most important lesson to be learned in school was how to get along with other people.⁵ The comparison seemed devastating, especially since the American youth took such pride in their ignorance and manifested the "organization man" philosophy that was under attack in the mid-50s.

Actually, there was nothing very new in all of this. Similar criticisms of American education, and progressive education in particular, had been made before in earlier decades of the 20th century by intellectuals such as Irving Babbitt, Paul Elmer More, Albert Jay Nock, and Robert Maynard Hutchins.⁶ These criticisms reached a highpoint between 1953 and 1955 with the publication of Arthur Bestor's *Educational Wastelands*, Hutchins' *The Conflict in Education*, Paul Woodring's *Let's Talk Sense About Our Schools*, Albert Lynd's *Quackery in the Public Schools*, and Rudolph Flesch's *Why Johnny Can't Read*.⁷ In the years just after World War II, James Conant, then President of Harvard University, had argued that the United States, as the leader of the free world, could not become complacent, and that its survival depended on the marshalling of its talented youth for scientific and military purposes.⁸ Fifteen months prior to Sputnik, Caspar Green had worried in the *Atlantic Monthly* that the "Dullards" were interfering with the education of the gifted.⁹ And only a year before, Dr. Vannevar Bush and former Senator William Benton had warned Americans of the great strides the Russians had made in mass education, particularly the training of scientists and technicians, and of the increasing sophistication and capabilities of Soviet science and technology.¹⁰

But while these criticisms caused some stir among the American intelligentsia, the public remained largely undisturbed.¹¹ In 1950, for example, *Life* magazine reported that a Roper survey had found that while some Americans were dissatisfied with the schools in their own neighborhoods, on the whole they were basically content with American education. The same issue of *Life* celebrated American education with Henry Steele Commager's famous article, "Our Schools Have Kept Us Free."¹² As Paul Woodring observed, before 1957 Americans by and large assumed that because they had more schools and kept their children in them longer, their educational system must be better. They also found it comfortable to believe that the Russians substituted propaganda for liberal education, that their scientific and technical schools were inferior, and that they had been able to develop an atomic bomb only by stealing American secrets.¹³

What was new about the post-Sputnik criticisms then was that the American public finally took notice. The editors of *Life* now commented:

For years most critics of U.S. education have suffered the curse of Cassandra — always to tell the truth, seldom to be listened to or believed. But now the curse has been lifted. What they were saying is beginning to be believed. The schools are in terrible shape. What has long been an ignored national problem, Sputnik has made a recognized crisis.¹⁴

Time magazine declared, "It seemed for a while that all the critics of United States public education, so vociferous since the war, had just about shot their bolt. Then came Sputnik." Clifton Fadiman added, "What opened our eyes? A flying box containing a dying dog. We are going to reform American education not because we are eager to produce finer citizens but because we are scared stiff."¹⁵

There was something else that was also new, a new seriousness on the part of the public about education. Benjamin Fine, then education editor for the *New York Times*, reported that while 1957 had begun quietly enough in education, by year's end the two Soviet satellites had changed the public attitude toward education and people were asking whether their children were being educated properly. There was a growing concern over the way Americans had taken education for granted and had defeated bond issues for new buildings and ignored teachers' pleas for higher salaries. And there was a new awareness that education could no longer be treated as a marginal luxury. Education had thus become front-page news. Suddenly the nation had realized that scientific and techno-

logical advances and the public welfare and defense were irrevocably interwoven.¹⁶

These new attitudes of the American public toward education were reflected in the speeches and writings of leading politicians. Vice-President Nixon, who in the summer of 1957 had told the annual NEA convention that no other institution had contributed more to American progress than the school,¹⁷ now gave his blessings to the critics of education. The fundamental challenge of the Soviet launchings, he declared, was in the field of education. Our military and economic strength could be no greater than our educational system. That was why the American educational system was being subjected to one of the most penetrating periods of criticism and re-examination in our national history. Even though our educational system was good, it could be made better, and, after all, making things better had been "the secret of American progress." Nixon adopted many of the critics' viewpoints. Our major problem, he said, was quality not quantity. We had to have better teachers and less soft courses, for just as a soft physical life results in flabby muscles, a soft mental life results in underdeveloped brains and weak intellects. We also had to place less emphasis on adjustment and more on standards. Students had to be taught to face failure and learn how to compete, just as in real life.¹⁸

In a similar vein, Senator John F. Kennedy wrote that America's world leadership and survival depended on whether her educational system was capable of meeting the challenge of the day or whether a shortage of teachers, classrooms, and money — with a resulting lack of high-quality education — would prove to be the undoing of the nation. More aid to schools was imperative because the fate of the nation rested on education.¹⁹

Public concern about education, concern that at times bordered on panic, continued throughout 1958.²⁰ Fred Hechinger reported that hardly a week passed without several television programs examining education. And when the Rockefeller report on education appeared, it was, not surprisingly, headline news even in small-town dailies.²¹

The Rockefeller report was the product of a panel chaired by John W. Gardner, then president of the Carnegie Corporation, and which included David Riesman and James R. Killian, Jr., president of MIT and then newly appointed Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology.²² The report was one of six prepared under the auspices of the Special Project of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. The Project had

been organized in 1956 to define the major problems and opportunities that the United States would confront in the following fifteen years.²³ Work on the report had begun prior to Sputnik, and this fact undoubtedly helped the report strike a more sober and thoughtful note in the midst of a flurry of polemics on education.

Formally titled *The Pursuit of Excellence*, the report introduced the public to a word that was to be the keynote of educational reform in the next few years.²⁴ While agreeing that world conditions required us to think of our performance as a nation, the report was fundamentally concerned with the subject of individual excellence, arguing that the fundamental value of a free society was individual dignity and that a nation's greatness ultimately depended on the greatness of the individuals who constituted it.

The report adopted the criticism popularized in the 1950s by Riesman in *The Lonely Crowd* and William H. Whyte, Jr., in *The Organization Man* that "our society has given too little attention to the individual of unusual talent or potentialities." This assertion was not meant to demean society's attempt to raise the general level of achievement. Instead it pointed up the need for attention to the education of the gifted and the need to encourage excellence of all kinds.

Every democracy *must* encourage high individual performance. If it does not, it closes itself off from the main springs of its dynamism and talent and imagination, and the traditional democratic invitation to the individual to realize his full potentialities becomes meaningless. More, perhaps, than any other form of government, a democracy must maintain what Ralph Barton Perry has called "an express insistence upon quality and distinction."²⁵

The report noted that Americans had always told themselves that education was vital to the nation's strength, and while it agreed that the times had "grimly underscored the correctness of that view," it argued that it was no longer enough merely to repeat this cliché. Americans had to recognize that in many areas of the nation their educational facilities were poor and their educational effort "slovenly." The schools were overcrowded, understaffed, and ill-equipped. Often chemistry, physics, and mathematics were not offered because there were no teachers to teach them. Teachers were often hard to find for such basic subjects as English and social sciences.

These conditions could not be blamed on educators entirely. The public had demanded the expansion of the educational system but without providing adequate funds for buildings

and salaries. Furthermore, schools had been asked to include in their curricula an incredible variety of subjects in order to assume more and more of the functions of the home, and to take responsibility for virtually every psychic and civic crisis involving young people. The report marveled at the fact that educators had held up under the pressure, and while its authors did not wish to absolve educators of their failures, above all they did not want to absolve the public of its failure. "The fateful question is not whether we have done well, or whether we are doing better than we have in the past, but whether we are meeting the stern demands and unparalleled opportunities of the times. And the answer is that we are *not*."²⁶

If the nation was to get the high quality educational programs the times demanded, there would have to be a thorough re-examination of current practices, patterns of organization, and objectives. Americans would also have to overcome the "cult of easiness," the quest for security, comfort, and luxury. A culture, if it is to survive, the report claimed, must offer "great meanings, great objectives, great convictions," and these must inspire the education of its youth.

The Pursuit of Excellence seemed to confirm the necessity for the new public seriousness about education. The *New York Times* editorialized that the report was a challenge to Americans to take action before it was too late.²⁷ The way Americans had thought about education in the past was no longer good enough. Pieties about the value of schooling to democracy without the necessary financial and moral support would no longer do. Americans had to put their money and attention where their mouths were.²⁸

The year 1959 brought the climax of post-Sputnik educational criticisms. President Eisenhower condemned the educational philosophy of John Dewey in a letter published in *Life* on March 15, 1959, implying that Dewey was to blame for the embarrassment his administration had suffered. "Educators, parents, and students must be continuously stirred up by the defects in our educational system," he wrote. "They must be induced to abandon the educational path that, rather blindly, they have been following as a result of John Dewey's teachings."²⁹

That same year, the Council for Basic Education published *The Case for Basic Education* which accused the schools of shoddy intellectual standards and urged them to upgrade academic requirements.³⁰ The journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, *Daedalus*, devoted its entire winter

issue to the subject, "Education In The Age Of Science," with such contributors as Arthur Bestor, Sidney Hook, and David Riesman rehearsing by then familiar points of view.³¹

1959 was also the year Jacques Barzun published *The House of Intellect*, an arrogant and elitist tract which once again presented the argument that the school's chief responsibility was to foster ability and achievement.³² Barzun announced that he was nauseated by the word "education," labelling it "damnable." Besides all the educating for health, character, happiness, and pedestrian safety, there was now driver education, alcohol education, cancer education, and sex education, "just as next to the *Education of Henry Adams* we have *The Education of a Poker Player*." The word "education" should therefore be used only in reference to these subjects and absolutely banned from discussions of "schooling" and "instruction." "Education" never seemed to end, whereas in "instruction" there was a point at which one knew how to read, write, count, speak German, or understand physics. If we really wanted to improve our schools, Barzun declared, we would have to "forget the language and especially the slogans, of mass education." Nonsense such as keeping the schools "democratic" only resulted in neglect of ability differences. It was a "wasteful, dangerous, and unjust attitude." Ability and achievement were too important to the nation to trifle with. The analogy of athletics had to be pressed until everyone recognized "that in the exertions of intellect those who lack the muscles, coordination, and will-power can claim no place at the training table, let alone the playing field."

Barzun concluded that we could not make intellectuals out of two million students since too many were simply incapable of a bookish education and realized themselves that some marketable vocational training was what they needed most. But we could foster ability by selecting those students with a talent for abstraction, articulateness, and ideas by giving them a special schooling. This did not mean the gifted would have to be segregated since they could still share many classes with their peers, but it did mean they would be speeded toward higher goals. In this way the schools could begin honestly to serve the ends of intellect.

The most acerbic criticisms of the schools in 1959 came from Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover in his *Education and Freedom*.³³ Rickover's interest in education was stirred by his assignment in 1947 to help build nuclear reactors. In the course of interviewing two thousand men for his engineering group, he was able to find only one hundred fifty who met his re-

quirements. This experience, he said, left a deep impression and led him directly to a study of why the educational system produced so few men who were qualified to do the work necessary for progress. Rickover's study subsequently led him to the conclusions that the schools were the greatest cultural lag in American society and that only massive upgrading of the scholastic standards of the schools would guarantee the future prosperity and freedom of the Republic.

Rickover joined Eisenhower in laying blame for educational failures squarely at the feet of John Dewey and other "educationists." It was they who had led the schools down the road of life-adjustment education and away from their responsibility to provide solid grounding in educational fundamentals. The American people had never authorized the schools to replace education with life-adjustment training and behavioral conditioning, and yet they had permitted the schools to experiment with John Dewey's ideas for a long time.

Rickover admired European schools because they were not "social clubs" or "finishing schools" but aimed at the development of intellectual excellence. If American schools were to meet the requirements of the modern world, they would have to follow this example. Only in this way could the schools hope to produce "the man of the future," the technical expert.

Education and Freedom was the climactic statement of post-Sputnik educational criticism. In fact, it can be argued that it was the climax of the educational criticism that had begun in the 1920s. For not only was it the most artless appeal to improve education in order to insure American military superiority (Sidney Hook scowled that it should have been properly entitled "Education for Victory in the Next War"³⁴), but one could not read it without a strong feeling of *déjà vu*. It repeated most of the major criticisms of the previous forty years, but without the urbanity or sophistication of a Hutchins or a Bestor. At times Rickover's arguments were amateurish. His learning theory — "the same basic process of storing the mind with knowledge can be adapted for each group of students" — was antedeluvian. His account of how Dewey had corrupted the schools was sheer fantasy. Despite Rickover's sincere concern about America's need for competent and independent minds, *Education and Freedom* came close to being a parody of educational criticism.

III

There was another reason why 1959 brought the climax of

post-Sputnik educational criticism. James B. Conant's *The American High School Today* was also published that year.³⁵ While Americans had manifested a new seriousness about education in the months following Sputnik, by 1959 their seriousness had turned to weariness. Conant now told them what they wanted to hear, that the high schools were not that bad after all, and in doing so he put a damper on the criticism of the schools.³⁶

Conant's study grew out of his belief that the United States had to develop all the expert manpower it could in order to win the Cold War and his curiosity about just how well talented youth were being educated in American high schools.³⁷ Conversations with John W. Gardner led to the Carnegie Corporation's commissioning Conant in the winter of 1957 to do a study of the high school. In the aftermath of Sputnik, Conant's report became a best seller.³⁸

Conant's approach differed from that of the Bestors and Rickovers. His research group went out and visited over a hundred high schools throughout the country to see what they were actually doing.³⁹ The results of this empirical study proved a devastating blow to the criticisms of those who had attacked the schools from a purely ideological standpoint.⁴⁰

Conant disdained comparing American education to education elsewhere. Such comparisons left him cold, he said. As far as he was concerned, the only thing there was to compare between two educational systems was the social and political structure encompassing them. The American high school, Conant contended, is a unique institution with no counterpart in any other country. Unlike the German *gymnasium*, for example, it does not provide the students' entire general education and its students do not go directly into professional studies at the university. Instead, the American student takes two to four more years of general education at college before beginning professional studies. Therefore, the standards met upon graduation from high schools are obviously not equal to those met after graduation from the *gymnasium*. Furthermore, the American high school is a comprehensive school which encompasses all the children of a community and attempts to provide an appropriate education for each. For some, a full program of general education is appropriate, but for the majority vocational training is imperative. No one type of education is suitable for all.

Conant did not attempt to answer the question of whether the high schools were good enough. Instead, he asked whether schools met three criteria: (1) Did they provide a good gen-

eral education for all students? (2) Did they provide vocational courses that would enable students to develop skills they could market after graduation? (3) Did they provide the opportunities for the academically able (which he estimated to be approximately 15-20 per cent of the high school population) to take advanced work in science, mathematics, and foreign languages? Although he found only eight schools meeting all three requirements to his satisfaction, he still concluded that aside from needed consolidation of small school districts, no radical alteration in the basic pattern of American education was necessary in order to improve the public schools. If all the high schools were functioning as well as some he had visited, he claimed, the education of all American youth would be satisfactory.

There were, of course, some minor changes that would have to be made. Foreign language instruction had to be improved along with the guidance of more able girls. And Conant did complain that, in general, the academically talented student was not being sufficiently challenged, working hard enough, or pursuing an academic program of sufficient range. But if schools adopted his recommendations for able students and communities began to de-emphasize sports, marching bands, and other extra-curricular activities in favor of academic activities, this situation could be remedied.

Conant restored the faith of Americans in their schools. His report disputed the claim that the schools were in bad shape, while assuring Americans that with more money, community concern, and the adoption of the report's recommendations, the schools could produce students who would meet the manpower needs of America in the Space Age.⁴¹

Conant's report did not go uncriticized — some charged that it was a whitewash and an attempt to bail out the educational status quo, while schoolmen denied that it was true that able students were not working hard enough — but it did signal the end of the educational storm.⁴² By the end of 1960, Fred Hechinger reported that the violent debate between lay critics and professional educators had subsided, and the argument over proposed school reforms was now concentrated within the education profession itself.⁴³

IV

What can be said about the furor in education that followed Sputnik? First of all, as Burgess and Borrowman have argued, the public dismay that followed Sputnik must be seen as an

expression of the general disillusionment and frustration that Americans experienced in the years after the end of World War II when their hopes for world peace did not materialize.⁴⁴ It was similar to the public dismay that had earlier followed the Russian's development of an atomic bomb years before American experts had predicted they would, except this time the Russians had achieved a major scientific and technological advance first. Sputnik made Americans feel even less secure than they felt already.

Secondly, history had left the schools in a position where they were vulnerable to the charges that they were largely to blame for the space gap. The schools, especially the high schools, had in fact drifted towards "life-adjustment" education during the 1930s and early 1940s because they were faced with having to cope with more students staying on in school for longer periods of time than ever before since the Depression had left youth with few other places to go. In an effort to keep this new mass of students sufficiently entertained and in school, educators began to focus on the personal problems of youth and to increase the number of extra-curricular activities. As Burgess and Borrowman remark, "At no other time in our history . . . had it seemed so important that students enjoy what they were about."⁴⁵ And in the years during and after World War II, when it became apparent that the mass of youth was in school to stay, educators continued to believe that since the majority of American youth were interested in neither vocational nor college preparation, life-adjustment education was the answer for them. This attitude was symbolized by the famous Educational Policies Commission publication *Education For All American Youth*. The fact that James Conant was a member of the EPC at the time was indicative of the fact that many educators did not regard a rigorous academic program as being suitable for most youth in the post-War world.⁴⁶ However, when Sputnik made it appear that the post-War world demanded that American schools stress rigorous academic programs, the emphasis of educators on life-adjustment education proved to be embarrassing.

Furthermore, the "Cold War" among American educators, as Willis Rudy called the battle that had been raging between professional educators and their critics for decades over whether the schools should devote their energies primarily to the education of the gifted or to trying to educate "all" youth, also left schoolmen in a bad position. Educators had always claimed that they were providing an education that met the needs of the gifted as well as those of other students, while

their critics consistently had argued that talented youth were being neglected and lost to the society." Sputnik seemed to prove the critics were right and that if the schools had indeed been attending to the gifted, America would have gotten into space first.

Finally, because of their deep faith in education, Americans not only look to their schools to solve most of their problems, but they frequently blame the schools when things go wrong. It was characteristic therefore that Americans should think that Sputnik was a sign that their schools had failed. It was also natural that they should think the space race could be won if the schools were beefed-up.

V

Americans wasted little time in trying to do just that. As Sidney Hook has observed, it is no exaggeration to say that before Sputnik and after Sputnik mark two eras in the history of American education.

The nation came out of the shock to its pride and self-confidence produced by the glittering orbit of the Soviet satellites with a frenzied scramble for educational short cuts which would restore its much vaunted technological superiority . . . Crash programs were called for to produce more engineers and scientists, to teach intensive courses in mathematics and sciences at all educational levels, to prune the curriculum of high schools and colleges of the dry rot of needless cultural courses, and to favor the gifted students by accelerating their educational development.⁴⁸

Asa Knowles, then president of the University of Toledo, commented, "Truly our educators and teachers are on the spot! Society is expecting them to fulfill a much more important role than at any previous time in our history. They are expected to produce an intellectual renaissance for the Western world — intellectual leadership on the part of the U.S.A."⁴⁹

An intellectual renaissance was a bit too much to expect, but what did emerge after the dust had settled was a stepped-up attempt to reform curricula and teaching methods. By the end of 1960, Hechinger reported that "the theme for American education was curriculum reform. For the first time in more than a generation American educators were introducing drastic changes."⁵⁰

As several writers have already pointed out, the so-called "revolution" in American education did not begin with Sputnik. Several factors had spurred significant efforts to upgrade the quality of American education earlier in the 1950s. For one thing, the examination of draftees during World War II,

which revealed that many high school graduates were mathematical and scientific illiterates, had aroused the concern of those scientists who made it their business after the war to investigate the quantity and quality of secondary school science and mathematics. According to director E. G. Begle, for example, the roots of the School Mathematics Study Group, founded in 1958, could be traced to a conference of mathematicians held in the early '50s concerning the quality of high school mathematics.⁵¹

Curriculum reform was also supported at that time by increasingly affluent middle class parents who desired a college education for their children and who assumed that a pre-collegiate curriculum prepared by distinguished scholars would help ready their children to compete for the limited number of college openings.⁵²

Another base for the reform movement that pre-dated Sputnik was the knowledge explosion which had left the schools teaching outdated information and which made scholars aware that students had to be acquainted with the theoretical constructs that give "facts" meaning. Consequently, there was a new emphasis on the "structures" of the academic disciplines and the methods of knowing employed by scholars. This new emphasis led, in turn, to an interest in how children could best learn these structures and strategies, and considerable attention to Piaget's studies of children's learning and the problems of programming and instruction.⁵³

Probably the most important factor that helped spawn the reform movement, however, was the conviction shared by post-War leaders of the federal-scientific establishment such as Rickover and Conant that the United States had to create the technologically trained manpower and management personnel that the growing electronics, aerospace, and atomic industries required.⁵⁴ Their efforts led to the establishment of the National Science Foundation, the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education, and eventually the Carnegie Corporation's support of Conant's study of the high school.⁵⁵

Established as an independent agency of the executive branch in 1950, the NSF was charged with strengthening basic research and education in the sciences. Its budget, which grew from a few hundred thousand dollars in 1950 to \$121 million in 1967, was used in large part to provide fellowships for graduate and post-doctoral students in science; to promote the training of teachers of science, mathematics, and engineering; to improve science and mathematics curricula, especially in the high schools; and to identify talented high school

and college students. The Fund for the Advancement of Education, founded in 1951, supported experimental programs in teacher education, classroom television, teacher aids and similar innovations.⁵⁶

Despite the significance of all these factors, in the end the primary catalyst for the educational "revolution" was Sputnik. Before Sputnik, educational reform was the concern of a few people and a few foundations. After Sputnik it was a matter of national and governmental concern. "Sputnik has been referred to so many times and in so many contexts," writes Goodlad, "that we are too much inclined to ignore or underestimate its significance as a factor productive of school reform."⁵⁷

The National Science Foundation, which had earlier funded the Physical Science Study Committee, now went on to fund such curriculum revision projects as the School Mathematics Study Group and the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study. In 1958, in direct response to Sputnik, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act which provided funds for the U.S. Office of Education to sponsor research and innovation in science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and guidance. The Act also permitted the federal government to finance new teacher training programs, experiments with new educational methods, educational research centers, and it allowed the federal government to grant money to the states on a matching basis for the purchase of science equipment and the construction of science laboratories in an effort to improve science instruction in the secondary schools.⁵⁸ The government-sponsored curriculum reform in science and mathematics also inspired subsequent private curriculum reform projects in the social sciences sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies and its various members.⁵⁹

It is interesting to note that the curriculum reformers were criticized by such educational scholars as TheodoreSizer and Lawrence Cremin for their apparent lack of concern about the ultimate aims of education.⁶⁰ And Charles Silberman later concluded that one of the reasons the new curricula did not have more impact on the schools was their "failure" to give sufficient attention to such questions as "What is education for?" or "What kind of human beings and what kind of society do we want to produce?"⁶¹ But these criticisms really seem a bit strange, if not ludicrous, because if the curriculum reformers failed to write elaborate rationalizations or philosophies of education for what they were doing, it was probably because they felt no need to. The ultimate purposes of the new curri-

cula were undoubtedly clear to them — to produce competent scientists, technicians, and scholars who would insure that the United States survived and maintained its dominant place in the world. Certainly there could have been no doubt in the minds of the Congressmen who rushed to pass the most massive bill for federal aid to education up to that time in American history that these were the ultimate purposes of educational reform. As Burgess and Borrowman argue, at bottom it was the Cold War and the nation's felt need for highly trained manpower that spurred educational reform in the 1950s and 1960s. Any concerns about the humanity of the students themselves or about how education might enrich the quality of their lives necessarily got lost in the shuffle.⁶²

VI

It is now seventeen years since Sputnik was launched, the United States landed on the moon first, and contrary to our worst fears in the fall of 1957, the Russians are not in control of outer space. (Ironically, while the schools were blamed for Sputnik, they were given no credit for the moon landing.) But having taken the lead in space exploration, we now find ourselves in a position we could not possibly have conceived of back then — we have scaled down our space program, and many of the engineers and Ph.D.'s in physics we thought we needed so desperately and expanded our university programs so feverishly to produce are out looking for work. The Vietnam war drained off resources that might have been spent on space research, and our increasing domestic problems over the last several years have made space exploration seem less and less crucial, a luxury on which we can no longer afford to spend so much of our national treasure.

In the field of education we also find ourselves in a situation we could not possibly have imagined seventeen years ago when the paths that educational reform needed to take seemed so clear. The rebellions of minority groups and middle-class youth against their educational predicaments in the 1960s have made the arguments of the 1950s over academic rigor and "life-adjustment" seem ancient.⁶³ Certainly the obsession of Sputnik era critics with the education of the gifted seems extremely elitist and snobbish indeed after a period in which we have become acutely aware of the educational oppression of the poor. Even the 1950s stress on individualism seems rather excessive now that we have begun to rediscover the virtues of collectivism and to realize that the pursuit of individualism

often ends in loneliness, unhappiness, and ecological disaster, among other things.⁶⁴

Furthermore, despite all of the changes that the curriculum reform movement introduced into schools, at bottom schools appear to have changed little.⁶⁵ Jerome Bruner has also recently confessed that the new curricula did not seem to meet the intellectual needs of either advantaged or disadvantaged youth and that he is now at something of a loss to know exactly what to suggest in the way of educational reform.⁶⁶ As a result of all this, we now find ourselves debating proposals for reform — even proposals to deschool society — that would have seemed absolutely soft-headed or preposterous in the late 1950s. In fact, the current educational enthusiasm, open education, is to a large extent progressive education resurrected. We have come full circle.

Going through cycles of reform is, of course, a characteristic feature of American education. In the last forty years, we have gone from the child-centered educational rhetoric of the 1930s to the society-centered rhetoric of the 1950s back to the child-centered rhetoric of the 1970s. This has been a function not only of such immediate crises as Sputnik and the rebellions against schools and colleges in the 1960s, but also a function of the ups and downs of the labor market, with child-centered rhetoric dominating during periods of labor surplus and society-centered rhetoric dominating during periods of labor shortage.⁶⁷ When there are few places for the young to go in the society, educators start stressing the importance of making educational practice humanistic and directing it towards the individual development of students. When the society suddenly finds itself in need of certain kinds of personnel, however, humanistic pretenses are thrown to the wind in the interests of grinding out manpower. Interestingly, foundations such as the Carnegie Corporation have responded to periods of educational crisis by supporting the studies of moderates appropriate to the particular crisis — Conant in the '50s, Silberman in the '70s — thus co-opting demands for the radical reform of schools and recommending limited changes aimed at bailing out the educational system, preserving the social order, and keeping things on an even keel.⁶⁸

What makes this business of rushing from one hysterical period of reform to the next so insidious then is the obvious fact that reform is never undertaken primarily for the sake of young people's welfare, but rather for the sake of preserving the existing social, economic, and political system. And it is not just the extent to which young people are treated as the

tools of state and private interests that is so disturbing, but it is also the fact that the educational establishment always moves so quickly and mindlessly to support a social order which, as the years since Sputnik have made clear, is so inhumane. A social order that uses its scientific and technological expertise not only to land men on the moon but to rain terror on the Indochinese, that keeps a huge portion of its population in poverty and misery, that periodically finds it necessary to have an economic recession, that renders meaningless and ruins the lives of even those members who have achieved the American Dream is not worthy of the support of educators or anyone else.⁶⁸ Charles Silberman is more right than he understands when he argues that America's most pressing educational problem now "is not how to increase the efficiency of the schools; it is how to create and maintain a humane society."⁶⁹ It seems finally to have dawned on Jerome Bruner as well that the issue is no longer "which way educational reform" but rather hinges on our capacity to create a culture that not only feeds us but keeps us caring and belonging.⁷¹

Contrary to the persistent American belief, however, a more humane and just society will never come simply through better schooling, but only through direct political action aimed at achieving that end. Whether American society will ever consent to making the radical changes that are needed to make it reasonably humane and just for most people is, of course, an imponderable question given the conservative history of American reform movements. But unless it does, the schools will continue to reflect the injustices of the social order, they will continue going through periods in which they are either trying to train manpower or just keep youth happy, and the lives of the young will continue to be sacrificed on the altar of social necessity.

notes

1. Richard Witkin, ed., *The Challenge of the Sputnik*, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958, p. 3.
2. H. B. Parkes and V. P. Carosso, *Recent America: A History*, Vol. II, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1963, p. 467.
3. Merle Curti, *The Social Ideas of American Educators*, Paterson, N.J.: Littlefield, Adams, 1965, p. xxxv.
4. See, for example, an interview with Arthur Bestor entitled "What Went Wrong with U.S. Schools," in *U.S. News and World Report*, January 24, 1958, pp. 68 ff.

5. Fred M. Hechinger, *The Big Red Schoolhouse*, Garden City, N.Y.: Dolphin, 1962, pp. 23-24.
6. Clarence Karier, *Man, Society, and Education*, Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1967, pp. 184-216. See also Willis Rudy, *Schools in an Age of Mass Culture*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965, pp. 309-340, and Charles Burgess and Merle L. Borrowman, *What Doctrines To Embrace*, Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1969, p. 126.
7. For capsule summaries and analyses of these works see Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, New York: Vintage Books, 1961, pp. 324-347; Rudy, *loc. cit.*; and Robert McCaul, "Twentieth Century Books Influencing American Education," *Education Digest*, XXXVI, No. 1 (September, 1970), pp. 71-82.
8. James B. Conant, *Education in a Divided World*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948. See also Thomas Grissom, "Education and the Cold War: James B. Conant," in Clarence J. Karier et al., *Roots of Crisis: American Education In The Twentieth Century*, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, pp. 193-194. It was also at the urging of Conant that the Educational Policies Commission had issued a statement on *Education For The Gifted* in 1950. See Conant's brief biography in The National Society For The Study Of Education, *Leaders In American Education*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971, pp. 126-128.
9. Rudy, p. 175.
10. Frank G. Jennings, "It Didn't Start With Sputnik," *Saturday Review*, September 16, 1967, p. 96. Benton published what seems to have been the first article in a large-circulation publication dramatizing the Russian educational challenge under the title "Now the 'Cold War' of the Classrooms" in *The New York Times Magazine* of April 1, 1956. This article and his subsequent reports and warnings were published in book form two years later under the title *This Is The Challenge*, New York: Associated College Presses, 1958.
11. See Paul Woodring's introduction to Hechinger, p. 10.
12. See *Life*, October 16, 1950, p. 11, and pp. 16-17.
13. Hechinger, p. 10.
14. "Crisis In Education," *Life*, March 24, 1958, p. 25. This was the first in a series of *Life* articles on the "Crisis In Education," the remainder of which appeared in the issues for March 31, April 7, 14, and 21, 1958. The series is representative of popular educational journalism in the months after Sputnik and dealt with such topics as the poor working conditions of teachers, the neglect of gifted children, the Physical Science Study Committee, and the influence of the family on learning.
15. "What Price Life Adjustment?" *Time*, December 2, 1957, p. 53, and Clifton Fadiman, "The Mess in Education — Who Is Responsible?" *Reader's Digest*, October, 1958, p. 51, both quoted in David W. Martin, "American Education As Seen in Periodical Literature, 1956-58," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1959, p. 143.
16. Benjamin Fine, "Education In Review: Year Has Brought An Awareness of the Need For a Better System of Schools," *The New York Times*, December 29, 1957, p. 7E. The degree to which education had taken on added importance in the public mind was well

- illustrated by the increase in periodical articles devoted to education. During the year after Sputnik, the number of articles devoted to education in mass circulation periodicals increased by 30 per cent. See Martin, p. 141.
17. National Education Association, *Proceedings*, (1957), p. 55.
 18. Richard M. Nixon, "A Challenge To American Education," *School and Society*, LXXXVI (September 27, 1958), p. 103.
 19. John F. Kennedy, "The Fate of the Nation," *NEA Journal*, XLVII (January, 1958), pp. 10-11.
 20. An example of the hysteria over education at the time is an advertisement which appeared in an October, 1958 issue of *Newsweek* and was later reprinted in *Reader's Digest* that warned, "Johnny had better learn to read. Because you can bet Ivan is spending a lot of time on his books." "We Americans don't want to move the world. But we don't want anyone else to either." See Rudy, p. 175.
 21. Fred M. Hechinger, "Five Basic Problems of Education," *The New York Times Magazine*, January 25, 1959, p. 11.
 22. Riesman himself had offered an analysis of the ills of American education in 1956 in *Constraint and Variety in American Education*. See Rudy, pp. 330-332.
 23. *Prospect For America: The Rockefeller Panel Reports*, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1961, pp. xv-xviii.
 24. Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc. *The Pursuit of Excellence: Education And The Future of America*, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958. Gardner later elaborated on the theme of excellence in two books, *Excellence*, New York: Harper & Row, 1960 and *Self-Renewal*, New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
 25. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
 26. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
 27. "The Educational Challenge," *The New York Times*, June 29, 1958, IV, p. 8:2.
 28. The Educational Policies Commission, in a statement entitled *The Contemporary Challenge to American Education*, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1958, arrived at conclusions similar to those of the Rockefeller panel. A statement issued the following year by the President's Science Advisory Committee, *Education for the Age of Science*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959, was also reminiscent of the Rockefeller report.
 29. Quoted in Sidney Hook, *Education For Modern Man*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963, p. 11.
 30. James D. Koerner, ed., *The Case for Basic Education*, Boston: Little, Brown, 1959.
 31. *Daedulus*, LXXXVIII (Winter, 1959).
 32. Jacques Barzun, *The House of Intellect*, New York: Harper Torchbook, 1961.
 33. Hyman G. Rickover, *Education and Freedom*, New York: E. P. Dutton, 1959.
 34. Hook, p. 11.
 35. James B. Conant, *The American High School Today*, New York: The New American Library, 1964.

36. Karier, *Man, Society, and Education*, p. 254.
37. NSSE, pp. 132-133.
38. Conant himself commented that "the Russians really put Sputnik up right on schedule in 1957 for my purposes. That book was addressed to 20,000 local school boards, all under tremendous pressure from Sputnik." See Terry Ferrer, "Conant Revisited," *Saturday Review*, March 18, 1967, p. 57.
39. James Koerner complained, however, that there were no recognized scholars in any subject involved in Conant's study. See Koerner, p. viii.
40. Karier, *Man, Society, and Education*, p. 253.
41. The Educational Policies Commission's *An Essay on Quality in Public Education*, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1959, apparently influenced by Conant who was a member of the Commission, made recommendations similar to those of Conant's report.
42. For additional criticisms of Conant's study, see Rudy, p. 320.
43. F. M. Hechinger, "Education: The Trends of 1960," *The New York Times*, January 1, 1961, IV, p. 8:1.
44. Burgess and Borrowman, p. 125.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 121.
46. It is clear, however, that Conant had always been concerned about the education of the gifted. This was demonstrated by the fact that at the same time he was participating in the writing of *Education For All American Youth*, he had established the Harvard committee that authored *General Education in a Free Society*, which stressed the importance of high schools giving special attention to the gifted. Conant saw no contradiction between the two documents. See NSSE, pp. 122-126, Burgess and Borrowman, pp. 129-130, and Grissom, pp. 189-193.
47. Rudy, pp. 309-340.
48. Hook, p. 9.
49. Asa S. Knowles, "Education As An Instrument Of National Policy," *Phi Delta Kappan*, XXXIX (April, 1958), p. 309.
50. Hechinger, "Education: The Trends of 1960," p. 8:1.
51. John I. Goodlad, "The Curriculum," in *The National Society For The Study Of Education, The Changing American School*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966, p. 31.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 36.
53. *Ibid.*, pp. 37-38. These themes were discussed in Jerome S. Bruner, *The Process of Education*, New York: Vintage Books, 1960, and W. Kenneth Richmond, *The Teaching Revolution*, London: Methuen, 1967.
54. Burgess and Borrowman, pp. 117, 125, and 136. See also Grissom, pp. 193-194.
55. Jennings, p. 96.
56. The Ford Foundation has recently published an assessment of The Fund's attempts to generate educational reform entitled *A Foundation Goes To School*. The general finding was that the attempts had failed because of the conservatism of educators and school systems.

57. Goodlad, p. 35.
58. This description of the NDEA provisions is based on the one given in S. Alexander Rippa, *Education in a Free Society*, New York: David McKay, 1967, pp. 334-335. The NDEA act was renewed by Congress in 1964 and expanded to provide funds for the improvement of instruction in reading, English, geography, history, and civics.
59. Descriptions of these and most other curriculum projects may be found in John I. Goodlad, *The Changing School Curriculum*, New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1966.
60. TheodoreSizer, "Reform Movement or Panacea," *Saturday Review*, June 19, 1965, and Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Genius Of American Education*, New York: Vintage Books, 1966, pp. 57-58.
61. Charles E. Silberman, *Crisis In The Classroom*, New York: Random House, 1970, p. 182.
62. There were a few educators who managed to keep their wits about them. See, for example, Philip H. Phenix, "Necessity and Educational Policy Reconsidered," *Phi Delta Kappan*, XL (April, 1959), pp. 269-271. Among other things, Phenix argued incisively that "The true necessities of our nation's life today are the compulsions of knowing the truth and doing the right, and these are and have always been the proper goals of education. Insofar as educators become instruments for a national policy more narrowly conceived — in particular, in terms of a power struggle — they not only prove themselves unfaithful to their professional trust, but ultimately disloyal to their nation and to humanity."
63. Ronald and Beatrice Gross, eds., *Radical School Reform*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969, p. 13.
64. For a discussion of the poverty of individualism, see Philip Slater, *The Pursuit of Loneliness*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.
65. Silberman, p. 159.
66. Jerome S. Bruner, "The Process of Education Revisited," *Phi Delta Kappan*, LIII (September, 1971), pp. 18-21.
67. Karier, et al., *Roots of Crisis*, p. 137. On this point see also Burgess and Borrowman, pp. 118-126.
68. *Ibid.*
69. On the issue of what American culture does to even its more fortunate members, see Slater and Anne Roiphe, "'An American Family': Things are Keen but Could be Keener," *The New York Times Magazine*, February 18, 1973, pp. 8 ff.
70. Silberman, p. 203.
71. Bruner, p. 21.

Derek Drummond

School Spaces

In the last twenty-five years, school architects have had to respond to numerous educational innovations that have had both direct and indirect implications on the spatial needs of the teacher and student alike. These innovations include upgrading of the curriculum to include new courses, new methods of instruction such as team teaching, and new patterns of student advancement in non-graded or continuous progress programs. These innovations have made obsolete the traditional "egg-crate" form of schoolhouse consisting of a number of like-sized permanent classrooms placed on either side of a corridor.

In use for the past one hundred years, this spatial arrangement no longer adequately responds to the needs of all educators. New teaching and learning patterns have resulted in instructional groups taking new forms and, in some instances, in the disappearance of the regularly structured time-table.

These new patterns, along with the introduction of advanced educational tools, such as language labs and programmed teaching machines, have generated new architectural responses. In his recent book on schools, James J. Morisseau describes in detail the development of these responses.¹ He points out that the initial break from the "egg-crate" pattern was made to meet the requirements of *specific* educational reforms. Although considerably changed, the schools which resulted were often as rigid and inflexible as their egg-crate predecessors.

The initial response of the architect to the demand for varied sizes of instructional groups was the introduction of operable partitions between pairs of classrooms. This tentative solution enabled the teachers, by simply closing the partitions, to retreat to the traditional form, and while it appealed

to the more conservative teachers and administrators, it did little to support educational reform. However, it was a necessary step towards breaking down resistance to the proposed changes as it provided spaces in which to experiment.

The introduction of operable partitions eventually led to new shapes as designers sought ways of combining more than two classrooms. Still obsessed with the idea of retaining the traditional classroom, the designer went to extraordinary and expensive lengths to achieve flexibility through the use of these partitions. He experimented with clustering and found that by grouping three or four classrooms, larger spaces of a more useful shape could be created.

Eventually the need for a more flexible space led to the use of the "loft" space. This type of space, often found in light industrial buildings, is characterized by long clear spans with a minimum of internal supports. Specific internal spaces were defined by demountable partitions of a semi-permanent nature. The location of these partitions was not dictated by internal supports and hence more flexibility was achieved.

responses to the economic problem

The need for "loft" space involving a simplified structural system coincided with the development of an overall systems approach to the building of schools. Developed as a response to the increasing financial burden of funding school construction, the systems approach was formulated to enable schools to be built of modular, pre-engineered components. Such systems as those developed by the School Construction System Development in California (SCSD) and the Study of Educational Facilities in Ontario (SEF) should not be regarded as attempts to provide more flexible space but merely an attempt to reduce the increasing cost of providing educational facilities.

In the interests of economy, many other cost-saving innovations have been attempted. A particularly inhuman solution was the introduction of *windowless schools*. In criticizing windowless office buildings, Robert Sommer, a teacher of Psychology and Environmental Studies, pointed out that:

Technical and scientific discoveries are responsible for some contemporary forms. The modern egg factory, a long windowless chicken coop, resulted from the discovery that Vitamin D added to the diet of chickens should replace natural daylight. No single break-through like this was responsible for the windowless office building.²

Although a clear saving in terms of material and construc-

tion can be realized from the elimination of windows, the cost in terms of the psychological effect on the users of the buildings cannot be minimized. Architects must be aware of the student's physical and emotional response to his surroundings — not only to heating, cooling, lighting and acoustics, but also to the visual and tactile environment. Surely, to fulfill all the requirements necessary for mental and emotional comfort and efficiency, these responses *must* include interaction with the external environment. Prolonged periods of enforced isolation from visual contact with the external environment in the interests of economy (and perhaps in a hoped-for decrease in distractions) are not an acceptable alternative.

interior ancillary spaces

One of the weakest aspects of school design has been in the treatment of the links between the formal learning spaces and ancillary interior and exterior spaces. It is imperative that designers abandon the idea that the walls of the classroom mark the boundaries of the child's learning. The teaching or learning area should be conceived as the whole school environment rather than as a series of individual semi-isolated spaces. This total approach to design for learning must extend to the boundaries of the school site and include a comprehensive design for the use of spaces exterior to the school building itself. Spaces other than those planned for formal activities appear to have been deliberately designed to decrease social contact. Reinforced by the rules of the school, corridors, for example, remain a means of moving from one space to another rather than being consciously designed to provide space to encourage interaction among students. Robert Sommer has concluded, with some sarcasm, that "Human contact in the form of casual conversation is a threat to order and a distraction to the assembly line."

Ideally, links between formal learning spaces must become learning spaces themselves. They must be designed to increase informal social contact. Where corridors now exist, they must be renovated so that they can serve as work-spaces, sitting areas or play spaces. Non-teaching spaces presently represent more than forty percent of the area of schools. Areas not designated for essential non-teaching purposes — cafeteria, teachers' lounge, gym, maintenance, etc., must be more effectively used.

spaces outside the school building

Alfred Roth's study of schools in Switzerland indicated an average of 400 square feet of gross area allocated for each pupil in primary schools.⁴ (Gross area is defined, in this instance, as the total size of the site on which the school is located.) English standards are of the same order although there are some outstanding examples of schools with much higher ratios. North American expert Ernest J. Kump has recommended 1,722 square feet per student with the proviso that the exterior space also serve the local neighborhood as a park.

Investigating the situation in the region of Montreal, one finds standards significantly below those found in Europe and only a fraction of those recommended for North America. We are faced with a situation in which the importance of non-academic activities, especially physical training, games and sports is well down the list of educational priorities. This is manifested by the relatively small amount of space provided in schools here for such activities.

This lack is pinpointed by a study of the gross amount of space allocated per student for specific schools. Obviously, inner city schools have the least number of square feet per student. A study of five primary schools of the Montreal Catholic School Commission in the eastern sector of the city of Montreal reveals an average provision of 105 square feet per student. Individual examples range as low as 45.5 square feet per student up to a maximum of 140 square feet per student. In Westmount, a wealthy suburb of Montreal, the area provided for Roslyn, a primary school, is 130 square feet per student. Here the figure has been reduced by a considerable expansion of the school since its original construction without proportionally expanding its site. This is a common occurrence in the case of urban schools since site expansion would normally be prevented by existing streets and buildings. In terms of gross area per student, suburban students are better off than their urban counterparts. However, the area provided still falls well below the standards prevalent in Europe.

A study of three recently constructed primary schools in Beaconsfield,⁵ a suburban community west of Montreal, reveals an average of 291 square feet provided per student. Two of the schools are on similarly shaped sites and have been "landscaped" by the same authority. The sites are flat and an area at the rear of the schools of approximately sixty feet in width has been asphalted. The remainder of the site is grass

with one or two trees, and the entire area is surrounded by a chain link fence. Our study has yet to examine, in detail, the children's use of the site, but preliminary observations at one school indicate that the area showing the most use is where some large trees provide shade (here the grass has been worn away) and the land itself is other than flat.

If the "school," therefore, is to include, in addition to classrooms, other opportunities for learning, it will not only have to provide gardens, play areas, games areas and exterior teaching spaces, but will also have to ensure that all these spaces are better integrated.

planning the school grounds

The design of the total school environment is a challenge which must be met by the designer and the educator alike. The planning of the exterior spaces must be carefully integrated with the design and function of interior spaces and must be undertaken from the outset rather than being considered only after the building has been completed. By complementing the built form with landscaping — earth mounds, free-standing walls, trees and other forms of planting — exterior spaces may be shaped to provide for specific activities. The spaces surrounding the school can fulfill a more useful purpose other than merely serving as waiting rooms, as they tend to do now.

With imaginative planning, exterior spaces can, for at least four to five months of the school year, be used as *teaching spaces*. This requires a partially covered, paved area with proper orientation, direct connection with interior teaching spaces and the possibility of visual surveillance of the students by the teacher. The only areas presently designed in such a manner are those connected to the kindergartens. However, if the usual trend for innovation in education to be initiated at the lower levels and gradually extend to the higher levels prevails, we may perhaps anticipate the eventual development of such exterior spaces in elementary and secondary schools.

Alfred Roth emphasizes the physiological and regenerative functions of the school yard,⁶ as well as its usefulness as a teaching space. Educators are encouraged to allow the child to spend as much time as possible outdoors owing to the fundamental benefit derived by the child in physical, mental and moral growth. "Good landscaping and the appropriate distribution of green spaces will give the child what it needs: an harmonious equilibrium between organized and free physical and intellectual activities."

Given the accepted importance of play in the physical, intellectual and emotional development of children, surprisingly little is known of the patterns of play related to the school environment. And the little that is known has not yet been applied in the design of exterior learning spaces. This is most evident in urban schools where the norm is a single, asphalted, prison-like yard. In primary schools, children from five to twelve years old are expected to play in the same space. The only recognition of specific activities is expressed in the painting by the authorities of white lines delineating boundaries for individual games.

In contrast to other ancillary exterior facilities, the recreation area must be separated from the teaching areas and include facilities for games as well as space for quiet informal interaction between students. Planned provision of the latter is completely lacking in today's schools. Emphasis, if any, has been placed on the provision of areas for the more vigorous activities of the older children. Bearing in mind the users and their usual activities, the recreation space must be subdivided to allow the children of different ages and needs to co-exist easily.

Spaces should be planned to allow their use by some of the students while others remain in the formal interior teaching spaces. This requires noise control, either in the form of physical barriers or separation of the activities by sufficient distances. Visual separation is also important as children working inside could be distracted by those playing outside. Coupling this constraint with the desirability of good visual contact with some aspects of the exterior, the designer is presented with a difficult but not unsolvable problem.

The ideal solution can be envisaged as a single-storey school with each interior learning space opening out to a partially-covered, paved, sun-filled, wind-protected exterior teaching and learning space. Beyond this "learning court," and both visually and acoustically separated from it, would be a recreation area designed to include both passive and vigorous activities.

new directions in school architecture

New directions in educational processes have, as has been mentioned above, induced the architect to respond with new arrangements and building forms. Anticipating further developments in educational technology and consequent changes in spatial demands, the architect must approach the design of

physical aspects of the educational environment in a more comprehensive manner. The concept of a truly flexible school requires a shift in the traditional role of the designer. Professor Theodore Larsen, Director of the University of Michigan's School Environments Research Project states that:

The architect now comes in at the very inception of the school curriculum, participates in setting up the original design programs, creates the original plant, then continues on as a design consultant.⁸

By supervising and designing for change, the architect remains involved with the school on a continuing basis. When the architect is not involved in this way, it can lead to situations such as that which occurred in California involving the systems developed by School Construction System Development. John Boice, in a study evaluating two SCSD schools, discovered that a majority of the teachers were not even aware of the flexibility of the system, and of those who were aware of it, few knew how to effect the changes which were possible.⁹

Not only will the continuing involvement of the architect help avoid such occurrences, but the architect, himself, through a continuing association with teachers and students, will be better prepared to design future schools.

obsolescence and renovation

The highly diverse nature of education, characterized by rapid change, necessitates the consideration of the school as a building always in a transitional state. Only when it becomes structurally obsolete and must be demolished should its usefulness finally be considered to be at an end.

The present problem faced by most school commissions, therefore, is not the construction of new schools, but the renovation of existing schools in response to new educational demands. These renovations have, in some instances, proved more successful than one might suspect. The handicap of adapting an existing structural system to new uses, together with, in most cases, the problem of a serious lack of ground area, can be countered by the fact that the alterations are in *direct* response to the needs of a group of teachers and students presently using the building.

Contrasted with the usual situation in which the decisions are made by the school authorities, the participation of the users of the facility has obvious advantages. These renovations are characterized by the disappearance of the traditional classroom and the creation of large open spaces. Where

acoustic or visual separation is desirable, new systems of partitioning are introduced.

A more difficult aspect of renovation is incorporating the concept of the integration of the building and the site at the planning stage. Many of our existing schools are designed in such a way as to make contact with exterior spaces difficult. Most are built on sites where expansion to provide an acceptable level of gross area per student would be prohibitive in terms of cost and neighborhood disruption. However, these problems must be overcome as the provision of improved, comprehensively designed and maintained facilities is essential to support evolving developments in education.

Recognizing that the arrangement of learning spaces controls the movement of both students and teachers in the school and hence their personal contacts, the designer, by easing the rigidity imposed by the traditional egg-crate plan, can create freedom of movement which would result in beneficial changes to the learning environment. Increased visibility of various activities and additional opportunities for interpersonal contacts should lead to increased participation, interest and involvement on the part of both students and teachers.

references

1. James J. Morisseau, *The New Schools*, New York: Van Nostrand-Reinhold Company, 1972.
2. Robert Sommer, *Tight Spaces*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974, p. 114.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 83.
4. Alfred Roth, *New School Building*, London: Thames & Hudson, 1966, pp. 16-17.
5. Beacon Hill School, St. Edmunds School, and St. Rémi School.
6. Alfred Roth, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
7. *Ibid.*
8. Theodore Larson, "Schools," *Progressive Architecture*, Vol. XLIX, No. 4, (April, 1968), p. 154.
9. John Boice, *Evaluation: Two Studies of SCSD Schools*, Research Report No. 2, Building Systems Clearinghouse, California, n.d.

W. Kenneth Richmond

Education and Schooling: What's the Difference?

In the first place, why bother to look for a distinction between the two terms? Why all this fuss about the use of words which everyone recognizes to be fuzzy, and why pretend to feel concerned if they *are* commonly taken to be interchangeable? Many would say that the question, "What is the difference between education and schooling?" if not actually improper, involves a verbal quibble and to that extent deserves to be dismissed as a non-problem. English usage is essentially flexible in these matters, after all, not given to the terminological exactitude of other European languages.

Sociologists, for their part, are not in the least inclined to insist on the need to draw any firm distinction between education and schooling. For them the organized learning which takes place in schools and similar institutions which together form the education system as a whole is a social *fact*. They have a point, of course. For practical purposes we must agree that entries in *Who's Who* informing us that so-and-so was "educated at Eton and Trinity" are in some sense correct: it would be highly pedantic to object that strictly speaking, the word ought to be "schooled!"

Chameleon-like, the meaning of the word "education" is as variable as its contexts in time and space. Too late in the day to protest that it was invented in the eighteenth century by schoolmasters who wished to give their work a spurious and inflated self-importance. The truth is that ever since mass schooling was first introduced, the enlargement of its influence and control over the young has fostered the impression that there is little or no significant difference between education and schooling. Formerly, the family, the Church, apprenticeship, neighborhood and other social agencies played a major role in the rearing, nurture and upbringing of chil-

dren. Significantly, these words are no longer fashionable in the technical jargon of education. As R. S. Peters remarks:

There is a general concept of "education" which covers almost any process of learning, rearing or growing up. Nowadays, when we speak of education in this general way, we usually mean going to school, to an institution devoted to learning.¹

This conflation of the word "education" to cover a wide range of functions can be seen as resulting from the gradual take-over by state-controlled bureaucracies of responsibilities which were originally discharged either by individuals on their own behalf or by informal, voluntary organizations. This aggrandizement is so obvious that it scarcely needs to be illustrated. Thus, in recent years, Teacher Training Colleges have been re-named Colleges of Education an honorific title which owes more to status-seeking motives than anything else. A similar pretentiousness is the trade mark of most histories of education, in which the relatively insignificant part played by formal schooling in the cognitive and personal development of the young has been consistently suppressed for the sake of bolstering up an importance which it never possessed. To date, in Sol Cohen's judgement, most historians, in confusing education with schooling, stand guilty of the sin of parochialism ("writing a narrow history of the schools") and the sin of evangelism ("seeking to inspire teachers with professional zeal rather than attempting to understand what really happened").² Ministers of Education would, no doubt, be very surprised if they were advised that their titles of office were misleading and that it might be better for all concerned if they reverted to calling themselves Ministers of Public Instruction. Most Professors of Education would be indignant — for the same reasons as were the Sophists in Socrates' day — if it were put to them that they were violating some as yet unwritten Trade Descriptions Act, still more indignant if it were suggested that they were regularly in the habit of condoning practices which were positively mis-educative.

But, surely, it will be said, most of us are well aware of the difference between education and schooling and cannot be accused of falling into the error of supposing that one is the same as the other. In fact, although many of us privately recognize the need to draw a distinction, we find it difficult to do anything of the kind; and in public we tend to go along with the opinion that no great harm can come of treating the two terms as if they really were synonymous. And even if our attitude is not so easy-going as this, the general view

seems to be that education and schooling, like love and marriage, go together; and that in the words of yesteryear's popular song, "You can't have one without the other."



"TEESIDE TEACHERS' STRIKE: PUPILS MISS EDUCATION," a newspaper headline announces. Children attend school in order to receive an education, thinks the average parent — in the same way that shoppers go to the supermarket to buy groceries. "Education," in short, has come to be thought of as a commodity, a package deal; and "schooling" provides its service station. Since the latter is the monopoly of the "education system" it is hardly surprising that the notion of education without schooling should have come to seem a contradiction in terms.

Are we only playing at word-games, then, in seeking to draw a distinction? Granted, both terms belong to the class which Wittgenstein described as blurred at the edges, interpenetrating and shading off into each other so imperceptibly that there seems to be no saying for certain where schooling ends and education begins. As Polanyi says:

We must accept the risks of semantic indeterminacy, since only words of indeterminate meaning can have a bearing on reality and that for meeting this hazard we must credit ourselves with the ability to perceive such bearing.³

Seeing that it is useless to look for definitions, and in view of the close family resemblance between education and schooling, what possible harm can there be in treating them as if they were synonymous? As to that, the obvious retort must be that it would be folly to conclude that they are identical simply because they share certain affinities. In any case, we cannot ignore the social fact that, "ordinary language has lost the ability to distinguish between procedure and substance, schooling and education, curricular participation and learning."⁴

In order to achieve clarification, the first step is to pinpoint the essential characteristics of the two concepts. The following list enumerates some of these in the form of propositions. If any of these propositions is held to be unarguable it will be because a clear distinction is self-evident. If, on the other hand, a valid objection can be raised against any of these propositions, the objection will at least serve as a cue for further discussion.

(1) *"Education" is much the fuzzier of the two concepts.*

Schooling is a tangible process, embodied in institutions:

it has its "outward and visible signs," whereas education corresponds rather to an "inward, invisible grace." In other words, whether or not a person has been subjected to schooling admits of no argument: whether or not he can be said to be educated is more doubtful.

- (2) *"Education" is a more socially prestigious word than "Schooling."*

In Ryle's terminology "education" is an *achievement* word, "schooling" a *task* word.

Alternatively, "education" is U, "schooling" Non-U (i.e. an O.K. word vis-à-vis one which is not quite O.K.).

- (3) *There is a part-whole relationship between Schooling and Education.*

Schooling is only one among a number of social agencies concerned with the process of education.

- (4) *There is a means-end relationship between Schooling and Education.*

Schooling serves a propaedeutic purpose in making education possible. It is, as Bruner says, an *enabling* process which helps the learner to become a responsible agent. Education is what happens when he leaves his instructor behind and takes off on his own. Carl Bereiter, in an article entitled "Schools without Education" in the *Harvard Educational Review*,⁵ argues forcibly that we would do well to drop the pretence that schools exist to provide pupils with an "education": far better, he thinks, to cut our losses and agree that all they can rightly be expected to do is to provide basic training.

- (5) *Schooling is largely concerned with training in specific skills whereas education is all-pervasive in its influence.* We usually say that a man has been schooled in this, that or the other field of knowledge, but we speak of him as "educated" without any such qualification. According to R. S. Peters, "*trained* suggests the development of competence in a limited skill or mode of thought whereas *educated* suggests a linkage with a wider system of belief."⁶

OBJECTION

A. N. Whitehead maintained, rightly, that any liberal education worth the name must enable a man to *know* something well and to *do* something well. Again, in *The Evolution of Educational Theory*, Sir John Adams warned against the

futile and effete notion of "the man who is educated, just that and nothing more."

- (6) *Animals can be schooled but only human beings can properly be said to be educated.*

Dolphins, even killer whales, can be taught, instructed, conditioned, trained, "gentled," — schooled — to perform all manner of engaging tricks. Possibly the greatest danger in the current tendency to identify education with schooling is that it leads ultimately to a dehumanization of theory and practice. In the last resort, education has to do with what M. V. C. Jeffreys has called "the sacred and hidden identity which no techniques can reach."

OBJECTION 1

"School is the one difference between men and animals. Animals don't go to school. In the Free Development of their Personality, swallows have built their nests in exactly the same way for millenniums."

OBJECTION 2

As late as the 19th century, English usage saw nothing wrong in speaking of the education of animals and even plants. The idea of an "educated man" is of comparatively recent origin.

- (7) *Schooling has its detractors but everyone, apparently, is in favor of Education.*

Anti-school criticism has a long history, too long to recapitulate here. One has only to think of Quintilian's castigations of the vices of Roman schools, of Luther's fulminations against them as "slaughter-houses of the mind," of Rousseau's contempt for "jeunes professeurs," of Pestalozzi's sad comment on the pupils of Geneva, "Sie kennen viel und wissen nichts," of Dewey's complaint about "the divorce of school from life," etc., — and in the contemporary situation of Kozol's "Death at an Early Age," Freire's "Pedagogy of the Oppressed" or John Holt's round assertion that "Schools are bad places for kids." Yet in denouncing *schooling*, all these critics urge the cause of *education* and stress its benefits.

OBJECTION

But these criticisms apply only to bad schooling, not to schooling *per se*.

- (8) *Under certain conditions, schooling can be shown to be miseducative — which would be impossible if schooling and education were invariably identical.*

Just what these "certain conditions" are, and how they arise, should therefore be our immediate concern. See 15 *infra* for further discussion of this point. Suffice for the moment to say that there is plenty of evidence to suggest that, for a substantial proportion of non-academic teenagers, prolonged schooling is too much of a good thing. For many, the raising of the school-leaving age merely confirms and reinforces the sense of anomie, frustration and low ego-concepts which they have acquired en route and from which they are unlikely to recover. The overt objectives of the secondary school, measured in terms of cognitive achievement, mask its covert objectives — the hidden curriculum which operates only too efficiently in condemning a majority to the role of third-class citizens. "The fact that much of what goes by the name of education, i.e. schooling, teaching, and learning does not necessarily assist in the optimization of human life, and in fact is often non-, mis-, or even anti-educative, signifies the general inadequacy of the educationists' preparation for, and comprehension of their role."

New ventures, like the so-called "School without Walls," must therefore be seen as necessary attempts to mount a rescue operation, releasing young adults from enforced confinement and restoring them to their rightful place as active members in society. Plutarch's saying, "The City is the best teacher," is at the heart of many of the significant innovations and experiments in educational reform today. Over-schooling, we are now beginning to realize, has the effect of prolonging childhood and adolescence unnecessarily, a device for preserving the learner in a state of submissive dependence. Despite its protestations to the contrary, it does everything possible to sidetrack, if it does not actually deny, the will to be free, to be different, to "do one's own thing" — which explains why so many of the youngsters nowadays are driven to seek outlets for personal satisfaction outside the school system. Task forces, Youth Volunteers, community service — these are the growth-points for tomorrow's education.

- (9) *Schooling is imposed on the learner willynilly, but education is liberal in the sense that it implies the existence of a responsible free agent.*

To be in *statu pupillari* is to submit to the authority and discipline of a mentor. Voluntary learning admits of no such need. In Rousseau's terminology, school learning is *labor* (being consciously subject to external, adult authority), whereas spontaneous, playful learning is *opus*. In Illich's terminology, it is the difference between a *bureaucratic*, rule-bound learning situation and one which is *convivial*. In Piagetian terms, it is the difference between *assimilation* and *accommodation*.

OBJECTION 1

In the case of young children, compulsion, however arbitrary, is necessary for their protection. Even as adults, most of us have reason to be grateful for having been forced to learn and do things against our personal inclinations. Says Peters, "Gifted teachers are precisely those who can get children going on activities which have no initial appeal to them".⁹

OBJECTION 2

Willynilly? This argument smacks too strongly of the old, unwillingly-to-school plaint. In any case, schooling does not *have* to be compulsory.

- (10) *Educere aut Educare? In general, education corresponds to the former, schooling to the latter.*

True enough, debates about the derivatives from these Latin verbs are mostly claptrap. At the same time, they serve to highlight the difference between those two schools of thought which, for the sake of convenience, are commonly referred to as "teacher-based" and "child centred." Hitherto, educational theory and practice have been predominantly "teacher-based," the assumption being that education was a process which was administered to the learner — a matter of doing things to him and for him — *not* a process in which he was the prime mover.

The Socratic method, Rousseau's negative education, Dewey's Progressivism, activity methods and integrated day curricula in primary schools, resources for learning projects, *et al.*, each represent an attempt to carry into practice a theory which holds that in the first and last resort the learner must be encouraged to get an education for himself. In the past, this theory and practice failed to find universal acceptance because adults were convinced that children were incapable of doing anything of the sort

and could not be trusted with the responsibility. Hence the stress on classroom instruction.

In the original edition of his masterly review of resource-based learning projects, L. C. Taylor took a somewhat gloomy view of their chances of succeeding. In the second edition, he is decidedly more optimistic. As he says, "The pace of change is now such that "recurrent" education is likely to become the general experience. An independent, resource-based style of learning provides a more suitable preparation than does class teaching for continued studies."¹⁰

To repeat, schooling serves a propaedeutic purpose in making education possible. The point is made more simply and elegantly by the children of Barbiana: "The teacher gives to a boy everything the teacher himself believes, loves and hopes for. The boy, *growing up, will add something of his own.*"¹¹

It is this growing-up-and-adding-something-of-his-own which the professional educationist tends to ignore. Pre-occupied with the "forms of knowledge" which are "public" only in the sense that they are the private monopoly of intellectuals, his concept of education is restrictive. The "knowledge" he peddles belongs to the realm of uncommon-sense (as Bernstein categorises it) and largely rules out the world of common-sense learning and existential knowing. The fact that the mass of ordinary folk do not share this concept is not to be held against them. It is only the sin of Pedagogue's Pride which causes us to look down on simple souls like Monsieur Jourdain because they are unaware of the fact that they have been talking prose (and good sense) all their lives. In short, schooling normally relies heavily on external discipline; education presupposes the exercise of inner freedom and self-discipline.

- (11) *Schooling promotes rational thought; education is the development of personal judgement and understanding.*

OBJECTION

Even Socrates seems to have been doubtful about the possibility of making men wise. Why not settle for more tangible objectives?

- (12) *Schooling is necessarily institutional, education not so.*
In all societies, schooling represents a systematic attempt

to organize learning collectively. Education, by contrast, is the concern of the individual. Ideally, the interests of the individual and of society coincide. Insofar as there is a conflict of interests, it is arguable that there is a vital difference between schooling and education.

The self-educated man may be a rarity in the modern world, but to speak of him as self-schooled makes no sense at all.

- (13) *Schooling ends sooner or later, but education is a continuous process for which death is the only terminal behaviour.*

Properly conducted, schooling sets the pupil on the road to lifelong learning. The indications are that too often it does nothing of the sort.

- (14) *Education is to schooling as theory is to practice.*

Thus, "schooling" is what we actually get, "education" is what we are *supposed* to receive. In fact, what we get is:

- (a) Instruction
- (b) Custodial care
- (c) Socialization
- (d) Classification

What we are *supposed* to get is something more than the sum of these parts — "the nurture of personal growth," "the whole man," etc., etc. To pretend that education is all one with schooling is, therefore, to perpetrate a colossal confidence trick. Quite apart from the disparity between the overt and covert objectives of schooling (already discussed under point 8), schooling is patently inefficient in fulfilling each of these four main functions:

- (a) As regards *instruction*, courses are often irrelevant or so organized as to ensure that many pupils are left with a permanent sense of failure and inferiority. Despite the best efforts of curriculum developers to validate the hypothesis that, "Any subject can be taught in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development," the only possible verdict must be that the search for a viable alternative to academic-type secondary education has demonstrably failed. Secondary schooling on the traditional model caters for a certain kind of intelligence, emphasizes the importance of symbolic skills and bestows its favors and rewards on those pupils — predominantly middle-class — who abide by the

"Principle of Deferred Gratification." Inevitably, the effect of formal classroom instruction is to depreciate the average and below-average ability pupils: a depreciation which one critic, not without cause, has styled "the great brain robbery."

- (b) *Custodial care*, so far as young children are concerned, may be a necessary function *in loco parentis* in modern industrial societies, but it is not altogether cynical to see it as a street-cleaning operation designed to keep teenagers out of circulation and to preserve them in an indeterminate status, in limbo between childhood and adulthood.
- (c) *Socialization*, in practice, means training children to accept the conventional wisdom, the effect of which is to confirm the values and requirements of an acquisitive, consumer society.
- (d) *Classification*, seen by sociologists as the main function of any educational system, involves the selection and grading of pupils for their future occupational roles. It results in the kind of schooling which is geared to examination requirements and intense competition for paper qualifications. So organized, schooling becomes a bitter game in which, in the nature of things, there are relatively few winners and many losers. In this stressful situation, learning is mostly *labor* and *opus* gets short shrift. Granted, because of the complex division of labor in advanced industrial societies, some method of selection and grading is essential. The question is whether this function ought to be discharged primarily by the school. As things are, many of the decisions affecting the learner's future occupational role are taken far too prematurely: at an early age he is labelled fit for this, that or the other category in the Registrar General's list — and the labels may stick for the rest of his working life. Worst of all, he may come to accept the evaluation placed upon him by the school. As for the examination fetish, there are good reasons for thinking that it has now reached the stage when it is on a par with the selling of indulgences in Luther's day. In too many cases, these so-called paper qualifications bear little or no direct or indirect relation to the learner's on-the-job performance: a wholesale racket which is nicely satirized by Ivar Berg in

The Great Training Robbery.

Both as regards the parts and the sum of the parts, then, there is a blatant credibility gap between our professed theory of education and its practice in schools. Clearly, a distinction has to be drawn between What-is (i.e. schooling) and What-might-be (education).

OBJECTION

This may well be the case, but all it proves is that we live in an imperfect world. Socrate's comment (in *The Republic*) about the impossibility of implementing idealistic plans seems relevant here.

- (15) *Schooling, i. e. the compulsory institutionalising of the young, is an invention of 19th century industrial mass production: an ersatz process compared with that of liberal education which was always associated with, and reserved for, a leisured class.*

On this reckoning, the objections raised previously (7, 9) can be dismissed on the grounds that compulsion, at any rate beyond early adolescence, is one of the conditions which make for bad schooling.

- (16) *Schooling puts a heavy premium on verbal reasoning and on testable cognitive skills — scholarship — but these cannot be considered the sole criteria of educational achievement.*

During the 19th century literacy was the main stock in trade of the schools. Ever since the invention of printing, indeed, our ideas about what constitutes "learning" and "knowledge" have been book-based. Just how these ideas came to be legitimised — or rather institutionalised — has been elucidated by Father Ong in his study of Ramus¹² and by Marshall McLuhan in *The Gutenberg Galaxy*. We forget that two of the most influential educators in the Western World, Socrates and Jesus Christ, left no written record of their teaching.

The extent to which our educational theory and practice, even our philosophies of education, are themselves institutionalized explains the curious blind spot which prevents most people, none more than professional educationists, from recognizing the many kinds of informal, non-verbal learning which receive no credit in schooling. Was Michaelangelo an educated man? R. S. Peters thinks

not, apparently! Says he, "We do not call a person "educated" who has simply mastered a skill even though the skill be very highly prized such as pottery."¹³ Or sculpture, it is fair to ask? What sort of cognitive perspective is it, one wonders, that can pass judgements like this?

The case of Michaelangelo, a typical pre-Gutenberg artist, is worth pondering if only to make the point that cultural values are relative, not absolute. It is true that he wrote sonnets and that, under protest, he painted the ceiling and wall of the Sistine Chapel, but for him sculpture was the supreme art, painting a next-best form of creative expression and literature a poor third. "Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must create an image," was the sum of his philosophy. What he had to "say" could not be adequately communicated in words: it had to be hewn, at times in a white heat of fury, from the mute block. So the Sonnets, moving as they are, lack the *terribilita* of his *Last Judgement*; and that awesome fresco, in turn, is not so sublime as his *Moses*: while none of them can match the unspeakable pathos of the Rondanini *Pietà*.

This digression might seem to run the risk of stating the obvious were it not that schooling is pre-eminently a matter of verbal learning and our educational psychology one which equates intelligence with verbal reasoning. We need a more human evaluation. The extent to which our modes of thought have been moulded by four hundred years of reading and writing can scarcely be exaggerated. Only recently have a few perceptive thinkers become aware of it and dared to crack some of the time honored, case-hardened presuppositions which determine our current theory and practice of education. The new theory and practice, as yet dimly envisaged, will conceive of education not as a process confined more or less to schooling but rather as a family of processes.

- (17) *Schooling is necessarily formal and deliberate, but education can be both informal and non-deliberate.*

It is often said that education is what is left when everything learned at school has been forgotten. The inference seems to be that education, like digestion, is largely a matter of unconscious assimilation. Schooling implies the need for conscious effort on the part of the pupil, compliance with regulations, obedience to the dictates of adults, "paying attention." Schooling, in short, means undergoing corrective treatment. Education, on the other

hand, is what one makes of one's schooling. Presumably this is what Nunn had in mind when he said that "Character is what each of us makes out of his temperament." For better or for worse, one *receives* a schooling. One acquires an education. Education is the Pygmalion at work in each of us, only as St. Augustine put it, "The Master is within."

- (18) *Education is perfectly possible in the absence of schooling.*
Q. E. D.

Thomas Huxley thought so, as did Margaret Mead's aunt. Oddly enough, even R. S. Peters agrees: "In the end, education is something that only the individual can achieve for himself. . . . He can do it in solitary confinement."¹⁴

references

1. R. S. Peters, "The Justification of Education," in *The Philosophy of Education*, ed. R. S. Peters, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973, p. 238.
2. Sol Cohen, "New Perspectives in the History of American Education," *History of Education*, ed. M. Seaborne, London: David & Charles, 1973, Vol. 2, p. 82.
3. M. Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1958, p. 251.
4. Ivan Illich, *On the Necessity to Deschool Society*, New York: UNESCO International Commission on the Development of Education (Series B: Opinions), 1971.
5. C. Bereiter, "Schools Without Education," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 42, No. 3 (August 1972), pp. 390-413.
6. R. S. Peters, *Ethics and Education*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1966, p. 32.
7. School of Barbiana, *Letter to a Teacher*, Hamondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1970.
8. Mark Braham, "The Grounding of the Technologist." Paper presented to APLET Conference, Falmer, 1973.
9. Peters, *Ethics and Education*, p. 39.
10. L. C. Taylor, *Resources for Learning*, Hamondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 2nd ed. 1972, p. 247.
11. *Letter to a Teacher*.
12. W. Ong, *Ramus: Method and the Decay of Dialogue*, New York: Octagon Books, 1972, p. 150.
13. Peters, *Ethics and Education*, p. 30.
14. Peters, *Ethics and Education*, p. 38.

**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
FROM
THE CANADA COUNCIL'S CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
ON THE INDIVIDUAL, LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY**

The Canada Council, advised by the Development Committee of its Academic Panel, has established a Consultative Committee on the Individual, Language and Society.

Among the areas of concern of this Committee will be the emotional and cognitive consequences of second language acquisition, bi- and multi- language facility, minority ethnic status, acculturation and deculturation. Broadly speaking, the focus is on:

- A. Linguistic studies with a social component;
- B. Psychological studies with a language component;
- C. Social studies with a language component.

The Committee is charged with assessing the state of research in the area, identifying gaps in that research and making recommendations to the Canada Council about ways of filling these gaps.

A critical aspect of the Committee's work is to identify all scholars in Canada who are working in the area of the Committee's concern. One approach is to solicit information through notices in publications such as this.

We ask scholars whose research bears on the terms-of-reference of the Committee to write to: —

**Dr. W. H. Coons, Chairman,
Consultative Committee
on the Individual, Language and Society,
Department of Psychology,
York University,
Downsview, Ontario, M3J 1P3.**

It would be appreciated if each respondent would indicate his research interests, problems he has encountered in the conduct of his work (including financial problems), fields of study in need of special attention, the names of others working in the area, and anything else which he thinks the Committee should consider.

George Johnston

Missionaries as Educators

I

Christianity is a religion of concepts and not merely the recitation of a cult or the observance of pious practices; in this it resembles the Judaism from which it sprang and the Islam that succeeded both in the early medieval Near East, whilst at the same time differing widely from the polytheistic religion of the Graeco-Roman world. The ideas that are involved focus on the meaning of the Godhead and his purposes, and as a consequence on the implications of theology for human behavior in the whole of its range. We can say that the Christian faith is at once prophetic and ethical. Its foundations are in a tradition that is biblical and therefore literary. Jesus, like his apostolic successors, presupposed the importance of the Hebrew scriptures; Origen and St. Augustine and the Schoolmen of the Middle Ages all presupposed the Christian Bible. And that remains true to this day.

An inevitable result of this is the impetus given to literacy and learning, and therefore to education. An educational enterprise is built into the primal stuff of such a faith — God's human representative was a teacher from an obscure province; and his succeeding representatives have always been likewise teachers as well as pastors. Hence a Christian missionary is bound to be at least a part-time educator.

II

In the ancient Catholic Church schools soon appeared alongside the official Roman colleges and schools — at Alexandria, Antioch, Nisibis, Odessa, for example. Later, after the collapse of the Western Empire education was maintained within the monasteries; secular classics as well as sacred books were copied and studied. It would take too long to speak of the signi-

ficance of the Catechetical Schools in great sees like Jerusalem under bishop Cyril, and of the contribution of leading scholars like Origen of Alexandria, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Basil of Caesarea, and St. Augustine of Hippo, but one should remember the Benedictine motto, "ora et labora" ("pray and work"), as an ideal for monks. That has given color and direction ever since to Catholic education.

When we come to the Renaissance-Reformation period, we find that church and school in each parish was a Reformed ideal, e. g., in John Knox's Scotland; but mission beyond Europe was not seriously regarded by this branch of the Church until 1700. It was Roman Catholics who took the faith to China and Japan (St. Francis Xavier), to Spanish America, to Portuguese Africa and India, to Huronia and Kébec (Fr. Brébeuf and his Jesuit companions). They did not in every case make education a primary feature of their efforts, but they did not neglect teaching. Sometimes, however, Catholic missions seem to be more cultic than educational, and less interested in producing an intellectually mature, alert and critical laity.

III

The modern missionary movement began about 1700 with the Anglican Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (S.P.G.), a corresponding Scots society, a Danish Lutheran missionary society, and Moravian work overseas. A hundred years later came the Bible Societies to provide books and tracts and thus to increase the demand for literacy. We have not seen the end of this process yet, though the Japanese and the Soviet Governments, and to some extent those of India and other recently "liberated" nations, have been even more successful than the Churches in teaching people to read and write. In our own time the outstanding name in the Christian literacy movement is that of Dr. Frank Laubach, whose slogan was "Each one teach one."

Since 1820 or thereabouts, mission activities have flourished through the work of the American Board of Foreign Missions, the National Church of Scotland, as a Church, the S.P.G. and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (S.P.C.K.) and the Church Missionary Society within the Church of England and the Anglican Communion throughout the British Commonwealth, as well as corresponding Societies, agencies and churches of the European Reformed Churches (Lutheran and Evangelical), to say nothing of a vast number of in-

dependent Mission Organizations (Baptist, Pentecostal, Evangelistic, the Salvation Army, the Quakers, and so on). Missionaries have competed for 150 years in India, Burma, Ceylon, Africa (central, south, east and west), China, Korea, Japan, the East Indies and the Philippines — with the result that a Church* of some kind exists everywhere in the world, except possibly Sikkim, Nepal and Tibet. As a part of this remarkable effort, education has played a most important role. In brief, missionaries have been the pioneers of education.

One name to conjure with is that of Alexander Duff who began his career in 1831 under explicit instructions from the Church of Scotland "to impart a Christian education to the youth of India." It was done along Western lines, because that was the policy accepted by the East India Company at the urging of the great Macaulay, and of course continued by the British Raj until 1947. Children learned to read, write and do arithmetic in English, the language of the conquerors. Girls too were taken into the Christian schools. Colleges and Universities were established — Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Serampore — with many affiliated Theological Seminaries all over India (and Pakistan). It was 19th century education provided by 19th century men and women, not all of them qualified teachers. The top graduates from India went to the United Kingdom, continental Europe, and the U.S.A. for further study and training and many became leading citizens in their own states on their return.

Precisely the same sort of thing took place in China (including Manchuria) until the advent of Mao Tse Tung in 1948; in Korea, Japan, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, and even in Turkey, Syria, Palestine and Egypt, as well as Iran and other Muslim areas.

IV

The competitive nature of the enterprise came home to the Western Churches a century ago, and this led (amongst other factors) to the modern Ecumenical Movement. We can punctuate its progress on the missionary side with great World Conferences — the Third was in 1910, held in the capital of Scotland; then came Jerusalem 1928; Tambaram 1938; Whitby (Canada) 1947; Willingen (Germany) 1952; Ghana 1958 and finally its incorporation into the World Council of Churches at New Delhi in 1961. Today the W.C.C. has a Division of Education with headquarters in Geneva.

*"Church" in this context is used to mean a formal Christian Community.

Edinburgh 1910 was a turning-point. Its Commission III reported on "Education in relation to The Christianisation of National Life" (the report debated June 17th). More than 200 people from all over the world reported on the aims of missionary education and its results, its weaknesses and special problems, and they suggested various remedies and changes.

The *aims* were *evangelistic* (i.e., seeking the conversion of children and youth, and so families); *edificatory* (i.e., educating and building up the indigenous churches and training their native leadership); and *leavening* (i.e., seeking to diffuse as widely as possible Christian influences and ideals). To these three might be added: manifesting the spirit of *philanthropy* and *charity* which is supposed to be a dominant character trait in Christians; and, providing *technical training* (in carpentry, house building, farming, engineering, and so on), in order that students might go out and make a living.

The results were impressive, especially in China and Japan; less so in India; notable in Uganda, Nyasaland, Rhodesia and the Gold Coast. Noteworthy was the opening of schools to girls and women in every area, including the Muslim lands. And one could point then, as indeed today, to many thousands of civil servants, politicians, teachers, lawyers and doctors, nurses, accountants and farmers, and shopkeepers, who had received their basic education in mission schools and were more or less grateful.

But in 1910, these representatives of so many Churches and Missionary Boards were by no means complacent and uncritical. One is impressed by their honest assessments and their lists of frank criticisms as they acknowledged the shortcomings of missionaries as educators:

(1) The *form of Christianity* presented was too Western and unwilling to accommodate itself to Oriental and African traditions, customs and needs. Architecture would be Gothic, German or American. The liturgy was Western Protestant. The very hymns and their music were Western. And each group perpetuated the theological point of view, the ecclesiastical divisions, and the intolerable denominationalism that had emerged in Europe, America, and the British Empire since 1500. Catholic missions were less open to some of these charges, but even here new Christians had to hear Mass in ancient Latin and subscribe to the traditions and doctrines of the Medieval Latin faith and the special teaching of the 17th century Counter-Reformation enunciated by St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Catherine of Siena, and the Baroque Popes.

No wonder India described Christianity as the religion of the conqueror; China and Japan called it the religion of the foreign devils. And they saw the Christian nations constantly at war, constantly seeking selfish wealth and glory, constantly refusing to show charity and philanthropy to one another. You will find a memorable example of this in Alan Moorehead's *The White Nile* (pp. 291-3), describing the confrontation of a French White Father, Père Lourdel, and Alexander Mackay of the C.M.S., at the court of Mutesa in Buganda about 1877 — and the scene between them both and the Arab slave traders who argued the case for Islam.

(2) In some countries like China before 1914 the mission schools were *inferior* to the secular institutions operated by the State.

(3) The instruction meant *giving information* to be memorized and repeated; it was individualist; it did not really educate students for life.

(4) The missionaries were too slow in making the administration and leadership indigenous.

(5) Above all, every missionary educational effort *tended to de-nationalize* the converts and the native Christians. Like Trinidadians, they learned to speak flawless, beautiful English-English. Their own native languages, literature, arts and culture were neglected if not denigrated altogether. In all this, of course, certain missionaries fared better than others; Catholics often better than Protestants.

Accordingly, the 1910 Conference recommended an urgent reassessment and a reconsideration of teaching methods and educational goals. It was considered that one very desirable result would be the formation of ecumenical agencies, and that, in fact, happened right here in Montreal with the creation of the Joint Board of Theological Colleges in 1912.

V

In the more than sixty years since Edinburgh 1910, many changes have taken place. Missionaries are no longer allowed into China. Important Churches have emerged: the Kyodan in Japan; the Church of South India; the Church of North India; and the Church of Sri Lanka, all United Churches. The Roman Church since 1962-5 has reformed the Mass, largely abandoned Latin, and entered into rich partnership with the Protestant Bible Societies, with agencies of the World Council of Churches and with many other Christian groups. Moreover, teaching missionaries now go to India, Africa, Japan,

Korea, and Latin America only by invitation of the indigenous churches and only if they possess the necessary scholarly qualifications. Evangelism seems to be taking a second place to edification and humanitarian service. Mission organizations have had to become more sensitive to the currents of thought, belief, and custom in the lands that invite them to enter.

But, when all is said and done, it would be grossly untrue and unfair not to recognize the tremendous contribution that has been made since the first century by missionaries to the instruction of children, youth and adults in schools, colleges, and universities. They have had a concern for truth that is valid and essential to this day. They have honestly sought to mould Christian virtues, and in a remarkable number of cases they have exemplified and embodied those virtues — humility, kindness, unselfishness, integrity, loyalty, service to the neighbor and especially to the poor and the weak, to those who are discriminated against and oppressed.

They were and are missionaries, i.e., they openly fulfill an educational ministry as the representatives of Jesus Christ and his Church. True, they are mortal, fallible, apt to err and sometimes unworthy of their calling. But they include saints, heroes and martyrs. They love the children and the people. We do well to acknowledge and respect the contribution they have made to the education of humanity.

Yvonne Katz

Collective Education in the Kibbutz: A Personal Experience

"The communal education of children is indispensable for the perpetuation of kibbutz values."

the kibbutz phenomenon

The kibbutz movements have played an important part in the founding, building and protection of the State of Israel. The founders of the kibbutzim² were the oppressed Jews who fled, mostly from Poland and Russia to Palestine in waves of migration between 1882 and 1948. The goal of the immigrants to Palestine was largely based on the ideal of the return to the land of their ancestors and on self-labor.³ The pioneers felt that by working the land they could identify with it more readily. It was through work that they would eventually build a dynamic and free nation.

The elements of self-labor were already discernable in the "First Aliya," although for the most part this initial influx consisted of poor immigrants who became gentlemen farmers, settled in villages or ran plantations which were worked by hired Arabs. During the "Second Aliya," the concept of self-labor became more important and A. D. Gordon, considered one of the founders of Socialist-Zionist ideology, formulated the expression, "The religion of labor." It was this concept which largely motivated the Socialist and the Zionist youth who came to settle the land of their ancestors.

Initially, kibbutzim were created partly for economic and security reasons and partly as a Socialist-Zionist venture in which everybody would be equal. Everyone would give according to his ability and receive according to his needs. From its inception, the kibbutz phenomenon has played a crucial as well as a controversial role in the history of the modern re-

settlement of Israel. Kibbutzim embodied the strong aspirations of young European Jews to transform stagnating Jewish history. By bringing ever increasing amounts of land under Jewish cultivation, kibbutzim were to provide the foundation for the creation of the new State of Israel in 1948. From the single kibbutz, *Degania Alef* at the southern tip of the Sea of Galilee, there are now over 250 kibbutzim located in every part of Israel.

Kibbutz life is sometimes strongly criticized, other times wholeheartedly praised, but rarely is it genuinely understood. This is perhaps because only a relatively small number of people have had the opportunity to appreciate kibbutz life in its personal dimensions. On the other hand, objective appraisals often foreclose true insight. The unique collective education system of the kibbutzim, for example, has recently been a source of great interest to many educators, but few have been able to experience it. Therefore, it is hoped that this essay, which is limited to a personal reflection on working with and observing four and five year olds in the kindergarten at *Kibbutz Mizra*, will offer some small contribution to the understanding of collective education in kibbutzim.

the collective education system

When a kibbutz mother returns from the hospital with her newly born infant, she has the option of keeping him with her in her room⁴ for six weeks and then placing him in the "baby house," or placing him directly in the "baby house" where, along with other babies, he will be looked after by qualified nurses. At the age of one-and-a-half to two, the children are moved to the "toddler's house" in groups of four to six, then when they reach four or five years of age, three groups are amalgamated to form a kindergarten. At this stage they make their second move to a new building. A trained kindergarten teacher is put in charge of their education and three housemothers are put in charge of their daily needs. The roles of the teacher and the housemothers are sometimes interchangeable. It is the job of the nurses, housemothers and teachers to help the children develop socially and educationally.

The children move again when they begin their elementary schooling and from the age of twelve they leave the children's community for the "mossad," the regional boarding high school which serves a number of kibbutzim. Here the children are offered a wide curriculum and their talents or special interests are explored.

One of the purposes of the collective education system is to leave the parents free to work and another is to transmit kibbutz values to the youngsters, while eliminating the often strained and frustrated relationships which arise in families as a result of interdependence. The child is dependent on the kibbutz as a whole and not on his parents for both his daily and his specialized needs. Therefore, when one or both of his parents visit him during the day, or when the child visits his parents in the afternoon, the relationship between them is not one in which the parents hold something over the child, nor is it one in which the child resents his parents. It is ideally a relationship based on friendship and love. The kibbutz strives to achieve three basic goals in the upbringing of its children: to teach the values of sharing and equality (community-spirit); to teach the meaning of physical labor; to transmit their Jewish heritage and to emphasize the significant place of kibbutzim in modern history in the hope that they will conscientiously choose to remain on the kibbutz and promote its values and ideals.

Kibbutz education has proved itself in two general ways. Firstly, it has proved effective in its aim of perpetuating itself as a large percentage of children who were brought up in kibbutzim have absorbed its values and have stayed on as kibbutz members. Secondly, a remarkably large number of people who were raised in kibbutzim, or at least spent part of their formative years there, have gone on to become leaders, political or military figures. Although only 4% of the population of Israel live on kibbutzim, 25% of the army officers in Israel are members of kibbutzim.

housemother in the gan

In the fall of 1973, motivated by Zionist inclinations and led by curiosity about kibbutz life, my husband and I immigrated to Israel. We spent our first five months in a *Merca Ha Klita*, an absorption centre, which was situated on a kibbutz. From this *Merca Ha Klita* we chose to settle in *Kibbutz Mizra* where I began to work as a housemother in *Gan Hagar*.⁵

The layout of the *gan* seems well suited for small children. To one side of the hallway there are five bedrooms where the boys and girls sleep together. This fact surprised me at first, but after a few moments reflection I realized that, in fact, non-discrimination between the sexes is part of the concept of equality. The bedrooms are rather spartan because they are reserved for sleeping only and are empty of toys, but each

has three to four wardrobes and an equal number of beds with small pictures hanging over them. From the beginning, the children are trained to keep their toys in the play area and the bedroom is referred to as the "overnight room."

One of the first things I observed was that cleanliness and tidiness were primary concerns. The floors, bathrooms, walls and windows were regularly washed and scrubbed so that from the time they are born, the children are exposed to the ritual of cleaning. Sometimes under guided supervision they are permitted to help. As a result of this exposure to cleanliness, the children grow up to value and promote this ideal.

The teacher explained to me that "development" is the key word in the *gan*. There are no "wallflowers." The youngsters are constantly encouraged to be active and to participate. Since it is the teacher and the housemothers, and not the parents, who are primarily responsible for the children's upbringing, it is their duty not only to teach and take care of these youngsters, but also to show affection to them. Therefore, the multiple role of the teacher and the housemothers can be a very difficult one. They want to receive a certain amount of respect from the children and at the same time they want each child to feel loved, although they must be careful not to show favoritism.

At one time, in the early stages of kibbutzim, it was believed that in a common child rearing system, where all the children received equally in terms of education, material and non-material things, a new type of person would be created. However, today's kibbutz members know differently. It was not possible to create a new and uniform person. In the kibbutz, like anywhere else, individual children have individual problems and often they have special needs. Nevertheless, the ideal of equality still prevails in the *gan* and the problem of how to reconcile the child's individuality with the ideal of equality is one the teacher and housemothers come into contact with every day.

the daily routine

The children are awakened at 7:00 a.m. in the cooler winter months (earlier in the summer) and are taken to the showers. After they are dressed and ready, they get a cup of hot cocoa and are off to play till breakfast at 8:30. In the early hours, as well as in the afternoon, the youngsters are free to choose whatever game or toy they want and they receive some individual supervision from the teacher. As a rule, the teacher tries

not to interfere in the activity they have chosen, but she will observe them carefully and note their patterns of behavior. The children who play outdoors can choose the junk yard (which is full of boxes and old parts of furniture and cars which the children can use to build), or the playground, or the woodwork table or other areas. Kibbutz youngsters will very rarely refer to any activity they are doing as "play." When they are building, drawing or arranging materials they call their activity "work." The concept of work has apparently become a reality to them at a very early age. On one occasion, when I saw a little girl busily banging on some nails and wood on the woodwork table and asked her what game she was playing, she looked at me indignantly and said, "What I am doing is called work not play."

For breakfast, the child-sized tables and chairs are arranged in three groups and at least one adult sits with each. Children are not forced to eat what they do not want, but they are taught to show some table manners and to finish whatever they asked for. After meals, they are expected to clear their own dishes but if a child should leave the table without doing so, he is summoned back. This is one of the ways in which children are taught to have responsibility.

Before the youngsters finish their breakfast, the teacher announces the main activity for the morning. Often this consists of preparation for one of the numerous Jewish holidays. The teacher may read a Biblical story which corresponds to the approaching holiday and later the children are asked to take on certain roles and act out the story. Sometimes the teacher will explain why particular traditions exist and then the children carry out the ritual involved. In this way they become familiarized with the Jewish heritage and learn to identify with their religion. Once, when I told a curious little girl that I was a Canadian, she looked at me in disbelief and said, "No you're not. You are a Jew, aren't you?"

On Fridays the children are guided in baking the traditional "chala" loaf, tidying up, singing special songs and preparing their Friday night clothing to welcome the Sabbath. In addition to holidays, birthdays are also special days in the *gan*. A cake is baked, songs are sung, presents are given and games are played to make every child feel that his or her day is an important one and that the whole group wishes to share in celebrating it. One little boy in the *gan* had the misfortune of losing his father in the "War of Yom Kippur" and he subsequently became perplexed and reserved. The teacher then began to introduce the idea of death to the children and she tried

to help them to talk about it and express how they felt about it. When the memorial day was held for the boy's father, all the children were taken to the cemetery and so were exposed to this reality for the first time.

When the weather permits, the children are taken out for walks in which they learn something about their surroundings and the work which is being done in the kibbutz. The work varies from industry, to maintenance of services, to animal raising and farming. At this time, the children may happen to see their fathers or mothers as they are working in a particular branch of the kibbutz and they will point them out with pride.

The children have their own little vegetable and flower gardens as well as their own cage of guinea pigs. These areas are situated beside the *gan* and the youngsters are already being taught to take care of them. During their free time, children are encouraged to draw and paint because it is felt that this is a very important means for them to express themselves. They are never told what to draw nor how to draw and the teacher tries to minimize her comments about a picture so as not to influence the child in what he will express.

At 4:00 p.m. the youngsters are sent off to their parents' room where they remain until bedtime. The hours they spend with their parents represent a special time for them. It is a time when the children can take what they have learned during the day while they were with their peers and put it to practice elsewhere. Many children can be found helping their parents in preparing special treats, talking about the things around them as they go for walks, or independently working on some project. The relationship between the parents and the children at this time is a warm and relaxed one because the children have had a chance to work out any frustrations or excess energy they may have had in the *gan*. As for the parents, they are free after a day's work to devote a few hours exclusively to their children without having to worry about disciplining them (this is done in the *gan*) nor about the regular household chores, because most of these are taken care of by the kibbutz.

adult relationships

The collective child-rearing system on the kibbutz seems to provide a healthy milieu for the children. However, whether the system is as ideal for the adults as it is for the youngsters is debatable. Inevitably, there is friction between the women

in the kindergarten. The ways they have of keeping house or of doing things in general may not always agree. Also, conflict arises between the housemothers-in-charge and the parents. Since the teacher is responsible for the children's well-being a large part of the day, she becomes a second mother to them. "I am ready to do everything and anything for the children," I once heard the teacher explain. Theoretically, of course, this attitude is necessary and expected of her. However, in practice, it happens that the parents may feel that the teacher is not treating their child in the way that they themselves would have liked him or her to be treated. At other times, the teacher may find herself under pressure from the parents to acquire certain things for the *gan*. The relationships between the parents and the teachers, therefore, can be very touchy.

On rare occasions it even happens that, after an argument with the teacher, the parents will not visit their child in the children's house. Generally, however, the teacher and the parents try to iron out any misunderstanding because, after all, the teacher is to be one of the main figures in the child's life for a few years⁶ and so it is to the advantage of everyone involved to be on good terms. Thus, the parents encourage their child to love and respect the teacher and the housemothers.

The extent to which the occasional tension in the *gan* affects the youngsters is difficult to judge. However, from my observation of the generally friendly and pleasant inter-relationships in the kindergarten, I would guess that the impact on the children of this tension is of a very limited nature. An older member of the kibbutz, who subsequently became a good friend, proudly told us how the objectives of the first settlers have been achieved — the land has been cultivated and the kibbutzim have become the backbone of Israel; the kibbutz values have become appreciated and recognized throughout the country and, for the most part, are being successfully transmitted to the children. The old settler seemed concerned, however, when he proceeded to tell us that he did not know what new goals the children of the kibbutz would have. Would their purpose be only to improve their standard of living and to perpetuate kibbutz values?

There are other problems still to be settled. For example, some parents feel that they would like to see a change in the collective education system which would allow their children to sleep at home and sometimes they feel that they would like to have more influence on their children's upbringing. On the

other hand, they realize that the system of collective education is much more effective in transmitting kibbutz values to the children than they themselves could ever be. On more than one occasion I have heard a parent exclaim, "My child belongs to the kibbutz!"

references

1. M. E. Spiro, *Kibbutz-Venture in Utopia*, New York: Schocken Books, 1972, p. 19.
2. "Kibbutzim" is the Hebrew plural of kibbutz.
3. "Self-labor" in this essay is used to mean working oneself as opposed to hiring people to do physical work.
4. The people who live on the kibbutz refer to their homes as "the room."
5. "Gan" is the Hebrew word for kindergarten. "Hagar" is the name of the teacher of this particular group.
6. The children may spend more than a year in kindergarten and the teacher may take them through grade one.

O. Rovinescu, C. Ruggles, W. Reid & P. Muldering, eds.

Expressions of Montreal Youth

An anthology of poetry written by Montreal children relating to photographs of their community and edited by McGill Faculty of Education students.

Montreal: Reigg Ethnic Expressions, 1974. \$3.00.

For copies write:

MS. OLIVIA ROVINESCU,
6616 Merton,
Montreal, Quebec.

Douglas Ray

Schooling for Peace and International Understanding

The use of schools as a political instrument has long been a highly developed art. Before widespread radio or travel, each nation could furnish through the schools the information available to most of its citizens and thereby further the interests of the State. Very often misinformation about others — particularly military, economic or cultural rivals — was added to a chauvinistic view of the motherland.¹ This kind of education let Hitler pervert one of the best schooled, most cultured and creative populations of Europe, reducing many of its citizens to the barbarians of Belsen or Auschwitz. One of the most insidious educational programs ever devised led this inhumanity to be confused with patriotism,² this schooling to be mistaken for education. It is important to remember that nationalistic schooling was augmented by the influence of press, radio, cinema, youth groups and demonstrations, and probably by bitter family memories of imposed treaties and economic privation.

Nuremberg introduced a new reason for attempting to school for humanity rather than for nationalism. The War Crimes trials recognized that all citizens are responsible for atrocities carried out at the order of their own leaders. Some commentators acknowledged "a shared responsibility for such horrible crimes even in an authoritarian state."³ Other writers pointed out that when collective responsibility could no longer be exercised at the polls, some type of conscientious objection to immoral orders was expected.⁴ This implies that citizens should be given a reasonable opportunity to learn of international conventions of justice that they may be expected to uphold; there must be a substantial scholarly influence upon the schools, independent of direct government control;⁵ selection and training of teachers and the preparation of the curriculum

must be similarly safeguarded from direct political manipulation; and the most rigorous of academic standards have to be retained.

A number of scholars such as Mannheim, Malinowski, Huxley, Ritchie, Dewey and Lauwerys, recognized that equation of learning and humanity was simplistic, since knowledge of other societies and their ideals might breed fear, envy or contempt rather than sympathy or respect.⁶ Nevertheless they refused to return to the skid because wheels sometimes ran crooked. They suggested more attention be given to the social sciences because theology and philosophy had been unsuccessful at reconciling differences.⁷ These eminent scholars thereby defined the principal thrust for the educational efforts of UNESCO, suggested in the preamble of its charter: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed."

UNESCO associated schools

More recently, the quest for peace has been joined by a quest for a just global community — in particular, for a greater measure of health, education and opportunity for the poorer nations,⁸ as well as much better assurances that future generations will not be unduly hampered by our plunder of the planet's resources or poisoning the biosphere.⁹ But the global community is being devised in non-material ways also, and recent studies have emphasized the distress caused by cultural imperialism.¹⁰ Thus, more attention to the means of ensuring the survival of a variety of cultural patterns and some chance of providing interaction between cultures has been suggested.¹¹ In effect, humanity stands at a point where the indentities of smaller societies can be extinguished quickly by the pervasiveness of particular cultural machinery (TV and automobiles, for example) or they can be preserved and become more influential by a shift in the purpose of quite similar hardware.

It is a long step between identifying such objectives for humanity and creating the environment where they are likely to develop. Governments must be persuaded, funds appropriated, persons trained and materials prepared. A thousand priorities must be renegotiated. UNESCO recognized that an agency in Paris with occasional meetings of representatives from member states was not sufficient for a task of this magnitude. Following a series of preliminary investigations, a decision was made in 1953 to encourage all member states to establish a number of experimental or demonstration schools,

which would be associated with one another and with UNESCO, and all pledged to the educational objective of promoting peace and international cooperation. They would try to implement the Charter's ringing preamble. Their quest would be aided by advice from the international scholarly community but would remain close to their own educational traditions so that their experience would be a useful model for others in their nations.¹³

By 1973, there were 926 Unesco Associated Schools in sixty-two countries.¹³ They functioned in very different ways. For example, in Denmark, Japan and Poland where the Ministry of Education provided strong backing, Associated Schools influenced general educational practice. In Britain, India, Thailand and the USSR, Associated Schools were means of testing or demonstrating ideas, but were not closely linked to the practices of other schools. In fact some of their best ideas failed to percolate throughout the system or even to be well known in other schools. Usually costs or teacher shortages were largely to blame. A still more reluctant support has been extended by Canada and the United States, undermining the expectation that Associated Schools would have the maximum impact upon education in North America. Here, the personal commitment of a few persons and the support of the community have spelled the difference between success or failure.¹⁴

associated schools in canada

The Canadian experience with UNESCO Associated Schools was delayed because the Federal Government approved the idea but had no educational capacity. Before 1962 when the Sèvres Conference reviewed the first decade of experience, the private attempts of a teacher from Oakwood Collegiate in Toronto constituted the only visible efforts in Canada. However, at the Sèvres conference, Canada was represented by the Canadian Education Association and subsequently A. E. Hobbs became a champion for a more active Canadian involvement. The constitutional questions were resolved by the creation of the Canadian Commission for UNESCO under the non-political umbrella of the Canada Council. In 1965, a part time field secretary identified interested schools in most provinces and, by 1973, there were forty Associated Schools in Canada.

In large measure they were autonomous, within the limits of the usual provincial regulations. However, a steady stream of UNESCO publications, occasional international visitors, an annual meeting of sponsors and a few students, and a growing

number of student-oriented international contacts provided some common ground.¹⁵ The total contribution from UNESCO was some \$20,000 per year¹⁶ but non-accounted local support resulted in a total program that would have cost several times that amount. Even so, the Associated Schools were more or less typical of their communities, with no more funding, staff time or resources than would be available to any ambitious staff. In fact, possibly the most effective international understanding or peace education programs in a Province have not been promoted by Associated Schools, nor have particular schools supported their programs consistently.

The kinds of activities undertaken by Associated Schools in Canada vary. There have been fund raising projects — especially those linked to international projects like the “Hundred Villages” community development program of Sri Lanka. There have been exchanges of class materials, letters, art, tapes, scrapbooks, and the like that force the students to look more critically at their own culture and to compare it with others. Occasionally student exchanges or work camps have been possible. Local applications of UNESCO themes have flourished in cultural festivals, ethnic studies, and environment analysis. There have also been bookish approaches where new materials and courses were devised to meet particular purposes suggested by UNESCO. Various teaching methods, including simulations, have tried to broaden students’ cultural perspectives.

Unfortunately there have never been any full scale systematic reviews of the effectiveness of Associated Schools in Canada. There are, however, a number of success indicators: the bouquets flung by visitors, the general approval of UNESCO officials, a certain pride of particular faculty, students and their communities, the occasional generous donation to further a program and the frequent appointment of Associated School staff to curriculum committees or policy boards. There have been failures as schools withdrew or staff sponsors resigned — usually because the expected support did not materialize and it seemed wrong to flaunt a meaningless label. Although a few dedicated and inspired leaders have achieved signal success within their community, they might well have done the same without the UNESCO identification.

Associated Schools remain largely unfamiliar to Canadians, but their international ideals are often approved in principle. While no provincial government or university has ever sponsored an Associated School, they do support parallel courses in their own systems. No real assessment of UNESCO should

ignore the restrained enthusiasm thus far extended to Associated Schools by provincial governments, school boards, education faculties or the professional associations. With few exceptions, these agencies have not adequately backed their local Associated Schools — the only teachers' association to endorse Associated Schools has been the Corporation des Enseignants du Québec — but they have pumped a number of ideas advocated by UNESCO into the broader educational system. However, since one of the objectives of Associated Schools was to accomplish this purpose, it could be argued that Canadian education has simply bypassed one step on the way to international understanding.

references

1. Garnet McDiarmid and David Pratt, *Teaching Prejudice*, Toronto: O.I.S.E., 1971, pp. 7-8.
2. George F. Kneller, *The Educational Philosophy of National Socialism*, New Haven: Yale, 1941.
3. Albert Speer, *Inside the Third Reich*, New York: Macmillan, 1970, p. 510.
4. Robert K. Woetzel, *The Nuremberg Trials in International Law*, New York: Praeger, 1962, pp. 108-121.
5. Robert Ulich, *The Education of Nations*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967, p. 190.
6. The fullest interpretation of this interest may lie in Bronislaw Malinowski, *Freedom and Civilization*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1944.
7. The same confidence in scientific humanism remains in Faure *et al.*, *Learning To Be*, Paris: UNESCO, 1972, pp. 158-159.
8. Lester B. Pearson, *et al.*, *Partners in Development*, New York: Praeger, 1969, Chapter 1.
9. Donella H. Meadows, *et al.*, *Limits to Growth*, New York: Universe Books, 1972.
10. A seminal essay rejecting the essentially materialistic opportunities and aiming for inner rebirth is Julius Nyerere, "Education for Self Reliance," Dar Es Salaam: Government Printing Office.
11. Lucien Gémard, "Technocracy and Humanism," *Prospects*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Spring 1974), pp. 56-62.
12. *International Understanding at School*, Paris: UNESCO, 1965, pp. 9-22.
13. *International Understanding at School*, April 1973, p. 2.
14. Reports of Adrien Roy and Brian Chappell, Ottawa, Canadian Commission for UNESCO, 1970; and National Reports to Conferences: *International Meeting of Experts on the UNESCO Associated Schools Project* (in Lévis, Canada, 1973), Paris: UNESCO, 1974; or *Multi-National Meeting of Representatives for Associated Schools Project in Asia*, Seoul; UNESCO, 1971.
15. The official review of Canadian experience in *Associated Schools Project*, *Occasional Paper No. 2*, Ottawa: Canadian Commission for UNESCO, January 1972.
16. Report of the Secretary General to the Sub-Commission on Education, Canadian Commission for UNESCO, 1974.

John W. Friesen

Some Thoughts About Critical Thinking as an Objective for Public Schools

Two official documents developed in Canada recently have clearly emphasized the development of individual autonomy and independent thinking as educational goals for the pupils in our schools.¹ Although curriculum guides have for some time paid lip service to these themes, official reports are intended to reinforce what are essentially sound educational practices. One might easily raise questions about the practicality of urging students to develop entirely personal patterns of value and thought, but no one appears to have devoted time to this enterprise. The task is important in light of the fact that students still graduate from public schools to take their places in a society in which norms and laws govern a large portion of human behaviors. This paper is intended to raise some of those related matters.

critical analysis and school curricula

One of the influential manuals advocating the adoption of independent critical thinking was authored in 1966 by Louis E.aths and colleagues.² Its essential goal was to provide teachers with a theory and a list of techniques designed to turn the average classroom learning situation into a forum for individual inquiry and discussion.³ Raths' assumption supporting his approach includes an explicit belief in the idea that students, regardless of age, are able to think independently, that they *should* think independently, and that they have ample data on hand at any given moment to reflect meaningfully on any item under consideration. This concern is predicated on the observation that too much confusion surrounds decision-making today, people are not really aware of the implications of their beliefs or of statements they make and rarely take time to consider them.⁴ Raths would have

schools occupy themselves with affording students opportunities to do so through the use of techniques which place the onus of noting the implications of a particular statement on the student himself.⁵

The fundamental feature of Rath's methodology consists of an alert teacher's listening for the student's value-laden kinds of expression and immediately following them up, through ordinary conversation or through use of a specific technique to encourage the student to consider the ramifications of his utterance. Examples of the clarifying response include questions such as: "Is this something you prize?" "Are you glad about that?" "Did you consider any alternatives?" "Is that important to you?" In each instance the emphasis is on student consideration and reflection; the teacher simply negotiates three or four rounds of exchange with the student, then breaks off the conversation with some noncommittal but honest phrase such as "Nice talking to you," "I see better what you mean now," or "Got to get to my next class," or "Let's talk about this another time, shall we?"⁶ The teacher does not have to turn the student aside after the brief dialogue, but longer exchanges do not necessarily enhance the objective of the method.

It would not be fair to say that the Rath's approach has been adopted *in toto* by school curriculum framers, although the resemblance of contemporary social studies materials to the value clarification method is significant. The list of studies offered by Rath involving the method at elementary, secondary and college levels is impressive, but other curriculum sources stress the same approach. In one curriculum guide, for example, it is suggested that values should be discussed in class without trying to reach a consensus in order to allow students to think for themselves, and to reflect on the validity of values they have learned in the home, on the playground, or in the wider community.⁷ The teacher sustains and reinforces student interest by acting as a fellow inquirer who has no final and absolute answers to offer. Any discussion of value situations with the objective of identifying a "last frontier" of value existence is irrelevant to the process; the fundamental intent is the process itself.

A recent curriculum guide for Alberta junior high school social studies stresses as goals the attainment of analytic skills and reflective thinking on the part of students but recognizes, as well, the social obligations of group participation. To this end it stresses that students should interpret the feelings and

ideas of others, respond to them in appropriate fashion, express their own feelings and ideas, and cooperate with others, *though not to the extent of compromising with basic values.*"⁸ The senior social studies guide for the same Province similarly stresses that students should become aware of values, respond to values, accept values, but conceptualize *their own* values through the autonomous organization of a value system. While it acknowledges that students *will* develop values on their own, it emphasizes that the end result should be the students' own preferences.⁹

existentialism and school values

It seems apparent that such developments as the Progressive Education movement, the freeing of educational systematization, and the application of existential philosophy to educational situations have had a marked effect on bringing into being the current emphases on value clarification, the freedom of the individual, and autonomy in value choosing. George Kneller, for example, postulates that the teacher must make clear in the educational situation that there is no value apart from the action which the child may care to express.¹⁰ It is the obligation of the teacher to instruct the pupil that he is responsible for his own actions; the worst possible course of action is for a person to take his cue from the crowd. Thus the teacher cannot make choices for the individual but he has to indicate to the student that the latter cannot be shielded from the consequences of his own acts. Likewise, "the student must recognize the inevitability of periods of intense frustration and loneliness; he must cultivate self-reliance as a key character trait."¹¹

Van Cleve Morris shows the implications of existentialism applied to education through a discussion of the metaphor of the moral advisor, and makes the point that though an individual may seek advice in regard to particular situations, he is not bound to that advice and, in fact, he *must* weigh its advantages and decide personally to accept or disregard it. The inevitable and only authentic decision is the conclusion that each individual is locked in to himself; he must make his own advice.¹²

Logically, it becomes the responsibility of the school, if it is properly functional as an existentially-oriented institution, to bring the student awareness of the truth of this proposition. Thus the goal of education is two-pronged; the individual is

to be given every opportunity to assess his situation and to formulate a personal set of values, and the school is to create an appropriate environment, yet not interfere in the student's personal decision-making process. Both goals bring into focus the operation of critical thinking in that the student will need constantly to evaluate forces, opinions, and influences around him in order to authenticate his own value system. Even the environment of the school should be under scrutiny of the authenticating student, for to be consistent with its own definition, critical analysis cannot play favorites with subject matter and every facet of the educational milieu thus constitutes a just object for examination, analysis and, perhaps, rejection or acceptance. Existential literature finds its basis in the premise that choosing, analyzing, and autonomous functioning stem from the very nature of man; a discovery of this truth leads the individual to comprehend that he cannot escape being the creator of his own values for, by nature of his existence, he cannot escape the obligation of choosing.¹³

These approaches have found considerable acceptance, and their promotion is not without merit; however, some caution should be taken to keep in mind several basic matters which demand consideration.

three thoughts on critical thinking

First of all, critical thinking as an educational concern seems to derive from a progressivist genealogy, but its stress is less oriented to the promotion of meaningful experiences for students. Instead, its central theme seems to be directing students toward a careful analysis of their own experiences. No attempt is made to furnish particular subject matter content to students; the assumption is made that they will manage to procure a sufficient amount of content on their own. Rathes admits that his value clarification method is helpful for the introduction of new materials, but he provides no hint as to what that content might be or where it might be procured. Perhaps the point is that this does not matter because so long as the student is proceeding along clarificatory lines, he will judiciously handle any and all content.¹⁴

But what about the selection of formal content? Has the school no responsibility in at least making available certain kinds of knowledge about the society in which it functions and to which it (the school) may be responsible? Can content be left to the chance experiences of students or entrusted to the

bombardment of opinionated journalists, media programming, or ordinary social interaction and communication? While it cannot be argued that a critical examination of data surrounding one's life-space is without value, it is probably not wise to ignore the issue of content altogether and stress only a process such as analysis. We seem to have run the gamut in education from intricately prepared teacher manuals listing hosts of specific objectives, to no curriculum at all other than a sharing of the playground experiences which students select. If critical thinking should become the singular concern of the educational endeavor, the question of content may be left to other sources to resolve, sources less competent than the school in terms of learning theory, child psychology, and methodology. It is abundantly clear that students need to develop the skills of critical thinking, but it is also evident that they will need something to think about. It would be better to do some critical thinking about that matter now rather than later.

A *second* closely related question has to do with the items to be analyzed and appropriated by students in the classroom. One of the misuses of John Dewey's experimentalism has been an undue emphasis on student experiences as content for classroom deliberation. Some educators have been led to conclude that, since Dewey emphasized the incorporation of individual experiences in the classroom, this implied the exclusion of everything else. The conclusion has been that rigorous research, scholarly writing, and an investigation of "heavy" reading materials have little relevance for the classroom unless they are voluntarily appropriated by students from their own experiential fields of inquiry.¹⁵

The debate between progressivists and perennialists in so far as curriculum content is concerned has filled volumes. The latter group has continually urged accentuation on content and method instead of student experience, perhaps at the expense of student interest and motivation. A revival of classical concerns is not necessarily desirable at the present time, however, concerns of the past may need occasionally to be resurrected. It might prove to be a boon to students to be able to ferret out facts and data which might generate insights on a particular subject under scrutiny rather than be forced to perform the latter on the basis of inadequate conceptions even if these have been personally and experientially derived. The question to be answered by educators then, is what will be the nature of research and scholarly effort in the school, if any,

and what kinds of measures will be undertaken to provide students with the related skills?"⁶

A *third* question, and possibly the most important, has to do with the outcomes of education. Purportedly, the school has a function to fulfill in terms of the roles and responsibilities students will eventually take on as full participants in adult society. Writers of the progressivist variety (notably John Dewey) made much of these responsibilities in relation to the concept of democracy urging that students be given the opportunity to practice democratic forms at school in order that they could participate more fully in society later.

Ernest Bayles notes that "democratic decision-making has to be a genuinely cooperative affair, for otherwise the advantages of thoughtful give-and-take among human minds, all seeking to find out *what* is right rather than to demonstrate *who* is right, are indeed lost."⁷ This does not deny independent thinking, for the capacity for independent development of insights is a focal objective of democratic education; it puts into perspective what the end goal of such thinking is — full and meaningful participation in the processes of decision-making concerning problems which affect the whole of society, not merely one individual. The crux of the matter is that if the student is to become an effective citizen of his country he will need to become equipped to handle both kinds of situations, that of forming independent judgements on certain matters, *and* also be able to participate in group decision-making when such is essential. In fact, it may be solely because an individual is capable of assessing problematic situations and formulating independent judgements about their resolution that he will be of advantage to groups. In other words, it is imperative that schools turn out students who *can* and *will* participate effectively in the life of their community as well as nationally and internationally.⁸ Merely stressing independent judgement ability without relating that skill to this social imperative constitutes an educational shortcoming.

Most educators today would probably agree with the statement that it is more important to teach people *how* to think rather than *what* to think on the grounds that the latter constitutes a form of indoctrination, violates the rights of the individual, and shortchanges the democratic process by strait-jacketing the development of intellectual contribution an individual might otherwise make.

One might wish to question the sometimes pungent way in

which the responsibilities of democracy can be presented, particularly in terms of restricting individual freedom. The outcome of such inquiry, however, is usually an attempt to formulate an alternative mode for social procedure, a task which is probably as difficult to achieve as it is to appreciate the strange admixture of individualism and group control that democracy has to offer. In any event, the fact that democratic societies are founded on the belief that an educated citizenry can govern itself intelligently and make wise decisions obligates the school to see to it that individuals have the knowledge and skills necessary to make such decisions.¹⁹

To conclude, the basic point of this paper perhaps requires some recapitulation, and it is this. The emphasis on promoting independent critical thought on the part of students, as opposed to regarding the teacher as a disseminator of knowledge, is the result of recent educational theorizing and is a commendable development. However, unless the formation of this skill is accompanied within the context of school and related to his inevitable participation in society, the pendulum of another educational innovation will have swung too far.

references

1. Reference here is to *Living and Learning*, Report of the Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario. Ontario Department of Education, 1968, p. 69 and *A Choice of Futures*, Report of the Commission on Educational Planning, Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1972, pp. 46-48. Evidence of the "critical thinking" syndrome can further be found in a recent study by H. T. Coutts and S. C. T. Clarke, *The Goals of Teacher Education*, Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers Association, 1972. The authors surveyed parents, teachers, trustees, university educators and students as to ranking educational goals for Alberta teacher education. The goal which was ranked first of thirty-six by the groups was, "Teacher education should prepare teachers who can foster in students the ability to inquire, to analyze, to generalize, i.e. to think."
2. Louis E. Rath, Merrill Harmin and Sidney B. Simon, *Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom*, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1966. Other manuals which support this same theme are: Michael Belok, et al. *Approaches to Values in Education*, Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1966; Gail M. Inlow, *Values in Transition: A Handbook*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1972; Abraham H. Maslow (ed.), *New Knowledge in Human Values*, Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1970; and John Martin Rich, *Education and Human Values*, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.
3. Rath's approach varies slightly from that of his colleagues who also urge independent thinking (reflective thinking), e.g. Ernest E. Bayles, *Pragmatism in Education*, New York: Harper and Row,

- 1966; Morris L. Bigge, and Maurice P. Hunt. *Psychological Foundations of Education*, New York: Harper and Row, 1962; and Maurice P. Hunt and Laurence E. Metcalf, *Teaching High School Social Studies*, New York: Harper and Row, 1955. (The latter two books have since been revised.) Unlike these authors, Rath's does not relate the independent thinking process to any end other than immediate clarification of ideas.
4. Rath's, *op cit.*, p. 5.
 5. The favorite method is the "clarifying response" which consists of a teacher's following up on any value utterance made by a student. Each episode is carefully concluded void of any judgemental reaction by the teacher. Other similar methods concocted by Rath's include the value-sheet, role-playing, the contrived lesson, devil's advocate, thought sheets, etc.
 6. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
 7. Edwin Fenton, *Developing a New Curriculum: A Rationale for the Holt Social Studies Curriculum*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967, p. 4.
 8. Province of Alberta, Department of Education, 1971, p. 5. Italics mine.
 9. Province of Alberta, Department of Education, 1970, p. 2. Italics mine.
 10. George F. Kneller, *Existentialism and Education*, New York: Philosophical Library, 1958, pp. 2-3.
 11. *Ibid.*, pp. 65-66.
 12. Van Cleve Morris, *Existentialism in Education*, New York: Harper and Row, 1966, p. 39.
 13. *Ibid.*, p. 40.
 14. Ernest E. Bayles agrees with John Dewey in stressing that if you only let a child indulge himself without guidance, "There is no growth that is more accidental." In other words, you cannot merely depend on "instincts" for curriculum content and procedure. Ernest E. Bayles and Bruce L. Hood, *Growth of American Educational Thought and Practice*, New York: Harper and Row, 1966, p. 222.
 15. A related notion is that curricula ought to be organized around "behavioral objectives" rather than content. See John I. Goodlad and Robert H. Anderson, *The Nongraded Classroom*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963, p. 82.
 16. It is important to note that factual information is not ordinarily obtainable by "thinking"; it has to be gathered. Ernest E. Bayles, *Pragmatism in Education*, p. 105.
 17. Ernest E. Bayles, *Pragmatism in Education*, p. 75.
 18. Frank Simon, *A Reconstructive Approach to Problem Solving in the Social Studies*, Calgary, Alberta: John D. McCra Ltd., 1970, p. 69.
 19. John Martin Rich, *Education and Human Values*, Reading Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968, pp. 13-14. Italics mine.

Donald S. Seckinger

The Teaching of Social Foundations: Didactic, Heuristic, or Philetic?

I

In a recent article in *Educational Theory*, as well as in his book *The Real World of the Public Schools*, Professor Harry S. Broudy distinguishes among three major styles of teaching.¹ These are, first, the *didactic*, which has as its aim the transmission and reinforcement of knowledge and skill; second, the *heuristic*, which is intended to stimulate creativity in problem-solving situations; and third, the *philetic*, which involves the teacher in relationships of loving concern in a community of learners.²

These distinctions are useful in examining the introductory survey course in Social Foundations of Education. With disturbing frequency, this kind of course, whatever its label, is characterized by disorganization and dissonance. As teacher educators we aim to provide would-be teachers in the schools with vision and perspective which goes beyond narrowly technical concerns. In attempting to do this in Foundations courses, however, we soon encounter the resistance of many post-adolescents to any knowledge which seeks to go further than immediate experiencing. We struggle also to make sense out of a composite of course materials which often are uncritically derived from a series of parent disciplines or educational issues.

Teaching these materials didactically, in order to lay a groundwork of knowledge and skill, may well result in accusations of presenting irrelevant information. On the other hand, heuristic teaching, which organizes content around problems and issues in education, and which should be of vital concern to all students, too often results in superficial treatments of commonplace social situations with which most students are al-

ready familiar. Yet a third way of doing Foundations involves the philetic facilitator of knowledge, who may become very popular with some of his students who seek him out for therapy, but who is rejected by didactic or heuristic learners as lacking in authority or in specific solutions.

My own experience, certainly shared with many other faculty members, has included cases of students who complimented me after a fashion by saying they would like to take me for a course more relevant to their future teaching needs. I take this to mean philetic success and heuristic failure, and the less said about measurable results of didactic learning the better. Under these conditions it is not very effective simply to admonish students at the beginning of a Social Foundations course that one is not teaching the methods of instruction of a particular subject matter or a specific grade level, much less to disillusion them with the notion that even methods colleagues will not attempt to provide recipe book answers to all the contingent human situations of teaching and learning.

There is clearly a serious and continuing problem in the teaching of Social Foundations of Education as an introductory survey course to undergraduates. In this essay I propose to employ Broudy's distinctions among the didactic, heuristic, and philetic to unravel the components of the problem. It must be emphasized at the outset that these are, of course, analytical categories and that in practice the teacher of Foundations will blend or combine them in various ways. The final section of this paper, in fact, suggests some possibilities along these lines.

The reader must further bear in mind that I am operating under three crucial assumptions which delimit the scope of the present study. These are, first, that it is not an acceptable solution simply to wait until after a student has accepted full-time employment in a school before attempting to teach him any of the facts, concepts, and skills involved in the Social Foundations; second, that it is inadequate for an instructor of Foundations that students may be satisfied only with the philetic aspects of his personality aside from what he might have taught them; and third, that it is not enough to give over the didactic teaching of facts and skills to programmed instruction so that the teacher can concentrate exclusively on heuristics and philetics.³

With these limitations in mind, we may turn to the distinctive characteristics of these types of styles of teaching as they apply to Social Foundations. We shall begin with didactics, the most prevalent form of teaching any subject matter in the

schools and colleges, then work our way into heuristics, and finally into the realm of philetics.

II

Teaching Social Foundations in the didactic style would involve the deliberate dependence of the teacher on the content of the parent disciplines, most commonly History, Philosophy, and Sociology. If additional disciplines in the social sciences are brought in, widening the scope of Social Foundations, it is usually in the context of heuristic teaching. Didactics typically means a considerable amount of lecturing, accompanied perhaps by supplementary discussions and the occasional use of heuristic devices such as audio-visual aids and visiting resource persons. Didactic evaluation takes the form of written examinations, term papers, and possibly some student oral reports.

There are at least three major strengths associated with didactic teaching: (1) Students enrolled in the introductory survey courses are used to this kind of teaching and many of them therefore feel secure with a specified schedule of academic assignments and examinations; (2) Teachers can more readily anticipate what is going to happen in the classroom and can therefore use their own didactic preparation to transmit what they have learned to their own students; and (3) The parent disciplines offer structure, substance, and focus in what would otherwise be an amorphous "area" of the study of education. Didactics might just as well be taught by a team consisting of representatives from the Departments of History, Philosophy, and Sociology who have expressed an interest in educational policy issues and practices and who have some public school experience.

Didactic teaching often is criticized for the following weaknesses: (1) Students consistently express boredom and perceive as irrelevant the logically organized academic surveys of any subject matter, and this is especially the case when Social Foundations are taught as derivative aspects of the parent disciplines; (2) Teachers find it difficult to deviate from highly structured lessons without causing anxiety in themselves and in their students that the material will not adequately be covered; and (3) The parent disciplines are themselves undergoing revisions in the academic departments and therefore it is not clear which approach to these subject matters should be considered as paradigms to be applied to the study of education. Philosophy, for example, is being *done*

quite differently in the systematic, analytical, and existential modes of thought and it does no good simply to treat these as addenda to traditional or modern systems.⁴

Teaching Social Foundations heuristically is to deal with one's materials and methods as the Social Studies of Education. As in the case of public school Social Studies or university Interdisciplinary Studies, the parent disciplines become the supportive disciplines and the range of knowledge is expanded to include such social science resource areas as Anthropology, Political Science, Economics, and Social Psychology. Lecturing and discussion would be only two methods employed in a constellation which would include a great deal of student committee work, interaction with local schools and social welfare agencies, and a general democratization of classroom experiences. Heuristic evaluation would go beyond paper and pencil examinations to involve the consensual validation⁵ of student projects by the participants, as well as such devices as micro-teaching and diaries which all students would keep of their field experiences.

The strengths of heuristic teaching are evident to the progressivist or reconstructionist minded teacher and student: (1) Students are pleased and at the same time challenged when they discover that they have an actual voice in determining their own pattern of participation in a curriculum which is geared to the interests and commitments of youth in a post-industrial culture; (2) Teachers are freed to share their own enthusiasms for psychological and social democracy as they participate in the joint creation of learning experiences with their students; and (3) The end result of this participatory and reformist experience is the reconstruction of Foundations as a distinctive enterprise in which the boredom and irrelevance of *telling* about the future applicability of subject matter is replaced by practical and personally rewarding action research *in* the subject.

As appealing and exciting as this approach may be to the socially activist teacher and student, it does have some definite weaknesses when carried into practice: (1) Most undergraduate students, as the result of their post-adolescent personal insecurities and preconceptions of teachers as authority figures, feel tremendously threatened when called upon to play decision-making roles and present materials of their own creation to their peers; (2) Many teachers fear the unanticipated outcomes of situations over which they may lose control, including violent arguments over controversial issues and negative student reactions to inept presentations of some of

their peers; and (3) Without the practice of having to work through the intellectual complexities and demands imposed by organized disciplines, students who attempt to employ these disciplines as supportive areas for heuristic purposes do so in superficial and often prejudicial ways. It could be argued, therefore, that most undergraduates are not prepared to apply ideas which they have not fully learned and in fact they have not accepted anything that comes near to an ideology of participatory democracy.

Philetic teaching of the Social Foundations is an act of love. The teacher does not direct, as in the didactic style, nor does he begin by raising social issues which are intended to excite students, as in heuristics. His task is to bring forth, and then alleviate, the anxieties and fears and insecurities common to the human condition. The master of philetics does this in low pressure classroom or personal counseling sessions which take on a therapeutic character. He is engaging in a kind of unlearning process in which barriers are removed from the inner self like so much scar tissue, so that genuine healing can begin to take place. In order to understand and to help others, so the reasoning goes, one must be able to find and actualize his own selfhood. Evaluation, of course, must ultimately be self-administered, and all threatening aspects of external grading systems removed.

The strengths of philetic teaching should not be minimized, for they center on very legitimate demands for humanizing education in an era of technocratic standardization which encroaches upon all of our personal lives. These strengths include: (1) Students are accepted on their own terms as human beings and given a chance to explore their own personalities before they are asked to relate themselves to any organized subject matter or series of social problems; (2) Teachers are liberated to become human friends and helpers, facilitators of learning in contrast to authority figures or propagandizing social reformers or even manipulators of peer group pressures; (3) Subject matter may then emerge from the shared concerns of students where they are in their spiritual and psychological lives, rather than where they are thought to be in the eyes of the didactic or heuristic teacher. For the master of philetics, a reorganization of pre-existing subject matter and even a re-orientation of methodology are not enough for learning to take place. There must be, in the first instance, a change of heart in both teacher and students.

Philetic teaching too has great difficulties, as even the so-called "existential" psychologists and philosophers have dis-

covered.⁶ Among the major weaknesses of attempting to teach in a philetic style are: (1) Student interests, experiences, and perceptions are so varied that it is extremely difficult to create a community of interests and a sense of cohesion or wanting to relate to others; (2) Teachers are treading dangerous ground by acting as therapists, implicitly promising students more than they can deliver and ultimately leading their students to sense a betrayal as they try to counsel their young friends into contact and compromise with the larger society; and (3) Subject matter tends to lose its objective meaning and devolve into an arbitrary collection of subjective and passing concerns which are not relevant to the social side of university education. This is a special difficulty in the teaching of Social Foundations. One might well ask that if there are so many prospective teachers who are themselves insecure as persons, then how can we as teacher educators expect to transform them into the kind of humanistic, caring individuals who will be able to assume leadership roles with their own students? Should we not identify and eliminate students who manifest personal anxieties before they have a chance to make mistakes in their own classrooms, rather than playing at therapy? One might then argue that philetics uncovers weak personalities but does not prepare strong teachers.

III

Each of these teaching styles has its own particular appeal, yet when observed in practice all of them issue forth under severe handicaps. Some educators may use this as an excuse to follow the conventional wisdom of the schools, namely, to teach didactically and let that be enough. This is not so much because didactics are visualized as an ideal form of schooling, but rather that the demands imposed by heuristics and philetics are too heavy for most teachers and learners to bear in the social and educational systems as presently constituted.

But what of another alternative which is followed by a minority of teachers who are creative in one dominant style of teaching which suits their personalities and whose creativity rests in the fact that they consciously or unconsciously bring in elements of the other styles? And what of teachers who are frustrated in their style and limited in their effectiveness because they have never considered bringing in some elements of other styles? Here is where it is possible to suggest some modification strategies.

The didactician need not change his basic world view of

subject matter as being essentially logical in organization and the concept that the order of knowledge precedes the order of learning. Even the didactician, however, will insist that the ultimate aim of understanding in his subject is some degree of increased effectiveness or appreciation on the part of his students as human beings and as professional persons. The Social Foundations are supposed eventually to issue forth in the lives of teachers with vision and the power to make intelligent decisions and compassionate judgments. This can be accomplished in the didactic style, complete with formal retrieval systems of examinations and papers, if heuristic and philetic elements are taken into account.

Social Foundations subject matter is laden with possibilities for issues and problems which directly bear upon the lives of undergraduate students in contemporary universities. If the teacher believes that certain concepts in philosophy, for example, are essential prerequisites in dealing with problems teachers in the field must face, then he can have his students *do* at least a limited series of exercises in philosophizing as they are studying *about* both traditional and modern philosophical systems. In like manner, the didactic teacher may select concepts from academic sociology which have profound educational bearings, as in the work of George H. Mead, for example, and his symbolic interactionism. Heuristics need not violate the integrity of subject matter if they proceed from a carefully worked out academic conceptualization.

Didacticians also can introduce a philetic element into their teaching of the Social Foundations, and in a quite natural manner. The use of personal experiences both of the teacher and his students, lightly touched with a low-key humor which often accompanies the absurdities one encounters in the schools, is a good means of humanizing didactic subject matter. Even some otherwise lifeless historical materials may be enlivened, though this must be done cautiously, by stressing the experiences of real people who live on through their letters and journals. The didactic teacher may even be tempted to engage ultimately in simulation experiences which are both heuristic and philetic, such as deliberately segregating his students on some absurdly arbitrary basis and then treating them differently on an oral examination to show how it felt in Calvinist-inspired schools — what it feels like to be in a racial or religious minority in some local communities today.

The heuristician often overlooks some basic realities in the excitement of problems and issues teaching. One of the paradoxical elements involved in his style concerns the nature of

choosing for educative purposes. This teacher rightly perceives the desirability of maximizing the conditions under which students will have opportunities to select their own learning activities. The didactic problem was pinpointed by a student in a Social Studies methods course, and it applies to Social Foundations when taught as a form of Social Studies: the majority of students typically choose what they perceive as less threatening, loosely structured kinds of social activities. The heuristic teacher, therefore, might well profit by the introduction of didactic exercises such as the construction of written examinations or the creation, testing, and modification of interviewing models in which students *do* social science in such a way that they must work their way through academic disciplinary materials in order that their activities meet with success.

When it comes to philetics, the heuristician is often more receptive to this affective side of the learning process because he has attempted to democratize the classroom. Social Foundations students will have been organized into autonomous task forces for action research and field experiences. The issues and problems will have been raised in class and discussed in an open atmosphere. However, the philetic pitfall against which the heuristic teacher must be ever alert is taking at face value the consensual validation of students and teacher operating in the classroom as a public forum. It is easy to get swept up in the enthusiasms of a vocal minority of articulate students while overlooking the private concerns of the many who suffer in silence. Private counseling sessions and individual projects which may or may not become the occasion for the public test are very much in order for the heuristician over and above his primary emphasis on social sharing and common experience.

The masters of philetics as primary teaching types seem to be few in number and suspect by many of their colleagues as scholastic draft evaders at best, charlatans at worst. Pseudo-existentialists may be discovered on ego trips in which they become the center of dependent love for many of their students in search of a missing mother or father figure. Even authentic and selfless masters of philetics, however, need to come to terms with both the didactic and heuristic aspects of the Social Foundations, although not necessarily in that order.

Heuristic consequences are perhaps only a step away from the philetic style and may be gently suggested by the loving guide whom students have come to trust. Exercises in self-realization within the comforting confines of the classroom community may carry over into projects which involve

going out into therapeutic agencies in the local community. It may well be possible to link the sense of discovery of self to the altruistic ideal of service to others in carefully arranged situations where the philetic teacher has set the stage by contacting his spiritual and psychological soul brothers who are in positions of authority in selected social welfare agencies.

Sooner or later, nevertheless, these loving and helping activities will have to lead out into the real world of the schools in which the prospective teachers enrolled in Social Foundations will ultimately have to function. Moreover, as one moves from didactics to heuristics and now into the realm of philetics it becomes increasingly clear that the teaching combinations of styles being suggested will have to go beyond the confines of any one course or any one teacher, no matter how charismatic a personality that man or woman may be.

The master of philetics, then, for the love of students and for the sake of what they might be able to do for humanity, will have to expose them to a world in which didactics is a not always pleasant but inescapably necessary means to an end. To help people, one must know them. To reform institutions, one must encounter them both in their loving and in their frustrating and miseducative aspects. In the classroom, the philetic teacher will find it necessary to deal with didactic subject matter to explain why the world as we find it is such a complex and apparently tough-minded place. And as far as field experiences are concerned, the master of philetics will take his students by degrees into school situations which are less and less in tune with the way he and they want the world to be. If this is done with the compassion and understanding of which the philetic teacher is capable, it need not be a shattering or disillusioning experience. And if some students with philetic styles of learning find they can enjoy the sunshine but not endure the shadows of human existence as people struggle in the schools, then it could well be that the life of teaching is not for them.

All three teaching and learning styles have their place in any educational program and in any course of study. The Social Foundations of Education is one of many areas which could profit by a careful consideration of the consequences of an overemphasis on the didactic, the heuristic, or the philetic. The arguments seem to boil down to the fact that most students and teachers are not yet accustomed to the styles of democratic living embodied in heuristic education and at the same time a great many of us fear the exposure of private anxieties implicit in the philetic approach. And so we go on in

most school situations, not even with didactics *per se*, but with taking the mechanics of didactics as the whole of what formal education can be.

It is the contention of this essay that education, even in more or less formalized systems of schooling, need not be what it usually has been. We were created to be more than narrowly didactic, machine-like creatures in our classrooms. In the teaching of Social Foundations in particular, it seems ironic that so vast and exciting a field lies before us, with so many possibilities in all the styles and realms of teaching and learning. The question is, do we dare to take up the challenge of incorporating even modest elements of other styles into our own practice? It could make a difference, and perhaps more than we can even now imagine.

references

1. See Harry S. Broudy, "Didactics, Heuristics, and Philetics," *Educational Theory*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (Summer, 1972), pp. 251-261 and Harry S. Broudy, *The Real World of the Public Schools*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972, especially Ch. VIII, "The Fallacy of Misplaced Relevance," pp. 176-198.
2. See Carl R. Rogers, "The Interpersonal Relationship in the Facilitation of Learning," in *Humanizing Education*, Washington, D.C.: A.S.C.D., 1967, pp. 1-18.
3. Broudy, "Didactics, Heuristics, and Philetics," pp. 256-257. Although he differentiated between the *mechanics* of didactics, which may be handled by machines, and the human explanatory functions of didactics, Broudy's argument could lead heuristic and philetic teachers to neglect the necessary attention they need to devote to this often unpopular and uninteresting task, thus this warning is designed for them in the context of practice.
4. See Wayne J. Urban, "Social Foundations and the Disciplines," *The Record*, Vol. 71, No. 2 (December, 1969), pp. 199-205, for examples of basic disagreements among academic social scientists which in turn generate problems for didactic teachers who look upon these as parent disciplines.
5. The term is taken from the writings of Theodore Brameld, especially *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.
6. For the recognition of the trials of the existential teacher, see Martin Buber, *Between Man and Man*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965, pp. 100-101; and Carl R. Rogers, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-18. Rogers especially sets out cautionary qualifications for the would-be facilitator, but believes the difficulties are worth what he contends is often the end result: self-initiated learning.

Gabrielle Pascal

From Formal Class to Community:

**an experiment in the teaching of
french prose composition**

French composition courses, part of the honors and major programs in French at McGill, have an essential but somewhat unappreciated role to play in the education of undergraduate students. Their aim is to determine, and then increase, the students' ability in written French so as to enable them to master the range of expression and thus, to broaden and deepen their comprehension of literary texts. The difficulties which lie in wait for both students and instructors demand an exploration of the conditions necessary for creating a sympathetic state of mind, a viable program and an appropriate pedagogical method for this kind of course.

the state of mind

The prospect of a compulsory course of French prose composition risks giving the student who wants to specialize in French literature a false and regrettable impression of intellectual regression. He may feel he will somehow be returning to high school where he worked laboriously on dictations and wrote rather wooden compositions. Now, at a time when he is eager to explore the writings of the great authors and to criticize their works, he finds he is required to refine his knowledge of the elusive material with which he has to work, that is the French language.

In asking him to increase his vocabulary, to discover the nuances of synonyms and to elucidate the principles which rule written French, will we not deflate the pleasure he is anticipating? Certainly, bringing the student to the realization of his shortcomings is always an unpleasant task, but in the present instance, it is no less important to take some of the mystique out of the appreciation of great literature than it is

to give language its proper place. There is no doubt that this task could be easier if the student were not continually discovering that some of his teachers have a constant tendency to decry the plebeian character of language over against the aristocratic nature of literature. The creation of this curious scale of values may be of benefit to those who use literary obscurantism to cloak pedagogical shortcomings but the student, for his part, can gain nothing by absorbing this prejudice. It will always be true that the classicism of Madame de Lafayette, the romanticism of Victor Hugo or the realism of Flaubert, will remain largely inaccessible to the student as long as he has not submitted himself to the rigors of a course in French prose composition. Besides enlarging his comprehension of the texts, such a course will prepare him to compose in French his criticism of the great literary works.

This is a point of quite basic significance. Just as the serious student of the history of painting must himself take brush and palette in hand and face a blank canvas and the student of musicology must himself attempt his own compositions and arrangements on the keyboard, so too the serious student of French literature must be required to write in the French language. And as long as the student has not patiently explored the nuances of synonyms and attempted his own compositions at the different levels of language, he will not grasp that, for the authors he is studying, the act of creative writing resolves itself into the choice of words and particular phrases. He will also have to discover the living principles of the written language and thus will be able to appreciate better the literature composed in it. To that end, it is necessary to reconcile in the student's mind the mischievously divorced ideas of language and literature.

a program divided in three parts

Obviously many methods could be employed in the conduct of a course in French prose composition. For example, the description of the different levels of language — of which the student has only intuitively a vague idea — can serve as a very effective introduction. My experience has led me to choose a yearly program composed of three elements worked out simultaneously so as to vary the effort required from the student.

1. The first part of the course consists of the analysis of literary texts by the use of concepts such as the archaisms, neologisms, dialecticisms, intellectual and affective results

of the terms employed. In thus placing the texts in their proper time and location and identifying the effects envisaged by the authors, we develop an analysis which aids the comprehension of the composition. The reward for the student gained by this effort consists in establishing the close connection between the stylistic discipline he has undertaken and his literary curiosity.

2. The second element of this program is in itself less difficult. It aims at broadening the vocabulary of the student by means of lists of words grouped around *des centres d'intérêts*. The student has a welcome opportunity to authenticate the words by placing them in a number of different contexts, for he is asked to compose short contexts for each new word or phrase. This enables him, among other things, to discover the relativity of the idea of synonym.
3. The final effort which is required from the student is the most demanding. He is asked to write regularly short pieces which illustrate various literary modes such as description and narration, while conforming to the exigencies of the *dissertation française*. In this way, he will approach the standards required from him in his courses of French literature.

a collective project with a pedagogical formula

Maybe more than others, courses in French prose composition give an opportunity to get close to the students. The control of the semantic content of words gives rise in turn to humor, surprise and fruitful discussion; criticizing texts together enables the students to express themselves more and more freely; and the coordination of individual exercises in workshop-type courses creates opportunities for an endless dialogue with the instructor. But if the human contacts are favored, the subject of the course remains demanding and the student is not always in the mood to appreciate the delicate shades of meaning of dialecticisms or archaisms . . . moreover to write regularly an average of thirty lines in a controlled style in a foreign language is not an easy task. Thus, it is very important to find ways of relaxing the pedagogical pace.

These two last years, my students and I decided to create an anthology toward the end of the second term. Each student chose a subject and had about ten days to prepare the outline of his article. Then, the topics were all presented and discussed informally in class. The only requirement laid down was that the students' work should be connected with their personal

experiences or tastes.

The first class discussion of these exercises gave an interesting opportunity to classify the different types of reports which were to make up our "book": criticisms of books or films or plays, art exhibitions or musical occasions; descriptions of cities or countries which had been visited; translations into French of poetry or prose from the different mother-tongues represented in the group; and original compositions of poems or short stories. All these different types of articles called for varied methods and efforts and gave an opportunity to discover *in vivo* the working of the abstract notions acquired in class during the first months.

The second step for the students consisted in writing a rough draft of their articles and in formulating precise questions on the problems they had met in the process of their work. These questions covered a wide range from vocabulary to problems of literary style. After this collective discussion, most of the students asked to see me in my office so that they might review further some of their difficulties. This provided me with a very rich opportunity to get a sense of the impact of our common experience. It is most remarkable that all of the students, without exception, willingly found the time to bring their project, documentation and questions to me. In these friendly and fruitful conversations, we often discovered and explored their general difficulties in the study of the French language. I was surprised to discover that some of the students had previously started novels or poems and wanted to talk to me about them.

In December 1973, I suggested to one of my colleagues giving the same type of course that his students and mine should collaborate in a similar production. This time, we chose a particular theme: "Montréal." All the articles were to describe one or another aspect of town. We got a very interesting result with a variety of points of view covering the geography, the legends, the history, the seasons, the architecture, the poetry of our city.

Finally it should be added that, as a result of our work together, what began as a formal, scheduled class became more and more a community of persons readily interchanging ideas and experiences of learning and maturation. When one has reached that point, and only then, has one crossed the boundary between trade school instruction and education at the true university level.

Mitchell E. Batoff

The Unit Box Approach:

**a novel facet of elementary school
science and mathematics
teacher preparation***

The Unit Box¹ is an innovative development in elementary school teacher preparation. Its construction is the principal assignment in a science methods course evolved by the author over a six year period at Jersey City State College.²

Each student in the course (college seniors in most cases) assembles a materials-centered, inquiry-oriented, multimedia unit package. Its core is a commercially available unit of study that has been tested in many classrooms. Units of a modular nature are used and they may be teaching units, resource units, or quasi-resource units. Students put together their Unit Boxes outside of class, during a five or six week period prior to beginning the student teaching experience and use the Unit Box during student teaching. In some situations, where the methods course is taught in the schools, students prepare their Unit Boxes over a fifteen week period concurrent with the apprentice teaching experience. In either case, the Unit Box provides an opportunity for apprentice teachers to *do* with children the kinds of teaching-learning they experienced in their methods course; with materials at hand an ideal can become a reality not a pious wish.

overview

The Unit Box Approach is novel in that students are not required to write a unit. Prior to the Spring Semester of 1969, the author had students write units — a practice which is widespread in methods courses around the country — and for which elementary education students generally are ill-pre-

*An earlier version of this paper and the project described herein was honored by the National Science Teachers Association and American Gas Association through a S T A R (Science Teaching Achievement Recognition) Award for 1973.

pared.³ Furthermore, writing science or mathematics units is not part of the real world of teaching. Working with materials is. The thrust of this approach is the implementation of a unit around which the Unit Box is built. Students are asked to start with a good modular Teacher's Guide and to bring together all the hardware (in multiples), all the supportive software, and all the other media needed to teach the unit effectively. Great emphasis is placed on getting and making appropriate concrete manipulative materials in classroom quantities of thirty-two or sixteen. But the focus of the approach is on learning rather than teaching per se and the Unit Box helps to provide a rich, stimulating learning environment.

Each Unit Box is not only a multimedia, but also a multi-sensory, and multilevel package of instructional materials and strategies intended for in-depth use over a period of four to eight weeks or longer. Each one is custom made by the apprentice teacher who uses and owns it. Its purpose is actively to involve children and teachers in meaningful investigations associated with a significant topic chosen from the geophysical or biological sciences or mathematics. Each Unit Box is also directed toward the development of one or more rational thinking powers. These intellectual process skills include observation and discrimination, classification, measurement, sampling, extrapolation, communication, number use, inference, and others. Some topics and Teacher's Guides also facilitate the development of manipulative motor skills.

contents

A Unit Box consists of the following integrated components:

1. One or more related Teacher's Guides used as a starting point.⁴
2. Manipulative materials for each pupil.
3. A set of record sheets or work sheets for pupils.
4. A tape cassette, associated work sheets, and manipulative materials.⁵
5. A set of overhead transparencies.
6. Trade or library books for pupils and teacher.
7. A set of vocabulary cards.⁶
8. A construction project to provide enrichment.⁷
9. Thoughtfully considered evaluation devices.⁸
10. A large sturdy box, smaller containers, and a file — all labeled and organized.

The Unit Boxes may contain a wide variety of other in-

structional materials — large pictures, charts, science learning games,⁹ a set of task cards, information on field or museum trips appropriate to the unit, and a teacher-made filmstrip or slide set. Certain items, to be sure, are included in the Unit Box (singly, or in small numbers) for demonstration purposes, but these demonstration items are not the mainstay of the unit. The manipulative-investigative materials are the *sine qua non* of the Unit Box.

rationale for the materials emphasis

Why provide materials in quantity? Why provide materials at all? The actualities of scientific investigation — whether by children or adult scientists — entail direct experiences with the multitudinous phenomena of the real world, opportunities to manipulate variables and invent organized explanations of observed phenomena. In short, scientific investigation involves experiences in search of meaning. For this, materials are needed. Enlightened teaching that gives excitement and pertinency to the learning environment entails the fostering of direct meaningful experiences with phenomena. For this, materials are needed. General exhortations, good intentions, grand proposals, impressive lists of objectives and activities are all meaningless sterilities unless and until they become operational in the classroom.

In too many instances the science unit is a carefully type-written paper prepared to satisfy a course requirement and then carefully laid aside. At best, a demonstration or two might be performed from the unit by a conscientious teacher — but talk and chalk are the predominant modes of instruction. Needed materials are lacking. The well-intentioned but hurried and harried student teacher, under ordinary circumstances, has neither the time nor know-how, desire nor confidence to gather the necessary hardware to involve each child in meaningful experiences; this is so, unless the gathering of needed materials is built into the teacher preparation program. Accordingly, in the Unit Box Approach it is built in as an integral part of the course. Hence, one aim of the Unit Box Approach is to foster maximum involvement of each pupil in his/her search for first-hand evidence and meaning. The goal is to provide concrete materials in a “wet laboratory” situation so that learning can go well beyond empty verbalisms of talk and chalk that lack an experiential base. This is not a utopian impossibility but a mandatory condition for teaching children. It is a compelling reason for the materials emphasis in the Unit Box Approach.

sources of the materials

Where and how do students obtain all these materials? They use various means and diverse sources. Scavenging plays a prominent role in the Unit Box experience. Some devices the students build, others they improvise from recycled objects, and a great many items they have to buy. But a concerted effort has been made, over a six year period, to search out sources of inexpensive equipment. Both students and the author have contributed numerous resources to a growing repertory of free and low-cost hardware. The list continues to expand and increase in usefulness. Each semester it becomes easier and more economically feasible for students to obtain classroom quantities of such items as magnifying lenses, Celsius thermometers, fifty cent cameras, compasses, magnets, tuning forks, electrical wire, metric teaching aids, live butterflies, and the like.¹⁰ This assignment represents a cooperative rather than competitive venture between the college teacher and his students.

pedagogic values

What are some other values of this approach? The great stress on making and collecting items involves students — from the start of their teaching career — in using materials and living organisms in inquiry teaching. Students are immediately confronted with the problems of obtaining and the rewards of using concrete manipulative materials in teaching children. Furthermore, as several science educators have suggested, one of the most valuable outcomes may prove to be the experience of producing the kit.¹¹ The student scrounges, improvises, builds, assembles, shops, orders from catalogs, “debugs,” and creates tangible objects; reads and builds a library of books and pamphlets; programs and uses audio tape cassettes; makes overhead projectuals; previews films and filmstrips, produces films, loops, slides, task cards, vocabulary cards, and learning games; laminates, designs, organizes manipulative materials and print media of all sorts, visits places, tests hardware, explores phenomena, and does mini-investigations. In short, the student undergoes a very broad and practical learning experience.

The Unit Box Approach puts teeth in the theory of how children (and adults) learn. Or, to switch the metaphor, this approach sets an ignition spark to some philosophical and psychological fuel espoused by educators since the 3rd century B.C.¹²

beginning

How and where does the student begin? Part of the first session in the methods course is used to expose the class to a wide, varied, and enticing smörgåsbord of modular Teacher's Guides. At this first meeting students have a chance to give a cursory glance to more than one hundred units. In addition, the author distributes to each student printed items that provide capsule descriptions of several hundred Teacher's Guides. After consultation with his/her cooperating teacher, the student selects a unit around which to build his/her Unit Box. This choice is influenced by his background and inclinations, the science curriculum and/or texts used in the school to which he is assigned, and suggestions his instructor makes on the strength of past experience with the units. Students are urged to choose a topic in which they can become deeply involved and around which they can build an enthusiastic classroom experience. A central purpose of the Unit Box Approach is to have each apprentice teacher acquire a depth of knowledge in a particular area through firsthand experience, and to develop expertise in exploring and teaching the unit. It is desirable that each student teacher pursue a different topic, since both students and professor learn more if a wide variety of units is handled by the class.

the teacher's guides used as a starting point

What are the sources of the Teacher's Guides used for Unit Boxes? To date the writer has used mainly four sources of teaching and resource units: those developed and classroom tested by the Elementary Science Study (ESS); the modular Experiences in Science Units (EIS) authored and tested by Tannenbaum and Stillman; the units developed and field tested by the Science Curriculum Improvement Study (SCIS); and the pre-primary unit *Sense and Tell* authored and tested by Marshall, Podendorf, Swartz and Shoresman. In addition, a number of successful Unit Boxes have been assembled using Minnesota Mathematics and Science Teaching Project (MIN-NEMAST) units; *Guppies, Bubbles and Vibrating Objects*; and *Kitchen Photography*. These seven sources offer the student teacher 161 choices of units in science and mathematics. Furthermore, they offer seven different contrasting and complementary styles insofar as the format of a *Teacher's Guide* is concerned. The latter vary in sequencing suggested, in statement of objectives, and in the amount of background information given. Since research has not shown that any one program

or type of Teacher's Guide is generally superior to all others for every purpose for all teachers and students under all circumstances, the apprentice teacher should be offered a number of options and given an opportunity to choose those he finds personally appealing. This honors his or her individuality in selecting one or several complementary guides as a starting point.

In addition to the seven primary sources designated above, there are a multitude of unit modules — particularly resource units and quasi-resource units — available from numerous other sources worldwide. However, some of these are less accessible and/or have not undergone as much classroom testing as those units previously mentioned. Currently under review as additional starting points for Unit Boxes are the following: *Science 5/13* from England; *BEBCO Guides* developed in Maryland; *Examining Your Environment* (EYE) developed in Ontario; University of Illinois Project in Elementary School Mathematics and Science (UICSM); *Individualized Science* (IS) modules; *Science Inquiry Project Series* (quasi-resource units); ASEP modules developed in Australia; SCOPES units under development at the University of Northern Iowa; units developed for the African Primary Science Program; ESCS units from Newfoundland;¹³ pollution control units developed in a Union, New Jersey, project; APS from Montréal; OBIS units being developed at the Lawrence Hall of Science, University of California; BSCS elementary school science modules from Colorado; COPEs units from New York University; ESC units developed in California; MAPS units by Berger and Associates; *Unified Science and Mathematics for Elementary Schools* (USMES) units from Newton, Massachusetts; National Wildlife Federation *Environmental Discovery Units*; National Audubon Society *Teacher's Guides*; and a host of units on metric measurement.

Some of these guides were used in the inservice Unit Box Project conducted in the summers of 1972 and 1973 at Owen Sound, Ontario and Ottawa respectively. This was done as part of an Ontario Ministry of Education Certificate Course in elementary school science. It should perhaps be noted that *Science — A Process Approach* (S*APA), the printed exercises developed by the Commission on Science Education of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), do not seem to lend themselves to the Unit Box Approach. Nevertheless, this matter is still being explored. The revised version, S*APA-II (1974), may be useful since it is more modular than the first version. One possibility,

which the writer would like to try, is to have a student put together a Unit Box built around a sequence of S*APA exercises on metric measurement or utilize the entire series of eighteen exercises on measurement.

Where and how do the students obtain the teachers' guides? Guides for each modular unit are obtained through the college bookstore, from the publishers, and in some cases from the professor. Since the Unit Box was introduced in 1969, the ordering of units through the college bookstore has taken considerable time. A half-yearly inventory of supply is taken and units are reordered each semester. Teachers' guides are ordered in numbers varying from four to forty depending on the title. The Curriculum Materials Center has a full collection of ESS, EIS, SCIS, EYE, BEBCO, UICSM, Science 5/13 and MINNEMAST Teacher's Guides and similar sets are on reserve in the college library at Jersey City State College. Thus, in addition to seeing the guides briefly at the first class session, students can examine them in the Curriculum Materials Center or borrow them from the library before making their choice. Students are also free to examine units from the author's personal collection. It is important to get the selection of teacher's guides into students' hands as quickly as possible both for viewing and purchase.

finale/commencement

At the conclusion of the methods course on campus or the program in the schools, each student brings in his completed Unit Box and everyone has an opportunity to see all the boxes. Twenty minute conferences allow the professor to discuss with each student the contents and use of the Unit Box. Each box is then photographed so that it may be shown to future classes. Large open-house displays may be set up in the gymnasium or cafeteria to give the boxes more exposure and such displays at Jersey City State College and in Ontario attracted hundreds of viewers. They also engendered a valuable cross-fertilization of ideas among the students involved, their teacher, and outside visitors.

Subsequent to the conferences at the conclusion of the methods course, students go out into the schools and begin student teaching. Hopefully and ideally, the apprentice teachers will be given an opportunity to use their Unit Boxes and see some of their efforts come to fruition during the practice teaching experience — as well as in their own classrooms after graduation. An assessment of what they actually do in science in

the classroom is made through classroom visits and is part of a ten-year follow-up study of the Unit Box Approach. One report of findings will be published in 1974-75. To date, the study has included well over six hundred classroom visits to student teachers and graduates and nearly seven hundred interviews with graduates who assembled Unit Boxes in the course.

numbers and topics

As of June 1974, 784 Unit Boxes had been completed in thirty-eight classes which the author has taught over an eleven semester period at Jersey City State College. The boxes were prepared by early childhood, general elementary, and special education majors for grade levels pre-kindergarten through grade eight; by day students and evening students; by preservice and inservice students; by undergraduates and graduates. Experienced teachers enrolled in Ontario Ministry of Education Certificate Courses in elementary school science produced another 104 Unit Boxes at Owen Sound in the summer of 1972 and 39 more at Ottawa in the summer of 1973. Most of the 927 Unit Boxes centered on topics in the physical and biological sciences (e.g., Batteries and Bulbs, Mystery Powders, Clay Boats, Life Cycles, Material Objects, Organisms, Chemical Change, Rocks and Charts, Growing Seeds, Bones, Hot and Cold, Continuity of Life). Many, however, were interdisciplinary or mathematics oriented units (e.g., Peas and Particles, Relative Position and Motion, Balancing, Mapping, Attribute Games and Problems, Time, Metric Measurement).¹⁴ A fair number have been readiness or pre-science units (e.g., Sense and Tell, Using Our Senses, Early Experiences).

summary

The Unit Box Approach minimizes certain traditional writing and copying activities frequently encountered in Education courses. Instead of finishing the course with the usual paper (unit) the student ends up with a complete custom-made multimedia kit plus a background of many experiences associated with its construction and use.

In summary, the Unit Box is mainly, but not merely, a collection of *things, assembled, used, and owned by the apprentice teacher*; it is a teaching-learning mediating system that interlocks materials and other media with the development of concepts, intellectual process skills, pupils' self-image,

language facility, and desired attitudes toward school, science, and above all, toward learning. These are its aims. The thrust of the Unit Box Approach is development and acquisition of materials and strategies to *implement* a tested Unit in the classroom; to implement recognized and worthy objectives. Successful implementation of the Unit certainly depends on the teacher's skill in handling the contents and class effectively. Organization and disciplined freedom are key elements in the magical mix of successful utilization. But being prepared with all the materials at hand and experience in their acquisition and use — is surely an important beginning. This is the Unit Box Approach.

acknowledgments

The author is grateful to Mr. Douglas M. Jolley of the Ontario Ministry of Education and Mr. John G. Cornfield, Assistant Head of Science, Ridgemount High School in Ottawa, whose foresight and diligent efforts made two projects in Ontario possible and successful.

footnotes

1. The term "Unit Box" was coined by the author in January of 1969.
2. This article deals with only one facet of the methods course, namely, the major project and terminal assignment. It is beyond the scope of this paper to describe the course. However, the following brief statements might be helpful to the reader by placing the Unit Box Assignment in perspective. It is a hands-on, non-lecture, media-oriented workshop type course. At *every* session students have an opportunity to work with ESS, SCIS, and AAAS-S*APA materials and activities. Films produced by ESS and SCIS along with slides and 8 mm motion pictures taken by the author are interspersed with the laboratory activities. These show real live children in classrooms engaging in activities similar to those the prospective teacher is involved in throughout the course. The atmosphere is non-threatening with high priority placed on interest, building of confidence, success, and joyful learning.
3. This statement is expanded at considerable length and documented with numerous references in a longer report available from the author. The paper presented here is a much condensed version of the full report in which many reasons are given for *not* having elementary education students write science units.
4. For example, the Elementary Science Study (ESS) *Teacher's Guide on Growing Seeds* and the *Experiences in Science* (EIS) *Teacher's Guide, Plants in Spring*; or the ESS units, *Life of Beans and Peas* and *Butterflies*, along with the Science Curriculum Improvement Study (SCIS) unit on *Life Cycles*; or the ESS unit, *Mystery Powders* combined with the Baltimore County, Maryland (BEBCO) unit on *Chemical and Physical Changes* and the EIS unit, *Chemical Change*; or the MINNEMAST unit Number 4, *Using Our*

Senses, combined with the Scott, Foresman modular pre-primary unit, *Sense and Tell*, plus the BEBCO unit on the Senses, and parts of the SCIS unit, Material Objects — and so forth.

5. This quasi-audio-tutorial component of the Unit Box is intended to *further* individualize learning (e.g., to accommodate a particular Piaget developmental stage of the pupil or to provide for a particular preference in learning style) — and might be considerably expanded. The writer may at some future date explore the idea of having an entire Unit Box built around a sequence of A-T modules. For more information on this topic consult the work of Novak at Cornell (1972) and a book by Novak to be published in 1974-75. See also the use of tape cassettes in *Individualized Science* (IS) under development at the Learning Research and Development Center of the University of Pittsburgh.
6. See L. S. Vygotsky (1962) and chapters 3 and 6 of Lansdown, Blackwood and Brandwein (1971).
7. For example, the construction and use of a shaving mirror telescope as one component of a Unit Box on Light or Optics or Astronomy. The construction project is usually not mentioned in the Teacher's Guide — but is a relevant and useful adjunct. A comprehensive list of Unit Box construction projects is available from the author.
8. For example, the evaluation supplements developed for each unit by the Science Curriculum Improvement Study (SCIS) or the evaluation materials recently developed for Elementary Science Study (ESS) units. See also the evaluation devices being produced for the Elementary Science Curriculum Study (ESCS) in Newfoundland.
9. See, for example, the use of science learning games in *Individualized Science* (IS); see articles by Weber (1971), Doran (1973) and the board game, *Metrication*. See, also, the puzzle-game component of the Science Curriculum Improvement Study (SCIS) unit, *Relativity*.
10. All of this does *not* preclude pupils bringing in science materials from home, nor does it preclude pupils constructing devices in class and at home. Both should certainly be encouraged. But the writer believes that these activities and contributions on the part of elementary school students should follow (and complement) the Unit Box Experience of the student teacher and classroom teacher. Tomorrow's science lesson should *not* depend upon whether or not the pupils bring in the necessary materials. Pupils may, however, be encouraged to stockpile and bring in certain items to be used several months from now. In regard to these points see the SCOPES units being developed at the University of Northern Iowa.
11. This is in contrast to situations in which a commercially prepared kit is handed to a teacher. The writer does *not* imply that all science kits should be teacher-produced or that unit kits are the only way to teach science or that commercial unit kits are useless. Nevertheless, there seems to be some definite definable value for teachers who put it all together themselves, i.e., the materials *not* the Teacher's Guide. This complex topic is treated at greater length in the Final Report of this project.
12. In addition to Piaget, Vygotsky, Bruner, Dewey, and others, see Huxley (1869), Spencer (1860), and Page (1847). See, also, chapter 8 of Hsün-tzu (3rd Century B.C.). Many ideas in vogue today can

be found in some form somewhere in the historical literature on education. A noteworthy and engaging example is the emphasis today — as reflected in the Unit Box Approach — on inquiry, discovery, and individual activity by pupils who interact with real things and phenomena. These ideas are *not* new; they were all espoused by J. W. A. Young, over sixty years ago, for the teaching of mathematics and by Henry Edward Armstrong, a prominent nineteenth century English chemist and teacher. Both men were probably perceived as deviant by other members of their local social system. Armstrong and his heuristic method, in his day, made little impression in the United States, and hardly a wave in his native England. This is understandable in historical perspective, since acceptance of new ideas and widespread change in education tend to be glacial. But change does occur and its effects are perceptible over a period of time.

13. During the Spring Semester of 1974 the writer explored the use of ESCS Teaching Guides. Students used ESCS process/principle oriented units (as a nucleus for their Unit Boxes) in combination with the relevant ESS, SCIS, EIS or MINNEMAST Units. ESCS is a second generation hybrid, and like biological hybrids may be even stronger than its pure strain origins. This Canadian curriculum represents a synthesis of some of the most significant elements in AAAS--S*APA and ESS plus elements of SCIS and MINNEMAST.
14. In regard to mathematics oriented units, the Unit Box Approach may also be useful in connection with teacher preparation for laboratory-centered mathematics teaching. Regarding this type of teaching see Kidd (1970), Berger (1973), Davidson and Walter (1972); also, the very early work of Young (1907).

references cited and other relevant literature

1. Bureau de Recherche et de Consultation en Education, *Approaching Problems Scientifically* (APS), Montréal: Librairie Beauchemin Limitée.
2. Henry E. Armstrong, *Teaching Scientific Method and Other Papers on Education*, London: Macmillan Co., 1913, pp. 236 and 255.
3. *Australian Science Education Project* (ASEP), 11 Glenbervie Road, Toorak, Victoria 3142.
4. Mitchell E. Batoff, *Kitchen Photography on a Shoestring*, Jersey City, New Jersey: By the Author, 1972.
5. G. W. Beeson, "Making Curriculum Decisions," *The Australian Science Teachers' Journal*, LIX: 45-52, September, 1973.
6. Emil J. Berger, ed., *Instructional Aids in Mathematics*, Thirty-fourth Yearbook, Reston, Virginia: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1973.
7. Board of Education of Baltimore County (BEBCO), Thirty Modular Units, Greenwood, 6901 North Charles Street, Towson, Maryland 21204. (Katherine M. Klier, Curriculum Consultant).
8. Matthew Bruce, "A Study of Undergraduate Programs for Science Teachers," unpublished report, Washington, D.C., USOE Project 7-C-001, "Science Education for Elementary Teachers," unpublished report, Washington, D.C., USOE Project 7-C-016.

9. The Commission on Science Education of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), *Science-A Process Approach* (S*APA), and S*APA-II, 1974, 1515 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.
10. Robert K. Crocker, Project Director, *Elementary Science Curriculum Study* (ESCS), Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland.
11. Patricia S. Davidson and Marion I. Walter, "A Laboratory Approach," *The Slow Learner in Mathematics*, Thirty-fifth Yearbook, Reston, Virginia: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1972.
12. Rodney L. Doran and William Watson, "Games for the Science Classroom," *The Science Teacher*, XL: 31-35, April, 1973.
13. Henry S. Dyer, "The Art of Unwrapping Curriculum Packages or How to Be An Educational String Saver," *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, LII: 155-57, May, 1968.
14. *Elementary Science Study* (ESS), Education Development Center, Inc., 55 Chapel Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02160. (French translations and adaptations, of ESS Teacher's Guides are available from McGraw-Hill, Editeurs, 750 Boulevard Laurentien, Montréal.)
15. Len Ennever, Project Director, *Science 5/13*, University of Bristol School of Education, 19 Berkeley Square, Bristol, England BS8 1HF; General Learning Corporation, 115 Nugget Avenue, Agincourt, Ontario; Purnell Educational, 850 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019; Macdonald Educational, 49-50 Poland Street, London, England W1A 2LG.
16. Paul DeHart Hurd, "Elementary School Science for the 1970s in Perspective," in *Developments in Elementary School Science, A Report of Seven Regional Conferences for School Administrators*, Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1970, pp. 1-11.
17. T. H. Huxley, *Scientific Education: Notes of an After-Dinner Speech*, 1869.
18. Willard J. Jacobson, "U.S.A.: Post-Sputnik Science Curricula," *Strategies for Curriculum Change: Cases from Thirteen Nations*, R. Murray Thomas, Lester B. Sands, and Dale L. Brubaker, eds., Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Co., 1968, pp. 116-35.
19. Kenneth P. Kidd, Shirley S. Myers, and David M. Cilley, *The Laboratory Approach to Mathematics*, Chicago, Illinois: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1970.
20. Leopold E. Klopfer, Project Director, *Individualized Science* (IS), Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh, 160 North Craig Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.
21. Louis I. Kusland and A. Harris Stone, *Teaching Children Science: An Inquiry Approach*, Second Edition, Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1972.
22. Brenda Lansdown, Paul E. Blackwood and Paul F. Brandwein, *Teaching Elementary Science Through Investigation and Colloquium*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1971.
23. J. Stanley Marshall, Illa Podendorf, Clifford Swartz, and Peter B.

- Shoresman, *Sense and Tell Teacher's Guidebook: Unit One of Pre-Primary Science System*, Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1968; Scarborough, Ontario: Gage Educational Publishing Ltd.
24. John McGavack, Jr. and Donald P. La Salle, *Guppies, Bubbles and Vibrating Objects: A Creative Approach to the Teaching of Science to Very Young Children*, New York: The John Day Co., 1969.
25. *Metrication*, Metrix Corporation, Box 19101, Orlando, Florida 32814. A Monopoly-type board game which has been found to be effective for introducing the language of the metric system in an informal, fun way.
26. *Minnesota Mathematics and Science Teaching Project* (MINNE-MAST), Minnesota School Mathematics and Science Center, University of Minnesota, 720 Washington Ave., S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414.
27. Marshall A. Nay, "Avoid Obsolescence: Build a Curriculum Resource Information Bank," *The Crucible* (Science Teachers Association of Ontario), IV: 4-11, February, 1973.
28. David E. Newton and Fletcher G. Watson, *The Research on Science Education Survey* (ROSES), *The Status of Teacher Education Programs in the Sciences*, 1965-1967, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, 1968, pp. vii, 63-4, 72, 85, 115-16.
29. Joseph D. Novak, "A Case Study of Curriculum Change — Science Since PSSC," *School Science and Mathematics*, LXIX: 374-84, May, 1969.
30. "The Use of Audio-Tutorial Methods in Elementary School Instruction," *The Audio-Tutorial Approach to Learning Through Independent Study and Integrated Experiences*, Third Edition, S. N. Postlethwait, J. D. Novak, and H. T. Murray, Jr., eds., Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1972.
31. "Audio-Tutorial Techniques for Individualized Science Instruction in the Elementary School," *Individualized Science*, Henry J. Triezenberg, ed., Washington, D.C.: National Science Teachers' Association, 1972.
32. *Outdoor Biology Instructional Strategies* (OBIS), Lawrence Hall of Science, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720.
33. David P. Page, *Theory and Practice of Teaching*, 1847.
34. Mary Budd Rowe, *Teaching Science As Continuous Inquiry*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.
35. Schools Council Research Studies, *Evaluation in Curriculum Development: Twelve Case Studies*, Basingstoke: Macmillan Education Limited, 1973, pp. 1-35.
36. *Science Curriculum Improvement Study* (SCIS), Lawrence Hall of Science, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720. (The French translation and adaptation of the SCIS program was completed in the Spring of 1973. Further information on the International French edition is available from the Institute of Psychological Research, Inc., 34 ouest, rue Fleury, Montréal.)
37. Herbert Spencer, *Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical*, 1860.
38. A. Harris Stone and others, *Science Inquiry Project Series*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966-1974.

39. Harold E. Tannenbaum, Beulah Tannenbaum, Nathan Stillman, and Myra Stillman, *Experiences in Science* (EIS), New York: Webster/McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1967.
40. *Unified Science and Mathematics for Elementary Schools* (USMES), Education Development Center, Inc., 55 Chapel Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02160; see *EDC News*, Issues 1-4; *School Science and Mathematics*, October 1974 and *Mosaic* (published by the National Science Foundation), Volume 5, Number 1, Winter, 1974.
41. Donald A. Vannan, "The American Elementary Science Methods Teacher Today," *Science Education*, LIV: 183-84, April, 1970.
42. L. S. Vygotsky, *Thought and Language*, Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1962.
43. Fletcher G. Watson, "New Approaches to Science in Elementary Schools," *Science and Mathematics: Countdown for Elementary Schools*, Frontiers of Science Foundation of Oklahoma, Inc., A Symposium held at Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 5 December 1959, pp. 32-38.
44. ———, "The Teaching of Physics . . ." *Science Activities*, X: 35-37+, November, 1973. Useful navigational aid for rational selection of any curricular material.
45. Victor L. Weber, Jr., Albert P. Nous, and Robert N. Costa, "Science Learning Games in an Individualized Setting," *Science Activities*, VIII: 13-19, March, 1971.
46. Daniel F. Wentworth, J. Kenneth Couchman, John MacBean and Adam Stecher, *Examining Your Environment* (EYE), Toronto: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston of Canada.
47. Dean K. Whitla and Dan C. Pinck, *Essentially Elementary Science: A Report on the Status of Elementary Science in Massachusetts Schools*, Submitted to the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, Office of Instructional Research and Evaluation in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and The Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge: Harvard University, March 1973. A significant study which is relevant to the starting points, rationale and spirit behind hundreds of Unit Boxes assembled at Jersey City State College and in Ontario, 1969-1974, cf. references 48 and 49 also.
48. Dean K. Whitla and Dan C. Pinck, *Something of Value: A Summary of Findings and Recommendations for Improving Elementary Science in Massachusetts*, Submitted to the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, Office of Instructional Research and Evaluation, Harvard University, March 1973.
49. Dean K. Whitla and Dan C. Pinck, *Lively Elementary Science Programs: A Handbook of Suggestions for Introducing and Maintaining Innovative Science Activities*, Submitted to the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, Office of Instructional Research and Evaluation, Harvard University, January 1974.
50. J. W. A. Young, *The Teaching of Mathematics in the Elementary and Secondary Schools*, New York: Longmans, Green, 1907.

**William C. Gibson. *WESBROOK AND HIS UNIVERSITY*.
Vancouver: The Library, Univ. of British Columbia, 1973.
xii + 204 pp. \$7.00.**

In North America at least, the rise of science and the growth of universities seem to be indissolubly linked developments. In reviewing a biography of a university scientist, it would thus be almost impious to ask whether the marriage of organized science and organized learning-in-general has been a good thing. And yet, it is just this question which comes to mind in a reading of the life of F. F. Westbrook, first President of the University of British Columbia. It is no doubt easier to ask the question at a time of levelling-off in student and faculty numbers, in capital expenditures and new research facilities. One may now write the history of academic science without any need to find in the sciences the embodied salvation of the university. To recall a hoary metaphor, the groves of academe show definite signs of physical maturity.

Westbrook's biographer also has the advantage of writing at a time of significant change in the methods of the historical sub-disciplines concerned with science and education. In the last two decades, especially, historians everywhere have taken renewed interest in the broad social functions of education and science, in their politics, their economics and their government. Besides all these advantages, it happens that almost no work has been done on the history of the University of British Columbia. Gibson's life of Westbrook may be considered an important event, then, in both the history of Canadian science and the history of Canadian education.

Westbrook's life spanned decades of great intellectual excitement in Canada and abroad, beginning with his general and medical education at the University of Manitoba (B.A., 1887, M.A., M.D. 1890). His post-graduate work began at King's College School and Hospital, London, in May, 1891, continuing at Marburg, Germany (1892) and Cambridge, England (1893-1895), with only a four-month "break" as Professor of Pathology at the Manitoba Medical College. This latter institution was altogether *too* pioneering and too stifling for Westbrook, who was relieved to return to Cambridge. His career in research, mainly in bacteriology, ended with his appointment as Professor of Bacteriology and Pathology at the thriving University of Minnesota and as Dean of Medicine (1906-1913) at the same institution. It was from the latter appointment that he was called in 1913, at the age of forty-four, to the presidency of the University of British Columbia. Five years later, he was dead, partly because of a recurrent infection (which could now be cured with a week or two of penicillin injections), and partly because of overwork. Fully three-quarters of Gibson's biography details Westbrook's efforts to begin a university under war-time conditions, with less than a tenth of the funds originally promised, and in "temporary" quarters whose effect on the quality and content of instruction must have been depressing.

Throughout the complicated story of Westbrook's dealings with the McBride and subsequent governments, Gibson keeps his facts straight and maintains a consistent pattern within chapters. Gibson gives us well-written narrative throughout the book, with perhaps the exception of one chapter (Ch. 4, "A Philosophy of Education"). His explanations of events are usually of the cause-effect variety. Each chapter is spiced with a few excerpts from Westbrook's date-book. The result is a terse,

straightforward, chronologically ordered, readable account of events. But does this sort of account take the reader far enough?

No matter how clean and crisp his style, it is clear that Gibson, even before he began to write this work, wished to end it by marking out certain of Wesbrook's personality traits: his industrious work habits, his paternalistic concern for the health and welfare of students, and his talents for administration and teaching. Of course, in the case of a university president, one normally has not to look far for "evidence" of such characteristics. With his "evidence" in hand, and his conclusion in mind, Gibson needed to ask only a limited number of questions in the course of his research.

Suppose for a moment that Gibson had asked some stickier questions. It is true, for instance, that Wesbrook encouraged students to seek self-government in their own Society — but government over what affairs? Was this democracy in any important sense? It is true, too, that Wesbrook accomplished a great deal of administrative work single-handedly — but did he have some administrative goals in view? If so, was he very efficient in achieving them? One could argue, perhaps not convincingly, that Wesbrook's theory of university government (if he had one) implied that a great many decisions could be taken only with the authority of the President, and without the participation of anybody else. Other interpretations come readily to mind; none has been examined or disposed of in Gibson's book.

The chapter dealing with Wesbrook's "philosophy" of education does contend with a few somewhat trickier problems. According to Gibson, Wesbrook's notions of medical education laid more emphasis on the general structure of investigation into ordinary disease than on the memorization of a great many case-studies. As Wesbrook himself said,

It is probable that the teaching of today is too diversified and that attempt is made to cover too much ground. At best, the student can only be taught certain general principles and how to observe. It is, therefore, best to illustrate the methods of observation by the thorough study of a few disease processes rather than to attempt to cover the whole field of medicine. (p. 32)

This inclination towards a methodical, general education was equally evident in Wesbrook's later planning of the offerings of the Faculty of Arts in the University of British Columbia. In this latter case, he built in certain "foundation" courses which, once taken, left the student free to complete his program in any way he thought reasonable.

The form of University government which Wesbrook thought appropriate would give the alumni a very large voice (as on the Cambridge model) while retaining most policy-making power in the hands of faculty. The government would require some representation. Indeed, most of the significant decisions to be made concerning the teaching and research activities of the University would be made by persons not directly involved in them. Why should this be? Perhaps Wesbrook explained it best himself in a 1907 speech:

Each community does wisely if at the very outset it takes stock of its local assets, studies environmental and other conditions which affect operation, and takes immediate steps to utilize its local advantages to the utmost whilst exercising due care for future generations. It is strictly within the function of a university to aid in a practical way. (p. 39)

If any doubt remained in this reader's mind about Wesbrook's commitment to the material development of the State through the efforts of its universities, it was removed by another gem from the same speech:

Had the state been developed to its proper point, Edison should have been working in a university and not for his own and other's personal gain; Luther Burbank would have been stimulating colleagues and students by his observations; . . . Marconi should have been developed in his practical applications as he had been in his theoretical knowledge by a university. (p. 39).

Obviously, Wesbrook had not been infected while in Germany by the spirit of disinterested learning, of *Lern- und Lehrfreiheit*, which the German universities hoped to embody. His university would provide facilities for thoroughly interested teaching and research. Another question: Did the commitment to provincial development explain why Wesbrook was so close a friend of H. R. MacMillan and Leon Ladner, both industrial barons of early British Columbia?

One wonders how different Wesbrook was from his counterparts at the Universities of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. One wonders, too, if his commitment to a provincially supported secular university meant that the benefits of institutions like St. Michael's College (now in the University of Toronto) and St. Thomas More College (University of Saskatchewan) could never be realized in British Columbia. Did he pay any attention to the model of the Scottish universities or to the experience of the Eastern Canadian universities?

At several points Gibson speaks of Wesbrook's inclination to "overdo" everything, whether it be study, teaching, administration or athletics. His energies were spoken of as "compelling," even during Wesbrook's lifetime. Gibson neglects to ask still another important question: why was Wesbrook a driven man? Was it religious conviction? Was it moral fervor? Or was Wesbrook so deeply a part of the international advance of science that his commitment to academic life and scientific work allowed him no rest? Unfortunately, there is no way to answer these questions on the basis of Gibson's biography. Since he has given so little indication of the extent and the nature of the evidence with which he dealt during his research, Gibson prevents his readers even from deciding whether there will *ever* be grounds for answering these questions.

Still, this beautifully printed and bound book may have done the very best service it could, for it has piqued the historical curiosity of one reader at least, and it has begun the job of giving a university an historical personality.

William A. Bruneau

University of British Columbia

Famum Gray &
George Mager.
LIBERATING EDUCATION:
PSYCHOLOGICAL LEARNING
THROUGH
IMPROVISATIONAL DRAMA.
Berkeley:
McCutchan, 1973.
202 pp. \$8.95.

This book presents a convincing case for improvisational drama as a method of teaching. The authors employ improvisation for therapy; but this is *not* psychodrama.

The book's excellence lies in the honest and imaginative approach of its authors. The actual experi-

ence of the drama classes is vividly communicated, and any careful reader who has remained keenly aware of his students or used improvisational methods in the classroom, must gain insights from the facts presented.

Gray and Mager start by agreeing that the difficulty of education by direct experience is that you cannot measure it; then go on to do just that,

This intelligent and sensitive boy learned a great deal about people in the course, and outgrew his initial fear of movement to become one of the most abandoned dancers. (p. 142)

Had the state been developed to its proper point, Edison should have been working in a university and not for his own and other's personal gain; Luther Burbank would have been stimulating colleagues and students by his observations; . . . Marconi should have been developed in his practical applications as he had been in his theoretical knowledge by a university. (p. 39).

Obviously, Wesbrook had not been infected while in Germany by the spirit of disinterested learning, of *Lern- und Lehrfreiheit*, which the German universities hoped to embody. His university would provide facilities for thoroughly interested teaching and research. Another question: Did the commitment to provincial development explain why Wesbrook was so close a friend of H. R. MacMillan and Leon Ladner, both industrial barons of early British Columbia?

One wonders how different Wesbrook was from his counterparts at the Universities of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. One wonders, too, if his commitment to a provincially supported secular university meant that the benefits of institutions like St. Michael's College (now in the University of Toronto) and St. Thomas More College (University of Saskatchewan) could never be realized in British Columbia. Did he pay any attention to the model of the Scottish universities or to the experience of the Eastern Canadian universities?

At several points Gibson speaks of Wesbrook's inclination to "overdo" everything, whether it be study, teaching, administration or athletics. His energies were spoken of as "compelling," even during Wesbrook's lifetime. Gibson neglects to ask still another important question: why was Wesbrook a driven man? Was it religious conviction? Was it moral fervor? Or was Wesbrook so deeply a part of the international advance of science that his commitment to academic life and scientific work allowed him no rest? Unfortunately, there is no way to answer these questions on the basis of Gibson's biography. Since he has given so little indication of the extent and the nature of the evidence with which he dealt during his research, Gibson prevents his readers even from deciding whether there will *ever* be grounds for answering these questions.

Still, this beautifully printed and bound book may have done the very best service it could, for it has piqued the historical curiosity of one reader at least, and it has begun the job of giving a university an historical personality.

William A. Bruneau

University of British Columbia

Famum Gray &
George Mager.
**LIBERATING EDUCATION:
PSYCHOLOGICAL LEARNING
THROUGH
IMPROVISATIONAL DRAMA.**
Berkeley:
McCutchan, 1973.
202 pp. \$8.95.

This book presents a convincing case for improvisational drama as a method of teaching. The authors employ improvisation for therapy; but this is *not* psychodrama.

The book's excellence lies in the honest and imaginative approach of its authors. The actual experi-

ence of the drama classes is vividly communicated, and any careful reader who has remained keenly aware of his students or used improvisational methods in the classroom, must gain insights from the facts presented.

Gray and Mager start by agreeing that the difficulty of education by direct experience is that you cannot measure it; then go on to do just that,

This intelligent and sensitive boy learned a great deal about people in the course, and outgrew his initial fear of movement to become one of the most abandoned dancers. (p. 142)

This kind of statement might wring howls from the unconverted such as "Do we really want to encourage boys to become 'abandoned dancers'?" My answer is, "Yes, we do" — if this "frees" the dancer and opens the way to fuller living.

Gray and Mager claim that,

Our purpose in teaching is to afford people opportunities to develop their human capacities fully. Our approach and premises are based on theories of developmental psychology. (p. 4).

I have myself used improvisational drama as a tool in exploring the possibilities of education through art. This in no way detracted from the developmental aspects of drama — but augmented them. In *Liberating Education* the emphasis is on therapy by means of 3-way psychological learning: teacher/student; student/student; and student with himself. All possible combinations of relationship are explored and the excerpts from both tapes and journals show that the students were enriched by this exploration of themselves and their environment.

The authors succeed in their presentation of principles, techniques and experiences, to demonstrate the vast possibilities developmental drama opens up. The capabilities of students are so often in question that it is exhilarating to read a book by human beings who realize how pitifully seldom during their school years most students' inner resources and abilities are called upon. "Never underestimate your pupils" is the unspoken maxim of this book, which contains detailed examples, techniques, aims and concrete facts enough to keep several dramatic workshops going for years. The book is clear and easy to read. For me, it is marred only by its ambiguous and pretentious-sounding title which seems to be a contradiction of the Boleslavsky adage, "The object of education is not to know but to live." (p. 1)

Education is a process, not some

static thing somehow imprisoned. However, once one understands that the title comes from the remark of a clinical psychologist, "A liberating education" (p. 2)—that is, a freeing method — the title then does justice to the book.

Paddy Hearsey
McGill University

Margaret Gillett &
John Laska, eds.
**FOUNDATIONS STUDIES
IN EDUCATION:
JUSTIFICATION AND
NEW DIRECTIONS.**
Metuchen, N.J.:
The Scarecrow Press, 1973.
423 pp. \$10.00.

Ordinary mortals, writes Prof. Gillett, can count on two inevitables, death and taxes; teacher trainees may depend on three — death, taxes, and History of Education. You could add Educational Sociology, Philosophy, and other constants whose enduring presence in education faculty calendars seems to indicate that a teacher ignorant of Ryerson, Durkheim, or Plato is no teacher at all.

Foundations Studies in Education seeks first to justify these inevitables through offering some good essays by writers like Maxine Greene, Wayne J. Urban, and Margaret Gillett herself in order to identify what teachers-to-be might expect to learn from the so-called foundations. The book serves a second, different purpose, however. In the 60's, foundations scholars saw fit to ally themselves closely with corresponding disciplines in Faculty of Arts departments. Conversely, the editors of *Foundations Studies* . . . ask "whether or not foundations of education are worthy of being considered an independent study," and, by implication, propose the American Educational Studies Association as the appropriate body for helping to bring about this self-sufficiency. To borrow Prof. Gillett's image, this is both bad and good news.

First the bad news. Books stemming from self-conscious debate

This kind of statement might wring howls from the unconverted such as "Do we really want to encourage boys to become 'abandoned dancers'?" My answer is, "Yes, we do" — if this "frees" the dancer and opens the way to fuller living.

Gray and Mager claim that,

Our purpose in teaching is to afford people opportunities to develop their human capacities fully. Our approach and premises are based on theories of developmental psychology. (p. 4).

I have myself used improvisational drama as a tool in exploring the possibilities of education through art. This in no way detracted from the developmental aspects of drama — but augmented them. In *Liberating Education* the emphasis is on therapy by means of 3-way psychological learning: teacher/student; student/student; and student with himself. All possible combinations of relationship are explored and the excerpts from both tapes and journals show that the students were enriched by this exploration of themselves and their environment.

The authors succeed in their presentation of principles, techniques and experiences, to demonstrate the vast possibilities developmental drama opens up. The capabilities of students are so often in question that it is exhilarating to read a book by human beings who realize how pitifully seldom during their school years most students' inner resources and abilities are called upon. "Never underestimate your pupils" is the unspoken maxim of this book, which contains detailed examples, techniques, aims and concrete facts enough to keep several dramatic workshops going for years. The book is clear and easy to read. For me, it is marred only by its ambiguous and pretentious-sounding title which seems to be a contradiction of the Boleslavsky adage, "The object of education is not to know but to live." (p. 1)

Education is a process, not some

static thing somehow imprisoned. However, once one understands that the title comes from the remark of a clinical psychologist, "A liberating education" (p. 2)—that is, a freeing method — the title then does justice to the book.

Paddy Hearsey
McGill University

Margaret Gillett &
John Laska, eds.
**FOUNDATIONS STUDIES
IN EDUCATION:
JUSTIFICATION AND
NEW DIRECTIONS.**
Metuchen, N.J.:
The Scarecrow Press, 1973.
423 pp. \$10.00.

Ordinary mortals, writes Prof. Gillett, can count on two inevitables, death and taxes; teacher trainees may depend on three — death, taxes, and History of Education. You could add Educational Sociology, Philosophy, and other constants whose enduring presence in education faculty calendars seems to indicate that a teacher ignorant of Ryerson, Durkheim, or Plato is no teacher at all.

Foundations Studies in Education seeks first to justify these inevitables through offering some good essays by writers like Maxine Greene, Wayne J. Urban, and Margaret Gillett herself in order to identify what teachers-to-be might expect to learn from the so-called foundations. The book serves a second, different purpose, however. In the 60's, foundations scholars saw fit to ally themselves closely with corresponding disciplines in Faculty of Arts departments. Conversely, the editors of *Foundations Studies* . . . ask "whether or not foundations of education are worthy of being considered an independent study," and, by implication, propose the American Educational Studies Association as the appropriate body for helping to bring about this self-sufficiency. To borrow Prof. Gillett's image, this is both bad and good news.

First the bad news. Books stemming from self-conscious debate

among scholars tend not to attract readers outside the field. Laymen confronted with such volumes assume the status of Wimbledon spectators. And students assigned a work given largely to examining the "worth" of a mandatory subject not surprisingly question its timeliness.

Now the good news. Given its professional orientation, *Foundations Studies* . . . provides balance. In Part One, John Laska describes foundations' historical shift from dependence to independence, introducing widely contrasting pieces by such writers as James Bryant Conant who deplores patched-up foundations curricula, and James L. Kueth who optimistically heralds a discipline of education. Enjoying Margaret Gillett's witty introduction, Parts Two and Three look respectively at teacher preparation and new directions, scanning the range of concerns from R. Freeman Butts' views on methodology, through Colin Greer's critical stance regarding historical revisionism, to Paul Nash's elegant words on humanistic and behavioral studies in teacher education.

On balance, here is a useful collection principally addressed to professors of the variously-described foundations subjects. Perhaps it will help us clarify what we hope to achieve in educating teachers. Possibly, too, in some indirect way, it will remind us of our ultimate clientele, the girls and boys in our schools.

John Calam

University of British Columbia

Rodney W. Napier &
Matti K. Gershenfeld.
**GROUPS:
THEORY AND EXPERIENCE.**
Boston:
Houghton Mifflin, 1973.
311 pp. \$9.50.

This book, with an accompanying instructor's manual, is intended as a non-technical guide and text to small group processes. Its intended audience consists primarily of those who are not specifically trained in

group dynamics — students, community leaders, mental health workers, business and organizational consultants, etc. The format consists of eight chapters, an authors' preface, an editor's introduction, an appendix and an index. Each chapter contains two parts — a theoretical section which provides a conceptual framework and presumably gives the reader a "language for observing groups as they operate"; and an experiential section which suggests a number of applied training exercises which have the supposed effect of supplementing theoretical understanding with first-hand observations of "groups-in-action." During the course of the eight chapters, problems of perception, communication, membership, norms, goals, leadership, decision making and group movement are all tackled. The appendix focuses on the skills which a group facilitator (i.e. the reader) must acquire before he begins to intervene in groups using the skill exercises given in each chapter.

In the reviewer's opinion, the value of Napier and Gershenfeld's contribution is highly suspect. Most portions of the text are replete with vague, over-generalized statements about group phenomena such as: "Among strangers the norm is usually to participate, while among friends it is easy to become sidetracked" (p. 30). The authors attempt to mitigate skeptical reactions to such statements by surrounding them with more esoteric phrases like "the feedback process," "defensive communication," "group maintenance roles" and "group harmony." Unfortunately, little effort has gone into defining such verbiage in terms of the empirical reality of the small group situation. Thus, while the authors may be correct in suggesting that the reader acquires a language for talking about groups, it is doubtful that he will understand what he is talking about. The countless illustrations and examples — some taken from group encounters, some from other

among scholars tend not to attract readers outside the field. Laymen confronted with such volumes assume the status of Wimbledon spectators. And students assigned a work given largely to examining the "worth" of a mandatory subject not surprisingly question its timeliness.

Now the good news. Given its professional orientation, *Foundations Studies* . . . provides balance. In Part One, John Laska describes foundations' historical shift from dependence to independence, introducing widely contrasting pieces by such writers as James Bryant Conant who deplores patched-up foundations curricula, and James L. Kueth who optimistically heralds a discipline of education. Enjoying Margaret Gillett's witty introduction, Parts Two and Three look respectively at teacher preparation and new directions, scanning the range of concerns from R. Freeman Butts' views on methodology, through Colin Greer's critical stance regarding historical revisionism, to Paul Nash's elegant words on humanistic and behavioral studies in teacher education.

On balance, here is a useful collection principally addressed to professors of the variously-described foundations subjects. Perhaps it will help us clarify what we hope to achieve in educating teachers. Possibly, too, in some indirect way, it will remind us of our ultimate clientele, the girls and boys in our schools.

John Calam

University of British Columbia

Rodney W. Napier &
Matti K. Gershenfeld.
**GROUPS:
THEORY AND EXPERIENCE.**
Boston:
Houghton Mifflin, 1973.
311 pp. \$9.50.

This book, with an accompanying instructor's manual, is intended as a non-technical guide and text to small group processes. Its intended audience consists primarily of those who are not specifically trained in

group dynamics — students, community leaders, mental health workers, business and organizational consultants, etc. The format consists of eight chapters, an authors' preface, an editor's introduction, an appendix and an index. Each chapter contains two parts — a theoretical section which provides a conceptual framework and presumably gives the reader a "language for observing groups as they operate"; and an experiential section which suggests a number of applied training exercises which have the supposed effect of supplementing theoretical understanding with first-hand observations of "groups-in-action." During the course of the eight chapters, problems of perception, communication, membership, norms, goals, leadership, decision making and group movement are all tackled. The appendix focuses on the skills which a group facilitator (i.e. the reader) must acquire before he begins to intervene in groups using the skill exercises given in each chapter.

In the reviewer's opinion, the value of Napier and Gershenfeld's contribution is highly suspect. Most portions of the text are replete with vague, over-generalized statements about group phenomena such as: "Among strangers the norm is usually to participate, while among friends it is easy to become sidetracked" (p. 30). The authors attempt to mitigate skeptical reactions to such statements by surrounding them with more esoteric phrases like "the feedback process," "defensive communication," "group maintenance roles" and "group harmony." Unfortunately, little effort has gone into defining such verbiage in terms of the empirical reality of the small group situation. Thus, while the authors may be correct in suggesting that the reader acquires a language for talking about groups, it is doubtful that he will understand what he is talking about. The countless illustrations and examples — some taken from group encounters, some from other

sources — which are sprinkled lavishly throughout the book do not offset this criticism. These are of a highly subjective, anecdotal or testimonial nature and can, in no way, replace or substitute for objective factual data.

But Napier and Gershenfeld do not seem to be fully aware of this difference. The reader is confronted with a host of opinions and theories but is given no means of evaluating them other than through "trial-by-immersion" (i.e., by completing the skill exercises in each chapter). Other more scientifically legitimate methods of acquiring knowledge of group dynamics such as the use of Bales' *Interaction Process Analysis* are given only fleeting recognition.

But the real question here is: How do beginning students of group dynamics, without any ability to observe objectively and evaluate group processes and learnings (even after reading the appendix on "practical skills for facilitators"), and with little idea of the necessity for such, suddenly qualify as facilitators in order that they might do their "home-work assignments"? The fact that the authors seem to have no difficulty with this question is seriously disturbing.

John McLeish
University of Alberta

Paul Shephard &
Daniel McKinley.
**ENVIRON/MENTAL:
ESSAYS ON THE PLANET
AS A HOME.**
Don Mills, Ontario:
Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1971.
300 pp. \$6.50.

R. H. Horwood.
**INQUIRY INTO
ENVIRONMENTAL
POLLUTION.**
Toronto:
Macmillan, 1973.
116 pp. \$2.95.

Among the many influences which eventually combined to establish in the mind of the American public

an acute awareness of the delicate state of the world's ecology was the appearance during 1969 of a publication entitled *The Subversive Science: Essays Toward an Ecology of Man*. It was an anthology of articles by leading ecologists, sociologists, and economists, whose object was to accentuate the transitory nature of human activities when seen in the broader and more enduring matrix of ecological inter-relationships.

Environ/mental is its sequel. In this second collection by the same editors, Paul Shepard and Daniel McKinley, the emphasis is more on man himself. The essays are "intended to illustrate the scope of current environmental disorder and the variety of possible perspectives on it," and to this end are divided into four parts. The first of these deals with man in the natural environment, followed by the problems pertaining to human societies, particularly factors related to our increasing numbers; the articles in the third section are concerned with the values which determine human activity in the environment, and the last group covers some of the prescriptions offered for the more pressing environmental ailments. There naturally tends to be a good deal of overlapping as many of the papers were not originally written to be compartmented in this fashion. Besides the bibliographies contained in many of the individual essays, the editors have supplied, at the end of the book, an extremely generous and valuable reading list for each of the above sections.

While this anthology, like its predecessor, provides much useful reading, the impact of its possible educational contribution has been reduced with the passage of time. In short, if its object is to alert us to certain aspects of living in a healthy environment, well, fortunately we have already been alerted many times over. For our collective consciousness of the whole man-environment question has evolved considerably during the past three or four years, owing to the well deserved coverage it

sources — which are sprinkled lavishly throughout the book do not offset this criticism. These are of a highly subjective, anecdotal or testimonial nature and can, in no way, replace or substitute for objective factual data.

But Napier and Gershenfeld do not seem to be fully aware of this difference. The reader is confronted with a host of opinions and theories but is given no means of evaluating them other than through "trial-by-immersion" (i.e., by completing the skill exercises in each chapter). Other more scientifically legitimate methods of acquiring knowledge of group dynamics such as the use of Bales' *Interaction Process Analysis* are given only fleeting recognition.

But the real question here is: How do beginning students of group dynamics, without any ability to observe objectively and evaluate group processes and learnings (even after reading the appendix on "practical skills for facilitators"), and with little idea of the necessity for such, suddenly qualify as facilitators in order that they might do their "home-work assignments"? The fact that the authors seem to have no difficulty with this question is seriously disturbing.

John McLeish
University of Alberta

Paul Shephard &
Daniel McKinley.
**ENVIRON/MENTAL:
ESSAYS ON THE PLANET
AS A HOME.**
Don Mills, Ontario:
Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1971.
300 pp. \$6.50.

R. H. Horwood.
**INQUIRY INTO
ENVIRONMENTAL
POLLUTION.**
Toronto:
Macmillan, 1973.
116 pp. \$2.95.

Among the many influences which eventually combined to establish in the mind of the American public

an acute awareness of the delicate state of the world's ecology was the appearance during 1969 of a publication entitled *The Subversive Science: Essays Toward an Ecology of Man*. It was an anthology of articles by leading ecologists, sociologists, and economists, whose object was to accentuate the transitory nature of human activities when seen in the broader and more enduring matrix of ecological inter-relationships.

Environ/mental is its sequel. In this second collection by the same editors, Paul Shepard and Daniel McKinley, the emphasis is more on man himself. The essays are "intended to illustrate the scope of current environmental disorder and the variety of possible perspectives on it," and to this end are divided into four parts. The first of these deals with man in the natural environment, followed by the problems pertaining to human societies, particularly factors related to our increasing numbers; the articles in the third section are concerned with the values which determine human activity in the environment, and the last group covers some of the prescriptions offered for the more pressing environmental ailments. There naturally tends to be a good deal of overlapping as many of the papers were not originally written to be compartmented in this fashion. Besides the bibliographies contained in many of the individual essays, the editors have supplied, at the end of the book, an extremely generous and valuable reading list for each of the above sections.

While this anthology, like its predecessor, provides much useful reading, the impact of its possible educational contribution has been reduced with the passage of time. In short, if its object is to alert us to certain aspects of living in a healthy environment, well, fortunately we have already been alerted many times over. For our collective consciousness of the whole man-environment question has evolved considerably during the past three or four years, owing to the well deserved coverage it

has received in the press and on T.V. as well as through our own modest experiences of food and energy shortages. Moreover, the subject is now being given extensive attention in our schools, to judge by the level of sophistication of the educational manuals that are currently appearing. One such Canadian product is *Inquiry into Environmental Pollution* by R. H. Horwood.

Rather than provide yet another textbook abounding in information on ecology and pollution, Horwood has attempted to present more of a guide to the subject, with the intention of stimulating individual student investigation and class discussion of problems arising from the numerous ways we use the environment. Thus the form that the book takes is that of an outline of the function and dysfunction of ecological systems with the emphasis placed on the collecting and examining of material: "our goal is to provide a teaching book, one that asks productive questions and suggests helpful exercises." In this manner, it manages to touch on many related subjects that could not otherwise be included in its 116 pages. The contents are organized so that each of the chapters is more or less independent of the others, and the whole can be re-arranged and read in various sequences if desired. However, the route followed in the book is attractive in its subtlety.

The student is first acquainted with the basis of ecosystem organization and is introduced to the concepts of abiotic environment: producer, consumer, decomposer activity; nutrient cycling and energy flow. Three elementary ecosystems are discussed as examples and already we are made aware of the possibility of pollution in nature through the accumulation of organic matter and how, in turn, this is averted by the circular pattern of the process; in other words, the creation of pollution is a fact of living but ecosystems have evolved in such a way that the waste products of one creature provide sustenance for

other organisms leading to the establishment of a dynamic balance between the principal components of the system.

Chapter Two discusses the role of water in the ecosystem and gives a general picture of the substance as solvent of both acid-bases and of gases. The vulnerability of water to pollution is illustrated in these terms: The upset of the acid-base balance by sulphur dioxide, and the reduction of the amount of oxygen held in solution when the water's temperature is raised, making it increasingly uninhabitable for those organisms with high-oxygen demands. Again, there is a strong accent of practical activity, with the more detailed and technical laboratory work assigned to the Appendix.

The third and fourth chapters return to the conceptual structure of the ecosystem of which the producer-decomposer relations are examined in greater detail, leading to the construction of a model of an imaginary ecosystem. In this hypothetical world there are only two components coupled together — a producer and a decomposer. However, each lives off the wastes of the other and, given a continuous supply of energy, the whole is theoretically capable of supporting itself indefinitely. That nature is not quite so simple is fairly obvious; why this is so is the subject of the remainder of Chapter Four. The smooth functioning of the imaginary ecosystem is complicated by the existence of consumers — animals who live off plant life (and off each other), using and re-arranging some of the constituent energy and nutrients of the vegetation before they are passed on to the decomposers. This is not to say that consumer activity need upset the balance of the ecosystem. On the contrary, in nature consumer activity lends itself to ecosystem stability by providing sufficient diversity to help reduce the effect of upsetting external influences. It is in this light that human activity in the ecosystem is studied. For humans too are consumers but their activities modify

the ecosystem far more than those of other animals and tend to reduce this diversity, sometimes intentionally but more often in ignorance.

The final chapter is perhaps the most impressive as it succeeds in covering, albeit too briefly, a variety of topics which effect human impingement upon the natural environment. On the philosophical side, our rather woolly notions of "independence" together with our cherished ideals of economic growth, are shown to appear ridiculous when viewed in the ecological context; and, rather ironically our recently renewed interest in wildlife is itself seen as a potential threat to the environment in that the facilities set up to accommodate "nature lovers" often result in an increased pressure being brought to bear on what little is left of the wilderness. In the more practical vein, various types of conflict over use of the environment are examined, such as the use of land for food production as opposed to the accommodation of urban sprawl, or the use of bodies of water for sewage disposal versus their use as sources of fresh water both for industry and recreation. Most importantly, the political and economic implications of these conflicts are underlined.

The only drawback to this otherwise most commendable little book is that it might be rather difficult to fully appreciate without sufficient familiarity with ecosystem dynamics. But, then, as the author has informed us, there are numerous texts already available to provide this.

Gavin Scott
Architect, Montreal

Joe L. Frost.
REVISITING EARLY
CHILDHOOD EDUCATION:
READINGS.
New York:
Holt, Rinehart and Winston,
1973.
548 pp. \$7.50.

Practising teachers of young children usually like to read new pub-

lications on the subject of early childhood education. They want to discover whether the book will shed a realistic light on the education of young children in the modern classroom or whether it will bamboozle the interested reader with theories, measurement analysis and experimental situations. It is reassuring to find that Joe L. Frost's *Revisiting Early Childhood Education*, a new series of readings following-on from his earlier 1968 publication *Early Childhood Education Rediscovered*, is a comprehensive view of the developments since the mid-60's both in theory and practice.

In his book, Frost has taken "early childhood education" to mean a wide range of opportunities from day-care and community health and care programs to pre-schools and public kindergartens. The book is in eight sections each with an introductory review of the reading to follow. The 51 contributors deal with the rationale behind early childhood education; settings for programs; the input into this field from Montessori and Piaget; child-development in the spheres of cognitive, affective, conative and play learning; language development; Head Start, open schools and free schools; and a final section on the practical aspects of planning, analyzing and evaluating early childhood programs.

The progression of ideas through the readings allows the reader to come to the same conclusions as the teacher in the classroom. There must be more questioning regarding the ways young children learn and are evaluated — this comes out in the stimulating pro-and-con arguments of Greenfield and Bruner versus William Labov in the language development section and the heart-searchings about the effectiveness of open and free schools by Paul Goodman and Jonathan Kozol. "It is clear that our ideas about teaching are inadequate, but is it possible that they are simply false?" (Stretch p. 470)

A teacher is also reassured to

the ecosystem far more than those of other animals and tend to reduce this diversity, sometimes intentionally but more often in ignorance.

The final chapter is perhaps the most impressive as it succeeds in covering, albeit too briefly, a variety of topics which effect human impingement upon the natural environment. On the philosophical side, our rather woolly notions of "independence" together with our cherished ideals of economic growth, are shown to appear ridiculous when viewed in the ecological context; and, rather ironically our recently renewed interest in wildlife is itself seen as a potential threat to the environment in that the facilities set up to accommodate "nature lovers" often result in an increased pressure being brought to bear on what little is left of the wilderness. In the more practical vein, various types of conflict over use of the environment are examined, such as the use of land for food production as opposed to the accommodation of urban sprawl, or the use of bodies of water for sewage disposal versus their use as sources of fresh water both for industry and recreation. Most importantly, the political and economic implications of these conflicts are underlined.

The only drawback to this otherwise most commendable little book is that it might be rather difficult to fully appreciate without sufficient familiarity with ecosystem dynamics. But, then, as the author has informed us, there are numerous texts already available to provide this.

Gavin Scott
Architect, Montreal

Joe L. Frost.
REVISITING EARLY
CHILDHOOD EDUCATION:
READINGS.
New York:
Holt, Rinehart and Winston,
1973.
548 pp. \$7.50.

Practising teachers of young children usually like to read new pub-

lications on the subject of early childhood education. They want to discover whether the book will shed a realistic light on the education of young children in the modern classroom or whether it will bamboozle the interested reader with theories, measurement analysis and experimental situations. It is reassuring to find that Joe L. Frost's *Revisiting Early Childhood Education*, a new series of readings following-on from his earlier 1968 publication *Early Childhood Education Rediscovered*, is a comprehensive view of the developments since the mid-60's both in theory and practice.

In his book, Frost has taken "early childhood education" to mean a wide range of opportunities from day-care and community health and care programs to pre-schools and public kindergartens. The book is in eight sections each with an introductory review of the reading to follow. The 51 contributors deal with the rationale behind early childhood education; settings for programs; the input into this field from Montessori and Piaget; child-development in the spheres of cognitive, affective, conative and play learning; language development; Head Start, open schools and free schools; and a final section on the practical aspects of planning, analyzing and evaluating early childhood programs.

The progression of ideas through the readings allows the reader to come to the same conclusions as the teacher in the classroom. There must be more questioning regarding the ways young children learn and are evaluated — this comes out in the stimulating pro-and-con arguments of Greenfield and Bruner versus William Labov in the language development section and the heart-searchings about the effectiveness of open and free schools by Paul Goodman and Jonathan Kozol. "It is clear that our ideas about teaching are inadequate, but is it possible that they are simply false?" (Stretch p. 470)

A teacher is also reassured to

find that the obvious ways to progress in early education are brought out in the book: the necessary co-operation between home and education-program; the need to broaden the scope of early education to include infancy as well as the first years in the public school system, to provide more opportunities to learn a diversity of knowledge not just social orientation; the development of programs that will use the advantages of cultural, economic and language differences rather than trying to fit everyone into a middle-class image.

It is not often that the practising teacher and the educational-theorist agree, but I think that Frost reveals through these readings the essence of early childhood as seen by both teacher and theorist. This is the young child's basic desire to learn and it is up to us to find out the optimum kinds of learning-situations that will enable the child to overcome the shortcomings of his genetic or economic background, at the same time as conserving his identity and individuality. Frost's book makes obvious the need for more research into human development and various kinds of programs for young children. I hope many students will have the opportunity to read it and be stimulated to enter this very vital field of early childhood education.

Ray Burgess

Sunnydale Park School

Lois Brockman,
John Whiteley & John Zubeck.
**CHILD DEVELOPMENT:
SELECTED READINGS.**
Toronto:
McClelland and Stewart,
1973.
454 pp. \$7.95.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT: SELECTED READINGS is both informative, because it includes basic selections by the foremost authorities in the study of child development, and unique, because its authors, having decided that there

exists today a lack of in-depth Canadian literature concerning child development, have skillfully incorporated into their anthology topics of special interest and relevance to the Canadian university student.

Therefore, in one volume, the student is offered the core information laid down by those such as Piaget in "Thought of the Young Child" and Terman in "The Discovery and Encouragement of Exceptional Talent"; and, in addition, there are articles of specific concern such as Storm and Cameron's "Achievement Motivation in Canadian Indian, Middle and Working Class Children."

Such diversity might be disruptive reading, yet this is not the case. The book is organized into an introduction and nine section topics which serve to group the thirty-eight articles into divisional aspects within the complex field of child development. These include topics such as: Heredity and Environment; Learning and Motivation; Intelligence; and Cognition. The Appendix which concludes this anthology is also organized into sections: the first, "Student Aid Material," instructs the student in how to understand scientific articles; the second reviews statistical procedures; and the third defines terms used in the book.

However, it is natural that the question evolves: should not the intensified study of Canadian child development be pursued only after a general comprehension has been gained? I think not. Rather, I agree with the authors who assume that it is beneficial for the student to be exposed to fundamental concepts of child development concurrently with issues of immediate concern. N. E. Lambert's "Child Training Values of English Canadian and French Canadian Parents," along with Mary L. Northway's "The Sociometry of Society: Some Facts and Fancy," will reinforce the general concepts in H. F. Harlow and M. R. Harlow's article, "The Effects of Rearing Conditions on Social Behavior." Thus students gain reinforcement

find that the obvious ways to progress in early education are brought out in the book: the necessary co-operation between home and education-program; the need to broaden the scope of early education to include infancy as well as the first years in the public school system, to provide more opportunities to learn a diversity of knowledge not just social orientation; the development of programs that will use the advantages of cultural, economic and language differences rather than trying to fit everyone into a middle-class image.

It is not often that the practising teacher and the educational-theorist agree, but I think that Frost reveals through these readings the essence of early childhood as seen by both teacher and theorist. This is the young child's basic desire to learn and it is up to us to find out the optimum kinds of learning-situations that will enable the child to overcome the shortcomings of his genetic or economic background, at the same time as conserving his identity and individuality. Frost's book makes obvious the need for more research into human development and various kinds of programs for young children. I hope many students will have the opportunity to read it and be stimulated to enter this very vital field of early childhood education.

Ray Burgess

Sunnydale Park School

Lois Brockman,
John Whiteley & John Zubeck.
**CHILD DEVELOPMENT:
SELECTED READINGS.**
Toronto:
McClelland and Stewart,
1973.
454 pp. \$7.95.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT: SELECTED READINGS is both informative, because it includes basic selections by the foremost authorities in the study of child development, and unique, because its authors, having decided that there

exists today a lack of in-depth Canadian literature concerning child development, have skillfully incorporated into their anthology topics of special interest and relevance to the Canadian university student.

Therefore, in one volume, the student is offered the core information laid down by those such as Piaget in "Thought of the Young Child" and Terman in "The Discovery and Encouragement of Exceptional Talent"; and, in addition, there are articles of specific concern such as Storm and Cameron's "Achievement Motivation in Canadian Indian, Middle and Working Class Children."

Such diversity might be disruptive reading, yet this is not the case. The book is organized into an introduction and nine section topics which serve to group the thirty-eight articles into divisional aspects within the complex field of child development. These include topics such as: Heredity and Environment; Learning and Motivation; Intelligence; and Cognition. The Appendix which concludes this anthology is also organized into sections: the first, "Student Aid Material," instructs the student in how to understand scientific articles; the second reviews statistical procedures; and the third defines terms used in the book.

However, it is natural that the question evolves: should not the intensified study of Canadian child development be pursued only after a general comprehension has been gained? I think not. Rather, I agree with the authors who assume that it is beneficial for the student to be exposed to fundamental concepts of child development concurrently with issues of immediate concern. N. E. Lambert's "Child Training Values of English Canadian and French Canadian Parents," along with Mary L. Northway's "The Sociometry of Society: Some Facts and Fancy," will reinforce the general concepts in H. F. Harlow and M. R. Harlow's article, "The Effects of Rearing Conditions on Social Behavior." Thus students gain reinforcement

of theory in child development through the readings concerning the Canadian children around them.

Janet Vacca
Rhode Island College

T. H. McLeod, ed.
POST SECONDARY
EDUCATION IN A
TECHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY.
(L'enseignement
post-secondaire dans
une société technologique).
McGill - Queen's University
Press, Montreal, 1973.
247 pp.
\$7.50 paper, \$13.75 cloth.

Post-Secondary Education in a Technological Society is comprised of papers prepared for the Nuffield Canadian Seminar held at Cap-Rouge, Quebec, 25-27 June 1971 together with a summary by the editor T. H. McLeod.

Collectively the papers represent a wealth of information for persons interested in comparative education or for those charged with planning post secondary education facilities. Each paper, with the exception of the summary, is statistical in nature and attempts to present facts without philosophical reasonings for their existence. This accumulated data falls into four categories: cost, goals, manpower and accessibility. With regard to cost, there is little consensus except to note that "the honeymoon is over." The open hand appears to be closing as society scrutinizes the social benefits it is said to receive from education.

An examination of the goals of post secondary education, the second of the four points, spotlights the shift from an approach designed to service the intellectual elite to a far broader base. This expanded role is however fraught with problems as the universities attempt to maintain a balance between community involvement and complete academic independence free from external influence and control. The third major point examined is the relationship between

education and manpower needs. There appears to be no immediate relationship between general increases in educational opportunity and increases in productivity or aggregate income of the community. The problem may be two fold: on one hand there is the difficulty in finding accurate manpower forecasts and on the other there is the sluggishness of the university community to respond to public need.

On the last point, student accessibility, there were many definitions of "right" and "privilege." Universal accessibility was less popular than an elitist policy whose roots lie in the high school system. This policy has imposed strains on the present system as noted in the paper, *Post-Secondary Education in Canada*, which quotes liberally from the Parent Commission's report. In some cases this dichotomy of thought has produced a tertiary system, such as the Australian Colleges of Advanced Studies, in an attempt to provide higher education for larger numbers of students.

Many of the problems encountered by the several countries represented at the Conference are remarkably similar — for example the surplus of Ph.D's in pure and applied sciences and the difficulty of undergraduates in the arts securing a position. Perhaps now that the problems and interests have been established the solutions can be collectively found!

John B. Gradwell
McGill University

J. M. Paton.
CONCERN AND
COMPETENCE IN
CANADIAN EDUCATION.
D. A. MacIver, ed.
Toronto: Fac. of Ed.,
University of Toronto, 1973.
151 pp. \$7.50.

This anthology of essays reflects, to use two of the words of the book's title, the intelligent *concern* and literary *competence* of a scholar-philosopher whose four decades

of theory in child development through the readings concerning the Canadian children around them.

Janet Vacca
Rhode Island College

T. H. McLeod, ed.
POST SECONDARY
EDUCATION IN A
TECHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY.
(L'enseignement
post-secondaire dans
une société technologique).
McGill - Queen's University
Press, Montreal, 1973.
247 pp.
\$7.50 paper, \$13.75 cloth.

Post-Secondary Education in a Technological Society is comprised of papers prepared for the Nuffield Canadian Seminar held at Cap-Rouge, Quebec, 25-27 June 1971 together with a summary by the editor T. H. McLeod.

Collectively the papers represent a wealth of information for persons interested in comparative education or for those charged with planning post secondary education facilities. Each paper, with the exception of the summary, is statistical in nature and attempts to present facts without philosophical reasonings for their existence. This accumulated data falls into four categories: cost, goals, manpower and accessibility. With regard to cost, there is little consensus except to note that "the honeymoon is over." The open hand appears to be closing as society scrutinizes the social benefits it is said to receive from education.

An examination of the goals of post secondary education, the second of the four points, spotlights the shift from an approach designed to service the intellectual elite to a far broader base. This expanded role is however fraught with problems as the universities attempt to maintain a balance between community involvement and complete academic independence free from external influence and control. The third major point examined is the relationship between

education and manpower needs. There appears to be no immediate relationship between general increases in educational opportunity and increases in productivity or aggregate income of the community. The problem may be two fold: on one hand there is the difficulty in finding accurate manpower forecasts and on the other there is the sluggishness of the university community to respond to public need.

On the last point, student accessibility, there were many definitions of "right" and "privilege." Universal accessibility was less popular than an elitist policy whose roots lie in the high school system. This policy has imposed strains on the present system as noted in the paper, *Post-Secondary Education in Canada*, which quotes liberally from the Parent Commission's report. In some cases this dichotomy of thought has produced a tertiary system, such as the Australian Colleges of Advanced Studies, in an attempt to provide higher education for larger numbers of students.

Many of the problems encountered by the several countries represented at the Conference are remarkably similar — for example the surplus of Ph.D's in pure and applied sciences and the difficulty of undergraduates in the arts securing a position. Perhaps now that the problems and interests have been established the solutions can be collectively found!

John B. Gradwell
McGill University

J. M. Paton.
CONCERN AND
COMPETENCE IN
CANADIAN EDUCATION.
D. A. MacIver, ed.
Toronto: Fac. of Ed.,
University of Toronto, 1973.
151 pp. \$7.50.

This anthology of essays reflects, to use two of the words of the book's title, the intelligent *concern* and literary *competence* of a scholar-philosopher whose four decades

of theory in child development through the readings concerning the Canadian children around them.

Janet Vacca
Rhode Island College

T. H. McLeod, ed.
POST SECONDARY
EDUCATION IN A
TECHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY.
(L'enseignement
post-secondaire dans
une société technologique).
McGill - Queen's University
Press, Montreal, 1973.
247 pp.
\$7.50 paper, \$13.75 cloth.

Post-Secondary Education in a Technological Society is comprised of papers prepared for the Nuffield Canadian Seminar held at Cap-Rouge, Quebec, 25-27 June 1971 together with a summary by the editor T. H. McLeod.

Collectively the papers represent a wealth of information for persons interested in comparative education or for those charged with planning post secondary education facilities. Each paper, with the exception of the summary, is statistical in nature and attempts to present facts without philosophical reasonings for their existence. This accumulated data falls into four categories: cost, goals, manpower and accessibility. With regard to cost, there is little consensus except to note that "the honeymoon is over." The open hand appears to be closing as society scrutinizes the social benefits it is said to receive from education.

An examination of the goals of post secondary education, the second of the four points, spotlights the shift from an approach designed to service the intellectual elite to a far broader base. This expanded role is however fraught with problems as the universities attempt to maintain a balance between community involvement and complete academic independence free from external influence and control. The third major point examined is the relationship between

education and manpower needs. There appears to be no immediate relationship between general increases in educational opportunity and increases in productivity or aggregate income of the community. The problem may be two fold: on one hand there is the difficulty in finding accurate manpower forecasts and on the other there is the sluggishness of the university community to respond to public need.

On the last point, student accessibility, there were many definitions of "right" and "privilege." Universal accessibility was less popular than an elitist policy whose roots lie in the high school system. This policy has imposed strains on the present system as noted in the paper, *Post-Secondary Education in Canada*, which quotes liberally from the Parent Commission's report. In some cases this dichotomy of thought has produced a tertiary system, such as the Australian Colleges of Advanced Studies, in an attempt to provide higher education for larger numbers of students.

Many of the problems encountered by the several countries represented at the Conference are remarkably similar — for example the surplus of Ph.D's in pure and applied sciences and the difficulty of undergraduates in the arts securing a position. Perhaps now that the problems and interests have been established the solutions can be collectively found!

John B. Gradwell
McGill University

J. M. Paton.
CONCERN AND
COMPETENCE IN
CANADIAN EDUCATION.
D. A. MacIver, ed.
Toronto: Fac. of Ed.,
University of Toronto, 1973.
151 pp. \$7.50.

This anthology of essays reflects, to use two of the words of the book's title, the intelligent *concern* and literary *competence* of a scholar-philosopher whose four decades

in Canadian education consistently manifested a fundamental and overriding desire to reconcile the ideas of the educational theorists with the realities of classroom practice. Influencing his thinking was his close association with teachers' organizations. Before coming to Quebec to assume the position of Associate Professor of English at Macdonald College, Dr. Paton was the president of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation. For fourteen crucially important years in the organization's history, from 1949 until 1963, he was the General Secretary of the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers. He left that post in 1963 to join the faculty of the College of Education, University of Toronto, where, from 1967 until his retirement in 1972, he was chairman of the Department of History, Philosophy and Sociology of Education.

The first of the two parts into which the anthology is divided is entitled "Issues in Education." In it he defines his philosophy of education, a philosophy that is essentially liberal and pragmatic but which is emphatically humanities oriented. To Dr. Paton, the main task of the school is to teach people to think.

Particularly notable in this first section are the thoughtful review of Hilda Neatby's *So Little for the Mind*, a review that is entitled "Dr. Neatby's Doctored Diatribe" and which is the best assessment of this all but forgotten condemnation of Canadian education that this reviewer can recall reading, and a timely essay, inspired by the Ontario MacKay Report, on moral and religious education. In "The Either/Or Syndrome in Educational Theorizing," Dr. Paton makes an eloquent plea for the educational middle ground, for an enlightened compromise between the extremes of traditionalism and those of progressivism, currently represented by the advocates of unbridled freedom in the schools.

The second part of the book, "The Professionalization of the Teacher," treats largely of the role

of teachers' associations in Canada. For a North American audience of the mid-70's, perhaps the most timely essay in this section is "Trade Union or Professional Association? The Canadian Experience." Dr. Paton places himself unequivocally in the camp of those who prefer the association to the union. He argues that the professional association, rather than the trade union, is more likely to concern itself with those issues that must be resolved if teachers are to enjoy truly professional status. His approach to education is characterized by *persuasion*, based upon knowledge and rational thought, and *compromise*, of the type essential to the proper functioning of democratic institutions.

Concern and Competence in Canadian Education provides a wealth of intellectual nourishment for those genuinely concerned with the problems and quandaries of contemporary Canadian education. Its approach is both sane and humane. It is exactly the type of book that one would expect from Jim Paton.

E. G. Cochrane
Protestant School Board
of Greater Montreal

D. G. Watts.
THE LEARNING OF HISTORY.
London:
Routledge & Kegan Paul,
1972.
117 pp. \$5.60.

These are difficult times for history teachers. Their subject is under attack from several quarters, not the least of which are disaffected students suspicious of all knowledge outside their own experience and time. Challenged by these dealers in "relevant" education, history teachers are on the defensive, so much so that it sometimes appears that they spend more time in justifying their subject than in actually teaching it. In striking contrast to the uncertain status of history in the schools is the revival of interest in

in Canadian education consistently manifested a fundamental and overriding desire to reconcile the ideas of the educational theorists with the realities of classroom practice. Influencing his thinking was his close association with teachers' organizations. Before coming to Quebec to assume the position of Associate Professor of English at Macdonald College, Dr. Paton was the president of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation. For fourteen crucially important years in the organization's history, from 1949 until 1963, he was the General Secretary of the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers. He left that post in 1963 to join the faculty of the College of Education, University of Toronto, where, from 1967 until his retirement in 1972, he was chairman of the Department of History, Philosophy and Sociology of Education.

The first of the two parts into which the anthology is divided is entitled "Issues in Education." In it he defines his philosophy of education, a philosophy that is essentially liberal and pragmatic but which is emphatically humanities oriented. To Dr. Paton, the main task of the school is to teach people to think.

Particularly notable in this first section are the thoughtful review of Hilda Neatby's *So Little for the Mind*, a review that is entitled "Dr. Neatby's Doctored Diatribe" and which is the best assessment of this all but forgotten condemnation of Canadian education that this reviewer can recall reading, and a timely essay, inspired by the Ontario MacKay Report, on moral and religious education. In "The Either/Or Syndrome in Educational Theorizing," Dr. Paton makes an eloquent plea for the educational middle ground, for an enlightened compromise between the extremes of traditionalism and those of progressivism, currently represented by the advocates of unbridled freedom in the schools.

The second part of the book, "The Professionalization of the Teacher," treats largely of the role

of teachers' associations in Canada. For a North American audience of the mid-70's, perhaps the most timely essay in this section is "Trade Union or Professional Association? The Canadian Experience." Dr. Paton places himself unequivocally in the camp of those who prefer the association to the union. He argues that the professional association, rather than the trade union, is more likely to concern itself with those issues that must be resolved if teachers are to enjoy truly professional status. His approach to education is characterized by *persuasion*, based upon knowledge and rational thought, and *compromise*, of the type essential to the proper functioning of democratic institutions.

Concern and Competence in Canadian Education provides a wealth of intellectual nourishment for those genuinely concerned with the problems and quandaries of contemporary Canadian education. Its approach is both sane and humane. It is exactly the type of book that one would expect from Jim Paton.

E. G. Cochrane
Protestant School Board
of Greater Montreal

D. G. Watts.
THE LEARNING OF HISTORY.
London:
Routledge & Kegan Paul,
1972.
117 pp. \$5.60.

These are difficult times for history teachers. Their subject is under attack from several quarters, not the least of which are disaffected students suspicious of all knowledge outside their own experience and time. Challenged by these dealers in "relevant" education, history teachers are on the defensive, so much so that it sometimes appears that they spend more time in justifying their subject than in actually teaching it. In striking contrast to the uncertain status of history in the schools is the revival of interest in

the past in the public mind. The popular success of the historical drama on television — "The Forsyte Saga" and "The National Dream" are just two examples — suggests that history is far from being a dead subject for many people.

Against this curious paradox, D. G. Watts, a teacher and writer of history in England, undertakes to discuss the means by which the teaching of history can be improved in the regular schools. Although the author's comments are intended for a British audience, they are of sufficient importance and merit to be of interest to history teachers everywhere.

The unique quality of the book is its investigation of the psychological aspects of learning history and the role played by history in developing the imagination and intellect of the pupil. Indeed, at times there is more Piaget and Dewey than Toynbee. In any case, the author's main thesis is that history is badly taught because its nature is badly understood and because teachers do not know enough about the pupils they are instructing. Watts maintains that history is part art and part science, that learning history is at once an emotional and intellectual experience. Once we accept this fact, an improvement in the teaching of history will result. According to Watts, the failure of history teachers to understand the character of history has caused them to err in their methods of instruction. For example, if the discovery approach has been less than successful in the teaching of history, claims the

author, it is because it was borrowed from the sciences. What works in science teaching does not necessarily work in history.

Sounding more like a child psychologist than an historian (the author is currently a Senior Counsellor with the Open University), Watts gives special attention to a discussion of the social development of the pupil, particularly his emotional and mental readiness to study and profit from history. His message: history teaching should be adapted to the youngster's stage of development. Arguing, for example, that inasmuch as youngsters in the 7-8 age bracket show a fascination for stories of conflict, heroes and villains, history teachers might well use this time for a study of Greeks and Trojans, or Romans and Carthaginians. Claiming also that studies show that pupils around fifteen are little interested in any history, Watts says that consideration should be given to dropping history from the curriculum in the lower secondary school.

It should be clear by now that Watts' book goes beyond that of "tips for teachers." The overall excellence of the work may be attributed to a writer who is at home in psychology as well as in history, and who has effectively arranged a marriage of the two. Prospective teachers and inservice teachers will find this book a gem. If there is a better work on the teaching of history, I am not aware of it.

Roger Magnuson
McGill University

McGILL JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

Index

Volumes VII and VIII

A — Title

<i>About Creativity</i>	F. Graeme Chalmers	VIII, 1, 33-39
<i>Administration and Creativity</i>	Richard Butt	VIII, 1, 95-98
<i>Antecedents and Consequences of Educational Technology</i>	Glenn F. Cartwright	VIII, 2, 145-149
<i>Aversion to the Mean</i>	Walter L. Strandburg	VII, 1, 68-70
<i>Changes in the Teaching Profes- sion</i>	Robert E. Lavery	VII, 2, 166-174
<i>Comment on "The Silent Mem- ber In Groups"</i>	Stephen D. Shatkin	VII, 1, 74-76
<i>Commitment to Creativity in Edu- cation</i>	E. Paul Torrance	VIII, 1, 3-12
<i>Computer, Teacher and Learner: Some Technological Implica- tions</i>	Bruce M. Shore	VIII, 2, 150-156
<i>Counselling in the Canadian Scene</i>	Myrne Nevison	VII, 1, 3-10
<i>Creating a New University Cam- pus: The University of Bots- wana, Lesotho and Swaziland</i> ..	H. O. H. Vernon- Jackson	VIII, 2, 198-207
<i>Creative and Aesthetic Experi- ence</i>	Ralph A. Smith	VIII, 1, 21-32
<i>Creative Dance</i>	Jennifer Wall	VIII, 1, 59-63
<i>Creative Teacher (The)</i>	Betty Jaques	VIII, 1, 127
<i>Creativity or the Few and the Many</i>	Robert Ulich	VIII, 2, 13-20
<i>Designing and Creating World Futures</i>	William H. Boyer	VIII, 1, 73-85
<i>Diary of an Ex-Art Teacher</i>	Boyd White	VIII, 1, 40-47
<i>L'écart des générations: pro- blème ou paradoxe?</i>	Avigdor Farine/ Hugh M. Leard	VII, 1, 46-61
<i>Editorial</i>	Hugh M. Leard/ William M. Talley	VII, 1, 1-2
<i>Editorial</i>	Norman Henchey/ John Lipkin	VII, 2, 93-94
<i>Editorial</i>	Margaret Gillett	VIII, 1, 1-2
<i>Educational Literature of the Quiet Revolution (The)</i>	André Le Blanc	VII, 2, 175-188
<i>Educational Media in Quebec</i>	Danielle Bown	VIII, 2, 188-191
<i>Educational Technology and the Re-Creation of the University</i> ..	G. M. Boyd	VIII, 2, 169-175
<i>Evolution récente de l'enseigne- ment supérieur québécois</i>	Germain Gauthier	VII, 2, 135-148
<i>Figure Study</i>	Lynn Studham	VIII, 1, 48-49
<i>Future Education and a New Epis- temology</i>	Magoroh Maruyama	VIII, 1, 86-94
<i>Hands On!</i>	Alwynn Pollard	VIII, 2, 176-178

<i>Hard, Soft, or Medium</i>	Margaret Gillett	VIII, 2, 129-144
<i>Impact of Liberalized Residence Hall Regulations (The)</i>	M. A. J. Guttman/ J. Alfred Southworth	VIII, 1, 99-105
<i>In Defence of the Language Lab.</i>	Jean-Marc Vary	VIII, 2, 165-168
<i>Indicateurs des valeurs des ado- lescents au secondaire</i>	Avigdor Farine	VII, 1, 29-39
<i>Louis-Philippe Audet and His Work</i>	Réal G. Boulianne	VII, 2, 205-210
<i>Moral Philosophy and Education: A Review Essay</i>	James E. McClellan	VIII, 1, 106-119
<i>Power and Participation in Edu- cational Reform</i>	Paul Gallagher	VII, 2, 149-165
<i>Privileged Communication and the Counsellor</i>	Paul LeBlanc	VII, 1, 11-21
<i>Problem Solving in PSI</i>	M. E. Weber/ O. M. Fuller	VIII, 2, 179-187
<i>Quebec Education: The Unfin- ished Revolution</i>	Norman Henchey/ Ann Denis	VII, 2, 95-118 VII, 2, 119-134
<i>Quebec's Cegeps: Promise and Reality</i>	John Lipkin	
<i>Retrospective on the Parent Re- port</i>	Magdelhayne F. Buteau	VII, 2, 189-204 VII, 1, 62-67
<i>Show Them Love — Attempt to Understand — Reduce the Sta- tistics — Mr. Elementary Coun- sellor</i>	Harold Altmann	
<i>Silent Member in Groups (The) ..</i>	William M. Talley	VII, 1, 71-74
<i>Simulation Modelling in Institu- tional Research</i>	Bernard S. Sheehan	VIII, 2, 192-197
<i>Source de créativité à l'université (Une)</i>	Jean-Marc Samson	VIII, 1, 64-72
<i>Teacher as Artist (The)</i>	Theodore Brameld	VIII, 1, 53-58
<i>Theory and Research in Instruc- tional Technology</i>	Paul Saettler	VIII, 2, 157-164
<i>Toward a New Approach to De- sign Education</i>	Lydia Ferrabee	VIII, 2, 208-213
<i>Valediction (A)</i>	J. D. O'Hara	VIII, 1, 50-51
<i>Who Wants the Truth If It's Bor- ing</i>	Alexander J. Young	VII, 1, 77-82
<i>Youth Movement, Rochdale, and the Counsellor (The)</i>	Robert Enright	VII, 1, 40-45

B — Author

Altmann, Harold	<i>Show Them Love — Attempt to Understand — Reduce the Statis- tics — Mr. Elementary Coun- sellor</i>	VII, 1, 62-67
Bown, Danielle	<i>Educational Media in Quebec ...</i>	VIII, 2, 188-191
Boulianne, Réal G.	<i>Louis-Philippe Audet and His Work</i>	VII, 2, 205-210
Boyd, G. M.	<i>Educational Technology and the Re-Creation of the University ..</i>	VIII, 2, 169-175

- Boyer, William H. *Designing and Creating World Futures* VIII, 1, 73-85
- Brameld, Theodore *The Teacher as Artist* VIII, 1, 53-58
- Buteau, Magdelhayne F. *Retrospective on the Parent Report* VII, 2, 189-204
- Butt, Richard *Administration and Creativity?* .. VIII, 1, 95-98
- Cartwright, Glenn F. *Antecedents and Consequences of Educational Technology* VIII, 2, 145-149
- Chalmers, F. Graeme *About Creativity* VIII, 1, 33-39
- Denis, Ann and John Lipkin *Quebec's Cegeps: Promise and Reality* VII, 2, 119-134
- Enright, Robert *The Youth Movement, Rochdale, and the Counsellor* VII, 1, 40-45
- Farine, Avigdor *Indicateurs des valeurs des adolescents au secondaire* VII, 1, 29-39
- Farine, Avigdor and Hugh M. Leard *L'écart des générations: problème ou paradoxe?* VII, 1, 46-61
- Ferrabee, Lydia *Toward a New Approach to Design Education* VIII, 2, 208-213
- Gallagher, Paul *Power and Participation in Educational Reform* VII, 2, 149-165
- Gauthier, Germain *Evolution récente de l'enseignement supérieur québécois* VII, 2, 135-148
- Gillett, Margaret *Editorial* VIII, 1, 1-2
- Guttman, M. A. *Hard, Soft, or Medium?* VIII, 2, 129-144
- Julius and J. Alfred Southworth *The Impact of Liberalized Residence Hall Regulations* VIII, 1, 99-1-5
- Henchey, Norman *Quebec Education: The Unfinished Revolution* VII, 2, 95-118
- _____ and John Lipkin *Editorial* VII, 2, 93-94
- Jakes, Betty *The Creative Teacher* VIII, 1, 127
- Lavery, Robert E. *Changes in the Teaching Profession* VII, 2, 166-174
- LeBlanc, André *The Educational Literature of the Quiet Revolution* VII, 2, 175-188
- LeBlanc, Paul *Privileged Communication and the Counsellor* VII, 1, 11-21
- Leard, Hugh M. and Avigdor Farine *L'écart des générations: problème ou paradoxe?* VII, 1, 46-61
- _____ and William M. Talley *Editorial* VII, 1, 1-2
- Lipkin, John and Ann Denis *Quebec's Cegeps: Promise and Reality* VII, 2, 119-134
- Lipkin, John and Norman Henchey *Editorial* VII, 2, 93-94
- Maruyama, Magoroh *Future Education and a New Epistemology* VIII, 1, 86-94
- McClellan, James E. *Moral Philosophy and Education: A Review Essay* VIII, 1, 106-119
- Nevison, Myrre *Counselling in the Canadian Scene* VII, 1, 3-10
- O'Hara, J. D. *A Valediction* VIII, 1, 50-51

O'Hara, J. D.	<i>Graduate Seminar</i>	VIII, 1, 51-52
Pollard, Alwynn	<i>Hands On!</i>	VIII, 2, 176-178
Saettler, Paul	<i>Theory and Research in Instructional Technology</i>	VIII, 2, 157-164
Samson, Jean-Marc	<i>Une source de créativité à l'université</i>	VIII, 1, 64-72
Shatkin, Stephen D.	<i>Comment on "The Silent Member in Groups"</i>	VII, 1, 74-76
Sheehan, Bernard S.	<i>Simulation Modelling in Institutional Research</i>	VIII, 2, 192-197
Shore, Bruce M.	<i>Computer, Teacher, and Learner: Some Technological Implications</i>	VIII, 2, 150-156
Smith, Ralph A.	<i>Creative and Aesthetic Experience</i>	VIII, 1, 21-32
Strandburg, Walter L.	<i>Aversion to the Mean</i>	VII, 1, 68-70
Studham, Lynn	<i>Figure Study</i>	VIII, 1, 48-49
Talley, William M.	<i>The Silent Member in Groups</i>	VII, 1, 71-74
_____ and Hugh M. Leard	<i>Editorial</i>	VII, 1, 1-2
Torrance, E. Paul	<i>Commitment to Creativity in Education</i>	VIII, 1, 3-12
Ulich, Robert	<i>Creativity or the Few and the Many</i>	VIII, 2, 13-20
Vary, Jean-Marc	<i>In Defence of the Language Lab.</i>	VIII, 2, 165-168
Vernon-Jackson, H. O. H.	<i>Creating a New University Campus: The University of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland</i>	VIII, 2, 198-207
Wall, Jennifer	<i>Creative Dance</i>	VIII, 1, 59-63
Weber, M. E. and O. M. Fuller	<i>Problem Solving in PSI</i>	VIII, 2, 179-187
White, Boyd	<i>Diary of an Ex-Art Teacher</i>	VIII, 1, 40-47
Young, Alexander J.	<i>Who Wants the Truth If It's Boring</i>	VII, 1, 77-82

C — Reviews

- Audet, Louis-Philippe. *Works*. (Review essay by Réal G. Boulianne) VII, 2, 205-210.
- Barnes, Douglas, et al. *Language, the Learner and the School*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1971 (rev. ed.). (by Susan Vadavil) VIII, 1, 123-124.
- Barron, Frank. *Creative Person and Creative Process*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969. (by Mary Bews) VII, 1, 83-84.
- Boyer, William H. *Education for Annihilation*. Honolulu: Hogarth Press, 1972. (by R. Tali) VIII, 1, 122.
- Butts, R. Freeman. *The Education of the West; A Formative Chapter in the History of Civilization*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973. (by Roger Magnuson) VIII, 2, 218.
- Carpenter, Edmund. *Oh, What a Blow That Phantom Gave Me!* Toronto: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973. (by W. Kenneth Richmond) VIII, 2, 216-217.
- Cummings, Susan N. *Communication for Education*. Toronto: Intext, 1971. (by Bruce M. Shore) VIII, 1, 125-126.

- Duffy, Gerald G. and George B. Sherman. *Systematic Reading Instruction*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972. (by F. P. Greene) VIII, 2, 214-216.
- Featherstone, Joseph. *An Introduction: British Primary Schools Today*. Toronto: MacMillan, 1972. (by Lila F. Wolfe) VIII, 2, 223-224.
- Freilich, Morris. *The Meaning of Culture: A Reader in Cultural Anthropology*. Toronto: Xerox Publishing, 1972. (by Maureen McGuire Olsen) VIII, 2, 221.
- Gilchrist, J. and W. J. Murray. *The Press in the French Revolution*. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1971. (by A. K. Maconochie) VIII, 1, 124-125.
- Gillett, Margaret. *Educational Technology: Toward Demystification*. Toronto: Prentice-Hall, 1973. (by W. Kenneth Richmond) VIII, 2, 216-217.
- Guszk, Frank J. *Diagnostic Reading Instruction in the Elementary School*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972. (by F. P. Greene) VIII, 2, 214-216.
- Goldman, Ronald. *Readings for Religion: A Basis for Developmental Religious Education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970. (by Thomas A. Francoeur) VIII, 2, 221-222.
- Harris, Robin. *A Bibliography of Higher Education in Canada, Supplement 1971*. (English and French) Toronto & Quebec: University of Toronto Press & Les presses de l'université Laval, 1971. (by Reginald Edwards) VII, 1, 84-85.
- Illich, Ivan. *Deschooling Society*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971. (by Brian Hendley) VII, 2, 211-213.
- Lipkin, John P. *Secondary School Teacher Education in Transition*. New York: Asia Publishing House, 1970. (by Baldev Raj Nayar) VII, 1, 85-86.
- Noll, James Wm. and Sam P. Kelley. *Foundation of Education in America — An Anthology of Major Thoughts and Significant Actions*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970. (by Douglas Ray) VII, 1, 86-87.
- Rudolph, Susanne Hoeber and Lloyd I. Rudolph, eds. *Education and Politics in India: Studies in Organization, Society and Policy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972. (by John Lipkin) VIII, 2, 219-220.
- Ryan, Thomas J. *Poverty and the Child: A Canadian Study*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1972. (by Heather Trump Davis) VIII, 2, 220-221.
- Shipley, C. Morton et al. *A Synthesis of Teaching Methods*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1972 (3rd ed.). (by Nancy Carlman) VIII, 2, 222-223.
- Shook, Laurence K. *Catholic Post-Secondary Education in English-Speaking Canada: A History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971. (by Hugh A. Stevenson) VII, 2, 218-220.
- Sizer, Nancy F. and Theodore R.Sizer, eds. *Moral Education, Five Lectures*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970. (Review essay by James E. McClellan) VIII, 1, 106-119.
- Tanner, Laurel N. and Henry Clay Lindgren. *Classroom Teaching and Learning: A Mental Health Approach*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971. (by Thomas A. Francoeur) VIII, 1, 121.

- Williamson, Juanita V. and Virginia M. Burke, eds. *A Various Language: Perspectives on American Dialects*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971. (by Patrick Dias) VIII, 1, 120-121.
- Wilson, John, Norman Williams and Barry Sugarman. *Introduction to Moral Education*. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin 1967 & 1969. (Review essay, by James E. McClellan) VIII, 1, 106-119.

From a Letter to the Editor

The latest McGill Journal of Education has just arrived on my desk. Good for you to devote an issue to the one and only Neill. In his last letter to me, just before I left for Montreal, he wrote:

"Death for me means never knowing whether freedom will prevail. If there's a hot line from Earth to Hell give me a ring and let me know how things progress or retrogress."

Typical of the man: I immediately dropped him a note saying that I had news for him: he wouldn't like it when he got there but a place was reserved for him upstairs.

— Kenneth Richmond

- Williamson, Juanita V. and Virginia M. Burke, eds. *A Various Language: Perspectives on American Dialects*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971. (by Patrick Dias) VIII, 1, 120-121.
- Wilson, John, Norman Williams and Barry Sugarman. *Introduction to Moral Education*. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin 1967 & 1969. (Review essay, by James E. McClellan) VIII, 1, 106-119.

From a Letter to the Editor

The latest McGill Journal of Education has just arrived on my desk. Good for you to devote an issue to the one and only Neill. In his last letter to me, just before I left for Montreal, he wrote:

"Death for me means never knowing whether freedom will prevail. If there's a hot line from Earth to Hell give me a ring and let me know how things progress or retrogress."

Typical of the man: I immediately dropped him a note saying that I had news for him: he wouldn't like it when he got there but a place was reserved for him upstairs.

— Kenneth Richmond

DEMANDE DE RENSEIGNEMENTS
À L'ADRESSE DU
COMITÉ CONSULTATIF DU CONSEIL DES ARTS
SUR L'INDIVIDU, LE LANGAGE ET LA SOCIÉTÉ

Le Conseil des Arts du Canada, sur l'avis du Comité de développement de sa Commission consultative des affaires universitaires, a établi le Comité consultatif sur l'individu, le langage et la société.

Ce Comité s'intéressera notamment aux effets que produisent, tant sur le plan affectif que sur le plan de la connaissance, l'acquisition d'une langue seconde, la facilité à s'exprimer dans deux ou plusieurs langues, l'appartenance à un groupe ethnique minoritaire, l'acculturation et la déculturation. En général, il accordera une attention particulière aux activités suivantes:

- A. Etudes linguistiques à composante sociale;
- B. Etudes psychologiques à composante linguistique;
- C. Etudes sociales à composante linguistique.

Le Comité a pour mission d'analyser la situation de la recherche dans ces domaines, d'en déterminer les lacunes et de proposer au Conseil des Arts des moyens de combler ces lacunes.

Pour bien s'acquitter de sa tâche, il est très important que le Comité puisse connaître tous les spécialistes qui oeuvrent au Canada dans les disciplines en cause. La publication d'avis dans des publications comme celle-ci est un des moyens qu'il emploie pour obtenir ces renseignements.

Nous invitons les universitaires dont les travaux se rapportent à la mission du Comité à bien vouloir écrire à: —

M. W. H. Coons,
Président du Comité consultatif
sur l'individu, le langage et la société,
Département de psychologie,
Université York,
Downsview, Ontario, M3J 1P3.

Les répondants sont priés de mentionner leur domaine de recherche, les difficultés rencontrées dans l'exécution de leurs travaux (y compris les difficultés financières), les sujets d'étude méritant une attention particulière, les noms d'autres spécialistes travaillant dans le même domaine, et toute autre chose pertinente.

Contributors . . .

Jean-Philippe Aubert is a lecturer in the French Language Centre, McGill, and a doctoral candidate in French Literature.

Mitchell E. Batoff is Associate Professor of Science Education at Jersey City State College. Dr. Batoff has twenty years of teaching experience at all levels, from kindergarten through graduate school.

E. F. Beane took his B.A. at Sir George Williams and started, but dropped out of, the McGill Diploma in Education course. He is currently working as an apprentice butcher in Pte. St. Charles.

Derek Drummond was a founder of the firm Donaldson, Drummond, Sankey, Architects which was a winner in the 1965 Province of Quebec design competition for elementary schools and subsequently responsible for a number of elementary schools in the Lakeshore area of Montreal. Mr. Drummond is presently an Associate Professor and the Associate Director of the School of Architecture, McGill.

John W. Friesen, who is an Associate Professor of Education at the University of Calgary, is the author of three books and some thirty published articles in the field of Education.

Jeffrey Herold, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor in the Foundations of Education Department at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. He was formerly Assistant Professor of Education at the State University of New York at Cortland.

George Johnston is Dean of the Faculty of Religious Studies at McGill.

Yvonne Katz, a graduate student in McGill's Department of Russian and Slavic Studies, spent 1973-74 on a kibbutz in Israel.

Gabrielle Pascal, Ph.D., is a member of the French Language and Literature Department and Associate Director of French Courses for Staff, McGill.

Douglas Ray is Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario and current President of the Comparative and International Education Society of Canada.

W. Kenneth Richmond of the University of Glasgow has taught in the McGill Faculty of Education summer school on a number of occasions. He is well known internationally for his books on Education and his *Education and Schooling* is to be published soon by Methuen.

Donald S. Seckinger, Associate Professor of Educational Foundations, University of Wyoming, is Secretary-Treasurer of the Far Western Philosophy of Education Society, a Fellow of the Philosophy of Education Society and a Contributing Member of the American Educational Studies Association.

Charles A. Tesconi is Associate Professor, Department of Policy Studies, College of Education, University of Illinois, Chicago Circle. He is co-author of *The Anti-Man Culture*, co-editor of *Challenges To Education and Education For Whom?* His *Schooling in America: A Social Philosophical Perspective* will be published this year.

mcgill Journal of education



Next Issue:

- **Community Colleges**
- **Women and Education**